PRIMARY '90
Consolidated Primary Election Tuesday June 5, 1990

VOTE!

Polls are open from 7 am to 8 pm
See the label on the back cover for the location of your polling place.

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot
Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:30 a.m. to about 9:00 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name ____________________________________________________________
Address _______________________________________________ Apt. #________
Telephone No. (required) ________________________________
Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □
Availability:
   I want to work in the following area(s): _________________________
   Second choice locations (if any) ________________________________

Signature ______________________________________________________
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 5, 1990 election. The Pamphlet includes:
1. a Sample Ballot (i.e., a copy of the ballot you see at your polling place or the one you receive when you vote) Page 5-21
2. the location of your polling place ........................ (see label on the back cover)
3. application for absentee ballot ........................... back cover
4. definitions of words you need to know .................. 22
5. information for disabled voters; and application for permanent absentee voter status .................. 24
6. rights of voters ........................................... 25
7. statements from the candidates who are running for office .................................................... 26-34
8. information about each proposition, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the proposition, and the legal text .......... 37-128
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

STEP 1

STEP 2

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

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

C 第二步
請確認將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

D 第三步
請把手機之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

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

STEP 4

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投票人應用。
This is a Non-Partisan Ballot. You may only vote for Non-Partisan local offices, and for State and local propositions.

Non-Partisan voters in the Primary election do not vote for:

- Governor
- Lieutenant Governor
- Secretary of State
- Controller
- Treasurer
- Attorney General
- Insurance Commissioner
- Member, State Board of Equalization
- United States Representative
- State Senator
- Member of the State Assembly
- Member, County Central Committee

You will be able to vote for those offices in the General Election in November.

To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARK ISLER</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAROL S. KOPPEL</strong></td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BILL HONIG</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALEX SALDAMANDO</strong></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J. DOMINIQUE OLOMENDY</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARLOS BEA</strong></td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KAY TSENIN</strong></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JEROME T. BENSON</strong></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DONNA HITCHENS</strong></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O'CONNOR (Attorney / Abogado)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN (Attorney / Law Teacher / Abogada / Maestra de Derecho)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULIE TANG (Assistant District Attorney / Fiscal Asistente del Distrito)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN (Sheriff's Department's Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO (Attorney/Abogado)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING (Incumbent/Titular del Cargo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW (Real Estate Portfolio Manager / Administrador de Bienes Raíces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WENDY NELDER (Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogado; Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO (Supervisor / Supervisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER (Deputy Assessor / Asesor Asistente)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>DEFENSOR PUBLICO (Incumbent/Titular del Cargo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The document contains a list of candidates for various positions, including judges of the municipal court and assessors, along with their votes. The document is in both English and Spanish.
### CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990

#### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td>HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.</td>
<td><strong>YES 185</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 187</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td>PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.</td>
<td><strong>YES 189</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 190</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td>GOVERNOR'S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor's time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.</td>
<td><strong>YES 192</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 193</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.</td>
<td><strong>YES 195</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 197</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td>THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.</td>
<td><strong>YES 200</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 203</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 SI 贅成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cien mil millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) viviendas de emergencia y simplemente temporales para familias y individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos buscando viviendas de arriendo que llenen las necesidades especiales de las ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa donde para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

185 NO 反对

189 SI 反对
ACTA DE BONOS PARA INFRAESTRUCTURA PARA PARAJOYOS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cien mil millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) viviendas de emergencia y simplemente temporales para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos buscando viviendas de arriendo que llenen las necesidades especiales de las ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa donde para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

189 NO 贅成

192 SI 贅成
REVENCION DE LEGISLACIÒN POR EL GOBERNADOR, FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÒN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. El tiempo en que el gobernador puede vetar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigor la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningun efecto fiscal directo.

192 NO 贅成

193 SI 反对
EXENCIÒN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transmisión del impuesto base a viviendas habitacionales a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningun impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatales u locales ya que solamente autoriza a la legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habrá una pérdida de rédices de los impuestos probablemente de $1 millón a $10 millones de dólares.

193 NO 贅成

195 SI 贄成
ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DÉSEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta acta establece un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y permite al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatales y locales para reforzar mejor las necesidades de los conductores de California. Disipa nuevas rutas a ser usadas para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, y estaciones para el transporte en gran escala.

195 NO 贅成

197 NO 反对

198 SI 贄成
199 NO 反对
200 SI 贽成
203 NO 反对

1990年是问题与提案考虑的立法提案。此法案提供发行债券$150,000,000以资助的房屋计划，其中包括：(1)紧急和临时住房，供家庭和个人使用，(2)新的大修房屋或新建筑，以满足特殊需要，如老年人、残障者和特殊需要的工人，(3)建筑物的维护和改善，以及(4)帮助首次购房的个人。

1990年是问题与提案考虑的立法提案。此法案提供发行债券$150,000,000以资助的房屋计划，其中包括：(1)紧急和临时住房，供家庭和个人使用，(2)新的大修房屋或新建筑，以满足特殊需要，如老年人、残障者和特殊需要的工人，(3)建筑物的维护和改善，以及(4)帮助首次购房的个人。
| Measure | Description | Propositions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS, ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES 211 → NO 213 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands &quot;peace officer&quot; definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218 → NO 220 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222 → NO 224 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226 → NO 228 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230 → NO 232 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Núm.</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Proponente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposición 211:** Funcionarios estatales, ética. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que dile la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectivos. Ordena que las funciones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal a este ayuno. Consecuencias de la aprobación: se desconoce las condiciones de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales. Impacto general: se desconoce el impacto general de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales.

**Proposición 213:** Funcionarios estatales, ética. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que dile la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectivos. Ordena que las funciones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal a este ayuno. Consecuencias de la aprobación: se desconoce las condiciones de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales. Impacto general: se desconoce el impacto general de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales.

**Proposición 215:** Funcionarios estatales, ética. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que dile la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectivos. Ordena que las funciones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal a este ayuno. Consecuencias de la aprobación: se desconoce las condiciones de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales. Impacto general: se desconoce el impacto general de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales.

**Proposición 217:** Funcionarios estatales, ética. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que dile la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectivos. Ordena que las funciones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal a este ayuno. Consecuencias de la aprobación: se desconoce las condiciones de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales. Impacto general: se desconoce el impacto general de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales.

**Proposición 218:** Funcionarios estatales, ética. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que dile la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectivos. Ordena que las funciones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal a este ayuno. Consecuencias de la aprobación: se desconoce las condiciones de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales. Impacto general: se desconoce el impacto general de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales.

**Proposición 220:** Funcionarios estatales, ética. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que dile la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectivos. Ordena que las funciones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal a este ayuno. Consecuencias de la aprobación: se desconoce las condiciones de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales. Impacto general: se desconoce el impacto general de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales.

**Proposición 222:** Funcionarios estatales, ética. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que dile la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectivos. Ordena que las funciones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal a este ayuno. Consecuencias de la aprobación: se desconoce las condiciones de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales. Impacto general: se desconoce el impacto general de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales.

**Proposición 224:** Funcionarios estatales, ética. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que dile la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectivos. Ordena que las funciones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal a este ayuno. Consecuencias de la aprobación: se desconoce las condiciones de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales. Impacto general: se desconoce el impacto general de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales.

**Proposición 226:** Funcionarios estatales, ética. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que dile la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectivos. Ordena que las funciones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal a este ayuno. Consecuencias de la aprobación: se desconoce las condiciones de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales. Impacto general: se desconoce el impacto general de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales.

**Proposición 228:** Funcionarios estatales, ética. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que dile la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectivos. Ordena que las funciones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal a este ayuno. Consecuencias de la aprobación: se desconoce las condiciones de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales. Impacto general: se desconoce el impacto general de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales.

**Proposición 230:** Funcionarios estatales, ética. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que dile la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectivos. Ordena que las funciones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal a este ayuno. Consecuencias de la aprobación: se desconoce las condiciones de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales. Impacto general: se desconoce el impacto general de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales.

**Proposición 232:** Funcionarios estatales, ética. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que dile la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectivos. Ordena que las funciones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal a este ayuno. Consecuencias de la aprobación: se desconoce las condiciones de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales. Impacto general: se desconoce el impacto general de la aprobación de los funcionarios estatales.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>YES 236</td>
<td>LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>YES 240</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STATUTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>YES 243</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>YES 248</td>
<td>HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's, nine campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>YES 254</td>
<td>EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>YES 258</td>
<td>1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NÚMERO</td>
<td>VOTO</td>
<td>texto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, EMINENCIA Y ESTADO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN FOR COMisión, EMINENCIA Y ESTADO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1986.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1986.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notas:**
- 1990年6月的高等教育建築物公債法案。
- 1990年6月的高等教育建築物公債法案。
- 1990年6月的高等教育建築物公債法案。
- 1990年6月的高等教育建築物公債法案。
- 1990年6月的高等教育建築物公債法案。
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

A
Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

B
Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

C
Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

D
WITHDRAWN

E
Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

263 SI 贊成

265 NO 反对

269 SI 贊成

272 NO 反对

277 SI 贊成

278 NO 反对

280 SI 贊成

281 NO 反对

ELEMINADA

284 SI 贊成

285 NO 反对

C: 市議會應無條件通過提高學費之提案，因為這將嚴重影響低收入家庭及學生的教育機會。

D: 市政府應籌設創業基金及創業孵化器，並應為創業者提供長期的無息貸款，以支持他們的企業成長。

E: 撒消

F: 市議會應限制高收入者於非住宅性用地上進行高收入活動，以保障住宅區的長期穩定。

N 51, N 52 & N 53
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### CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990

#### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288, NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290, NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293, NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296, NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong></td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298, NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300, NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302, NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305, NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309, NO 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>市參議會應否有權取消已退休的前參議員在健康制度中的現有權利，並要求他們支付全部費用？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando se implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los directores jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultoría con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 SI</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Comisión de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>¿Deberá un requisito que las miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que no hayan declarado a los miembros de estas comisiones no residentes o que hayan declarado que no cumplen con sus obligaciones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>¿Se amenderá la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrado por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, o mientras y cuando los Supervisores que están en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1960 comiencen haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 SI</td>
<td>賛成</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas crímenes que están relacionados con la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de drogas hipódromicas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — If you do not wish to go to your polling place to vote, you may vote by mail or by going to the Registrar’s Office in City Hall in person. This is called absentee voting.

BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest.


CHARTER BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (PROPOSITION J, K, L) — Boards and commissions created by the Charter, either directly or indirectly.

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

DEFERRED CAPITAL MAINTENANCE (PROPOSITION B) — Major building repair projects that have been postponed.

ELECTOR (PROPOSITION L) — A person who is eligible to register to vote.

FINANCE (PROPOSITION C) — Various ways to pay for something over time. This may include raising money or offering something in trade.

FISCAL YEAR (PROPOSITION A, D) — The twelve months from July 1 to June 30 make up a fiscal year. The City budgets revenues and expenses on a fiscal year basis.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INITIATIVE (PROPOSITION F, O) — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE (PROPOSITION D, J) — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters. For such a law to be passed by the Board of Supervisors, a majority, or in some cases, three-fourths of the Supervisors must vote to approve the law at two consecutive meetings.

OUTSTANDING PRINCIPAL (PROPOSITION A, C) — The actual amount of borrowed money, not yet paid back. Principal does not include interest charges.

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A person who has turned in the required papers and signatures with the Registrar of Voters to run for an office as a write-in candidate. The name of this person will not be on the ballot. Voters who want to vote for this person can do so by writing the name of the person on the inside of the grey envelope given with the ballot.

SPECIAL PROPERTY TAX [MELLO-ROOS DISTRICT] (PROPOSITION B) — A flat tax on a parcel of land, which is not based on the property’s value. The special tax would be in addition to current property taxes. This tax requires a two-thirds majority vote.

STAFFING LEVEL (PROPOSITION F) — The number of employees on duty at any one time.

TAX EXEMPT DEBT (PROPOSITION C) — Money borrowed by the City which is paid back with interest. The lenders are not taxed on the money earned from these loans.

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas de Luca, Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters
Vincent Chao
San Francisco Unified School District Reading Specialist
Beverly Ornstein
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, Northern California Chapter
S.M. Rileau
The Newspaper Guild, Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now," "The Proposal," "A Yes Vote Means," and "A No Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters’ rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.
CUT OUT THIS COUPON AND TAKE IT WITH YOU TO THE POLLS. After reading this pamphlet, write down the names of the candidates of your choice, and circle the numbers corresponding to "YES" or "NO" on the propositions. Completing this coupon will help you vote faster and help reduce lines at the polls. **NOTE** — This is a Primary Election. You can only vote for partisan offices if you are registered as a member of a party, and if there are candidates from your party running.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 15</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 1</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 3</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 3</th>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNOR</td>
<td>(Check Ballot for the number of candidates to vote for)</td>
<td>116 230 232</td>
<td>119 240 242</td>
<td>120 243 245</td>
<td>121 248 250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT. GOVERNOR</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>118 236 238</td>
<td>119 240 242</td>
<td>120 243 245</td>
<td>121 248 250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARY OF STATE</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>119 240 242</td>
<td>120 243 245</td>
<td>121 248 250</td>
<td>122 254 256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROLLER</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>120 243 245</td>
<td>121 248 250</td>
<td>122 254 256</td>
<td>123 258 259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURER</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE COMMISSIONER</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, BOARD OF EQUALIZATION</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 5</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PUBLIC DEFENDER       | 116                              | 1                               | 1                               | 1                               | 1                               |                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP 107</td>
<td>185 187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP 108</td>
<td>189 190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP 109</td>
<td>192 193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP 110</td>
<td>195 197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP 111</td>
<td>200 203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP 112</td>
<td>211 213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP 113</td>
<td>215 217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP 114</td>
<td>218 220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP 115</td>
<td>222 224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP 116</td>
<td>226 228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP 117</td>
<td>230 232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP A</td>
<td>263 265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP B</td>
<td>269 272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP C</td>
<td>277 278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP D</td>
<td>280 281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP E</td>
<td>WITHDRAWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP F</td>
<td>284 285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP G</td>
<td>288 289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP H</td>
<td>290 292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP I</td>
<td>293 295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP J</td>
<td>296 297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP K</td>
<td>298 299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP L</td>
<td>300 301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP M</td>
<td>302 304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP N</td>
<td>305 307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP O</td>
<td>309 310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, and Molly Wood

Board of Supervisors appointees: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gillham, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that absentee ballots be mailed to them or they may vote in person at City Hall from May 7 through June 5 during normal working hours (see "Your Rights as a Voter" section of this pamphlet). In addition, voters with specified disabilities enumerated below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library’s Branch for the Blind at 3150 Sacramento Street produces and distributes tape recorded copies of the State and Local Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually-impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voter’s office by calling 554-4386.

ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them. The persons providing assistance may be someone who came with the voter, or poll workers can be asked to provide needed assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the sidewalk in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If your polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided that this will not impede the flow of traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large print instructions on how to vote and magnifying sheets to enlarge the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows for seated voting.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip tool and pen to be used in punching the ballot and signing in.

APPLICATION TO BE A PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

The physically disabled may apply to be permanent absentee voters. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, you will automatically receive an absentee ballot every election until you move or re-register.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the form below and return it to the Registrar of Voters. Room 158, City Hall, San Francisco, 94102. Each time you move or re-register to vote, you must apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases you do not need to re-apply.

I hereby apply for “Permanent Absentee Voter” status in San Francisco by reason of:

___ Lost use of one or more limbs.
___ Lost use of both hands.
___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g. cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair).
___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease.
___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities.
___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.
___ PLEASE SEE EXPLANATORY LETTER ATTACHED.

FIRST

MIDDLE

LAST

Name ____________________________ ____________________________ ____________________________

Residence Address # ____________________________ ____________________________ ____________________________

STREET ____________________________ ____________________________ ____________________________

Mailing Address # ____________________________ ____________________________ ____________________________

STREET ____________________________ ____________________________ APT. # ____________________________

CITY ____________________________ ____________________________ ZIP CODE ____________________________

(if different than residence address given above)

I declare under penalty of Perjury that the above is true and correct:

Date ____________________________ Signature ____________________________

(Return only this page; do not return the whole book)
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens over 18 years old who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 8, 1990.

Q — I moved before May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 8 and June 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — If you are registered as a member of a political party you may choose a candidate for:
Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Member-State Board of Equalization (District 2), Member-State Assembly, State Senator if you live in Senate District 8, United States Representative, and members of the County Central Committee.
Non-partisan offices are:
Superintendent of Public Instruction, Superior Court Judge, Municipal Court Judge, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 5, 1990. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar's Office at 554-4375 to let us know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help you.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don’t know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to my polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 5 by:
• going to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall from May 7 through June 5, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday; or
• mailing in a request for an absentee ballot. You may send in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. The application must be received by the Registrar of Voters before May 29, 1990.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include:
• your home address
• the address to which you want the ballot mailed
• your printed name and your signature.
Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is paid $98,670 a year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is paid $102,882 a year.
The Public Defender represents the following persons unable to pay for their own lawyer: 1) persons accused of crimes, 2) juveniles in legal actions, and 3) persons in mental health hearings.
PAUL E. SCHWENGER

My address is 16 Ord Court, Apt. #4
My occupation is Deputy Assessor
My age is 53
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan, Mission High School graduate, and San Francisco State University graduate. I have been a Deputy Assessor for San Francisco for the past 22 years. I have been awarded the SRPA, Senior Real Property Designation, which is one of the highest awards for professional appraisers. My 22 years of experience will enable me to effectively represent homeowners' and renters' concerns before State Legislative Committees. I will analyze property values to make sure business pays its fair share and I will oversee the operations of the Assessor's office in an experienced and professional manner.

Paul E. Schwenger

The sponsors for Paul E. Schwenger are:

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: With 28 years of public service, I am the only candidate with real management experience.
As Sheriff of San Francisco, I managed 399 employees; as Police Chief, 2,500; as New York Prison Commissioner, 13,000.
While this would be the largest managerial responsibility faced by the other candidates, it would be my smallest.
I want to be your assessor so I can make it a model agency, I know government and real estate. I am dedicated to public service and to lower taxes for you.
Mayor Agnos agrees I am the rational choice.
I would appreciate your vote.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Assessor

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Attorney/Supervisor
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have absolutely no ownership or income interests in real property which create any conflict of interest as Assessor.
As attorney for 25 years, Supervisor for three terms, and past President of the Board, I have a proven record of unique, practical accomplishments.
Just as I’ve fought for reduced local government spending, I’ll work for new statewide lower assessment formulas with the same energy that created the nationally copied No-Smoking Ordinance; the Police Fingerprint Computer which reduced our crime rate; laws allowing earthquake victims to quickly replace damaged buildings.
My goal is to achieve fair, reduced property assessments.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:
Alfred S. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Chief of Police.

RONALD G. KERSHAW

My address is 3533 21st Street
My occupation is Real Estate Portfolio Manager
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are: B.S. Accounting, Brigham Young University 1975
MBA Real Estate, Golden Gate University 1986
Eleven years experience in all aspects of property management, appraisals, renovation and property sales
Currently responsible for supervising a real estate portfolio of $150,000,000
Past President SF Chapter, Institute of Internal Auditors
Currently, President, Log Cabin Club of San Francisco
San Francisco homeowner and resident since 1975.
San Francisco needs a fiscal conservative who is the only qualified candidate to become the City’s new Assessor.

Ronald G. Kershaw

The sponsors for Ronald G. Kershaw are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender represents people in trouble who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. The responsibility must be performed ethically, competently, and efficiently. During three terms in office, with the help of a superb staff of men and women, that duty has been fulfilled with compassion, dignity, and with the highest professional standards of the American legal system.

In the next term, I pledge to continue to carry out the special trust of this office: to guarantee that everyone in this City has the full benefit of our Constitution and is treated with fairness and with justice.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:


Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #3

ALEX SALDAMANDO

My address is 700 Arkansas Street
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: In my 11 years presiding as a Municipal Court Judge, I have worked to protect the citizens of San Francisco. I have delivered justice swiftly and firmly, in a fair and impartial manner. As a Superior Court Judge, I would bring the same approach to felony criminal cases and complex civil disputes. I am currently President of the California Judges Foundation. My background includes experience as a prosecutor and a public interest lawyer. A graduate of the University of California (Berkeley) and Hastings College of Law, I live with my wife and two children on Potrero Hill.

My sponsors include: Judge Ira Brown, Jr.; Judge John Dearman; Judge Isabella Grant; Judge Ed Stern; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Lillian Sing; Former Judge Charles Renfrew; Mayor Art Agnos; Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein; Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi; Assemblyman Willie Brown; Assemblyman John Burton; Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Harry Britt; Supervisor Jim Gonzalez; Supervisor Terence Hallinan; Supervisor Willie Kennedy; School Board Member Rosario Anaya; School Board Member Libby Denebeim; School Board Member Fred Rodriguez; Commissioner Paul Melbostad; Larry Mazzola, President, Local 38, Thelma Shelley, Director, Performing Arts Center; Benny Yee; Stan Smith, Building Trades Council; and Police Commissioner John Keker.

Alex Saldamando

J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY

My address is 340 Magellan
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a Municipal Court Judge since 1974, native Californian, resident San Francisco since 1937; attended local schools, N.D.V., St. Ignatius, USF and USF School of Law; married Patricia M. Berti, admitted State Bar 1960, devoted thirty years to public service; adjunct Professor of Law, USF; participant, member and/or lecturer for many organizations — Salesian Boys Club, 44 years — Municipal Court Speakers Bureau — California Judges Association — California Center for Judicial Education and Research — San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project; Supervising Judge, Preliminary Courts, Presiding Judge, Assistant Presiding Judge, Court Administrative Committee member eight years; honored by: San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Irish-Israeli-Italian Society, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, Lawyers Club, USF School of Law and USF Law Society for outstanding community service.


J. Dominique Olcomendy

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #5

KAY TSENIN
My address is 637 Steiner Street
My occupation is Attorney and Counselor at Law
My age is 43 years
My qualifications for office are: B.A., San Francisco State University (Dean’s List), graduate, University of San Francisco School of Law. Attorney for sixteen years specializing in civil litigation. Pro-Tem Municipal Court Judge in San Francisco for five years.
Born in China, moved to San Francisco as a child, graduate of George Washington High School.
Broad Community service includes founding of environmental law societies while in law school, Vice President for Legal Affairs for California National Organization for Women (NOW), Board Member for the Russian American Credit Union and San Francisco Trial Lawyers and Board Advisor for the Legal Advocates for Women. Vice-President, Alamo Square Neighborhood Association.
Strong commitment to equal justice for all without prejudice or bias. The following San Franciscans support me because they feel that the Superior Court needs a judge with my background, legal expertise and perspective on the law:

CARLOS BEA
My address is 2727 Pierce Street
My occupation is Judge Superior Court #5
My qualifications for office are: I am a Superior Court Judge in San Francisco and author of articles in several professional journals, such as California Trial Lawyers and Defense Research Institute’s. Am recognized by the State Bar for pro bono work with members of the Hispanic Community. Have served two terms as a member of the Board of Visitors, Stanford Law School. Was a panelist and lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar. Was an adjunct professor, Hastings College of Law and Stanford Law School. I graduated from Stanford Law School and have been an attorney in San Francisco since 1959.
Sponsors include: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Ollie Marie-Victoire, all the judges of the Superior Court, Angela Alioto, Ernest Chuck Ayala, Willie Brown, Jr., John Burton, Jim Gonzalez, Quentin Kopp, H. Jesse Arnelle, James Herman, Mary Noel Pepys, Robert McDonnell, G. Joseph Bertain, Edward McFetridge, Zeppelin Wong, Paul Renne, Leo Murphy, Jr., Gina Moscone, James Brosnahan, Barbara Caulfield, Robert Morales, Paul Haerle, Michael Hardeman, Howard Nemirovski, Edwin Heafey, Jr., Larry Mazzola, Vincent Friia, Putnam Livermore, William Coblenz.

Carlos Bea

Kay Tsenin

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DONNA HITCHENS

My address is 468 30th Street
My occupation is attorney
My age is 42 years
My qualifications for office are: Over the past thirteen years, I have represented clients in San Francisco courts, taught law to San Francisco students and served on the Boards of Directors of private and public agencies designed to further the cause of justice in our city.

My experience as a mediator, counselor and advocate demonstrates my willingness to pursue alternative dispute resolutions. Judicial leadership and integrity are standards that the community should demand. My record attests to my ability to meet those standards.

- J.D. UC Berkeley 1977
- Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates, a public interest firm specializing in sex discrimination cases. 1978 – 1984
- Co-founder, Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom
- Staff Counsel, ACLU. 1984 – 85
- Partner, Hitchens & Brenner. Small Business, non-profit corporations, civil rights and family law. Presently
- Former chair, San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women.
- Member, Board of Directors, Pacific Primary PreSchool.

SUPPORT: Assemblymember John Burton; Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisors Nancy Walker, Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, and Terence Hallinan; Judge Lillian Sing, Jude Mary Morgan, and Judge Herbert Donaldson; Commissioners Jim Jefferson, Adrian Bermudez, Jr., James Morales, Paul Melbostad, Richard Grosboll, and Leni Marin; Hon. Libby Denebeim; Hon. Leland Yee; Carol Migden; Will Leong; Catherine Dodd, R.N.; Jeff Mori, and Mauri Schwartz

Donna Hitchens

JEROME T. BENSON

My address is 187 Robinhood Drive
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the Superior Court
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are:
- 23 years public service in the courtroom protecting victims, litigants and the community.
- 7 years as Chief of the Criminal Division in the District Attorney’s Office including:
  - 65 felony jury trial prosecutions for murder, rape, child abuse, drugs, white-collar fraud.
  - Stanford Law School graduate 1964.
  - Chairman, State Bar of California Subcommittee on Jury Instructions (Criminal).
  - Member, Project Safer California.
  - Fair and equal application of the law without regard to race, sex, or economic status.
  - I am a native San Franciscan and homeowner living with my wife and two daughters near Miraoma Park.
  - My judicial office is dedicated to fair rulings, hard work, human sensitivity, and legal equality.

CITYWIDE SUPPORT:
State Senator Quentin Kopp; Justice Harry Low; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Public Defender Jeff Brown; Sheriff Michael Hennessey; Former Chief of Police Alfred Nelder.

SUPERVISORS:
Angela Alioto, Tom Hsieh, Wendy Nelder;

JUDGES:
John Ertola, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Ina Gyemant, Paul Alvarado, Isabella Grant;

LABOR:
Mike Hardeman, Stan Smith, Kevin Ryan;

ATTORNEYS AND COMMUNITY:
William Coblentz; Harold Dobbs; Charles Breyer; Airport Commission President Morris Bernstein; Wayne Friday; Benny Yee; Louis Giraudo; Doris Thomas; Christopher Bowman; Haddie Redd; Elizabeth Aguilar-Tarchi; Ron Huberman;

Jerome T. Benson
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

JAMES HARRIGAN

My address is 494 Mangala St.
My occupation is Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department.
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I live in Glen Park with my wife, Serena Lee, and our three children.
I received my law degree with academic awards and Law Review distinction in 1975 from Golden Gate University, San Francisco.
I have completed more than 80 jury and court trials in Municipal and Superior Court, representing thousands of citizens and victims of crime in civil and criminal cases in private practice, as a public defender, and as Legal Counsel to the Sheriff.
My expertise includes: employment law, labor relations, criminal, landlord/tenant, and constitutional law. As Counsel to the Sheriff, I resolve the legal affairs of a major law enforcement agency. My work brings me before the civil and criminal justice system each day.

"James Harrigan is by far the best qualified candidate. No other candidate has his broad range of experience: public service and private practice; law enforcement and defense law; extensive courtroom experience and administrative expertise. I strongly urge your vote for James Harrigan."

— Sheriff Michael Hennessey

I have not listed my sponsors. I firmly believe the voter’s decision should be based on one’s qualifications and experience — not on political connections.
I pledge equal application of the law. I ask for your support.
Thank you.

James Harrigan

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Ave.
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My qualifications for office are: What I am in life, I owe to my family and to an excellent education: M.A., counseling, Stanford University; B.A., psychology, University of San Francisco; Juris Doctorate, Hastings College of Law. I began practicing law in 1982 and have been an assistant district attorney since 1983: with experience in criminal prosecution and family law enforcing child support. I have served 10 years on the College Board; my colleagues elected me president three terms because of my firm but fair judgment. My duties include equitably settling conflicts, grievances and contracts. In my years of public service, compassion, integrity and common sense have always guided my decisions; and as a judge that will continue to be the case.

My supporters:
Justice Harry Low
Judges: Isabella Grant, Lenard Louie, David Garcia, Larry Kay, Mary Morgan, Bill Mallen, Herbert Donaldson.
District Attorney: Arlo Smith
Public Defender: Jeff Brown
Senators: Milton Marks, Quentin Kopp
Attorneys: Charlie Clifford, Harriet Ross, William Coblenz,
Cedric Chao, Roberta Achtenberg
BART Director: Mike Bernick
Commissioners: Rosario Anaya, Tim Wolfred, Chuck Ayala,
Naomi Gray.
Supervisors: Thomas Hsieh, Angela Alioto
Walter Johnson; Alex Esclamado; Reverend Amos Brown;
Carole Migden;
UC Regent Yori Wada.

Julie Tang

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

ELLEN CHAITIN
My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I am honored that MAYOR ART AGNOS and 8 PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION — who know my courtroom experience and qualifications in civil and criminal law — endorse me.

As a lawyer in private practice 18 years, mother of 2 children, married 19 years, I care about the strength and integrity of San Francisco’s courts.

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred community trust — not a consolation prize for a restless politician. A lawyer lacking courtroom experience is unqualified to be judge.

In HUNDREDS of court appearances and trials, as chair of the Bar Association Criminal Justice Advisory Council, as a San Francisco Delinquency Prevention Commissioner, and as a Hastings Law School teacher, I have demonstrated a longstanding commitment to professional excellence.

Community and law enforcement leaders who acknowledge my legal service and endorse me:

SPEAKER Willie Brown
SUPERVISORS Nancy Walker, Bill Maher, Harry Britt, Terence Hallinan
JUDGES Dorothy vonBeroldingen, John Dearman, Edward Stern
COURT COMMISSIONER George Colbert
SENATOR Milton Marks
SCHOOL BOARD JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Libby Denebeim, Myra Kopf
POLICE COMMISSIONER John Keiter
FIRE COMMISSIONER Sharon Brezt
SHERIFF LIEUTENANT Connie O’Connor
POLICE OFFICERS VICE PRESIDENT Paul Chignell
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY Charles Wood
BUSINESSMAN Mel Swig
PUC COMMISSIONER Rodel Rodis

William J. O’Connor
My address is 3615 Buchanan St. #206
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I am the most qualified candidate for this office. I have had judicial experience, serving as Municipal Court judge pro tem for over five years, and have been commended by the Presiding Judge for the quality of my service. I have been a journeyman lawyer for 15 years, with both criminal and civil experience, and have done over 30 jury trials.

With Amnesty International and Church representatives, I have been an International Trial Observer.

I have been a Board Member of the Elizabeth Frye Center and the Irish Forum, and a volunteer on the Bar Association’s free legal services panel.


Ellen Chaitin

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against these measures. All arguments, “official” and paid, are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None of them has been checked for accuracy by this office or any other city official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Official Arguments”

There is one “official” argument for and one against each measure, and they are published at no cost. “Official” arguments are selected by the Registrar of Voters in accordance with the priorities set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code as summarized below:

For:
1. Person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee supporting the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Against:
1. For a referendum, person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee against the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Rebuttals

Authors of official arguments may each prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. As with official and paid arguments, rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Each rebuttal follows immediately after its corresponding official argument.

Paid Arguments

All paid arguments are accepted for publication upon (1) deposit of an amount equal to $50 plus $1.50 per word, (2) submission of a petition containing valid signatures of registered voters in lieu of the printing fee at the rate of two signatures for each dollar of the fee, or (3) a combination of a printing fee and signatures which together equal the number of signatures and/or amount of money required to qualify the argument for publication.

For each measure, paid arguments follow after the official arguments and rebuttals. All paid arguments supporting a measure are printed together followed by all paid arguments against that same measure. Paid arguments within each group (e.g. all paid arguments in favor of Proposition Z) are not printed in any particular order. Rather they are arranged so that each page is fully utilized.

There is one ballot measure for which paid arguments were not accepted. The School Facilities Safety Special Tax measure is being proposed under state law; only one argument for, one argument against, and respective rebuttals for this measure are allowed.

Again, arguments and rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked by this office or any other city official or agency.
PROPOSITION A

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263
NO 265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City buildings were damaged by the October 17, 1989 earthquake and many may not survive another strong earthquake. Many City buildings contain asbestos and many are not accessible to disabled persons. Many City buildings do not meet current health, safety and building codes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $332,400,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This total would be reduced by the amount of grants the City receives from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the State of California for earthquake repair and hazard reduction. No more than $65,000,000 of bonds could be sold in any fiscal year.

This money would be used to pay for safety improvements to some City buildings, including repairing earthquake damage, making the buildings better able to survive earthquakes, removing or reducing the danger of asbestos in these buildings, making them more accessible to the disabled and bringing them up to current codes.

The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds for not more than $332,400,000 to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue bonds to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that the approximate costs would be as follows:

- Bond redemption: $332,400,000
- Bond interest: $244,314,000
- Debt service requirement: $576,714,000

The bond authorization limits the issuance of bonds to no more than $65 million per year. Assuming a single sale on a 20 year basis at current interest rates with no reduction for possible FEMA or State funding, annual debt service on each $65 million increment would amount to $5,638,750, which amount is equivalent to one and forty-eight hundredths cents ($0.0148) in the current tax rate."

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 26, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A the earthquake repair and protection measure.

Proposition A provides $332.4 million to repair earthquake damaged city buildings and to seismically reinforce many of them so that they would not sustain as much damage (or worse) during a future earthquake. This improves public safety while it also protects the investment we are making in repairs.

Your “Yes on A” vote will provide for:

- Repairs of earthquake damage, asbestos removal and handicapped accessibility work in over 200 earthquake damaged city buildings.
- Seismic strengthening of the Civic Center complex including City Hall, the Veterans Building, Opera House, Department of Public Health and Civic Auditorium.
- Seismic strengthening for the Palace of Fine Arts/Exploratorium, nine additional branch libraries, two additional police stations, two jails and the services building at San Francisco General Hospital.

- Replacement of the broken and earthquake damaged water and sewer lines at the Zoo.

Proposition A represents a prudent investment which would protect many irreplaceable public buildings from major damage or collapse in a future earthquake.

In order to keep property taxes from rising more than 2-3¢ per $100 of assessed value, Proposition A will not allow more than $65 million in bonds to be sold in any one year. It further requires that any Federal or State earthquake relief money we receive to repair these buildings reduce the amount of bonds sold. This assures that local taxpayers will not be required to pay for repairs that can be made using Federal/State emergency relief assistance.

Vote Yes on Proposition A to protect city buildings and increase public safety in a next major earthquake.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition A
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition A

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

When future earthquakes strike, our libraries need to be safe. Proposition A will provide funds to help earthquake proof our library system. 

Vote YES on A.

Michael Mellor, President
Friends of the San Francisco Public Library

This bond issue will help to ensure the seismic safety of the Palace of Fine Arts, home of the Exploratorium which is visited by over 600,000 people a year. Prop A represents a prudent investment to improve public safety and protect irreplaceable public buildings. We urge all citizens to vote “Yes” on Proposition A.

Exploratorium
F. Van Kasper, Chairman
William K. Coblenz, Vice Chairman
C. Richard Kramlich, Vice Chairman
G. Steven Burrill, Treasurer

Replacement of the earthquake-damaged, underground, 50-year-old water, gas and sewer lines at the San Francisco Zoo is critically needed for the safety and well-being of the animals. It will significantly improve public services to the 1.2 million children and adults who visit annually. The Zoological Society will endeavor to raise funds to renovate and build new above-ground facilities to supplement the $26 million included in the bond issue for the Zoo. Help make the Zoo a true sanctuary.

David E. Anderson
Zoo Director
Phil Arnold
Assistant General Manager
Recreation & Park
William Brewster Ely IV
Headmaster, Town School
Mary Burns
General Manager
Recreation & Park
Margaret K. Burks
Executive Director, Zoological Society
Jack W. Castor
Animal Keeper Shop Steward, Local 858
Todd Cecil
Children’s Zoo Keeper
Sherri Chiesa
President, Local 2
Robert Todd Cockburn
Executive Director, Clean Water Program
Rosemary Davidson
Urban School
Dolores A. Donovan
Animal Control & Welfare Commission
Keith G. Eickman
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Roy Eisenhardt
Director, California Academy of Sciences
Becky Evans
Conservation Activist
Norman Gershenz
Director, Ecosystem Survival Plan
Arthur J. Goedewaagen
Board Member, SPEAK
John E. Hafner Jr.
Professor Biology, SFSU
Roger Hoppes
Director, Children’s Zoo
Michael Housh
Assistant to the Mayor
David J. Howe
Animal Keeper
Mark Hurley
Animal Control & Welfare Commission
Norma J. Kristovich
Zoo Docent Council
Connie Luxe
Vice Chairman, Zoological Society Board

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Zoological Society Board
Frances May McAteer
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Amy Meyer
People for GGNRA
Andrew Nash
President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Trent W. Orr
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Elisabeth D. Rieger
Zoo Volunteer
Fred A. Rodriguez
School Board Member
Carroll Soo-Hoo
Zoo Benefactor
Stephen V. R. Spaulding
Zoological Society Treasurer
James J. Walsh Jr.
Citizens Advisory Committee on Wastewater Management
Connie O’Connor
President, Recreation & Park Commission

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We must rebuild and repair our infrastructure. The October 17 quake was a warning. More resources going to earthquake preparedness programs today will save lives in the future. Vote YES on A.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

We urge everyone to vote YES on Proposition A. The people of San Francisco have a $3.5 billion investment in public buildings. This bond issue will be used to fund repairs to many of our facilities damaged in last October's earthquake, including City Hall, General Hospital, neighborhood libraries, police stations and cultural buildings. It will also provide monies necessary to make life-safety improvements to other city buildings.

Your YES Vote on Proposition A will protect lives and property in the event of another major earthquake at a very small cost to businesses and homeowners. Because bonds to finance repairs will be sold over 6 - 10 years, replacing older bond issues as they are paid-off, the result will be an almost unchanged tax rate. In fact, the City's independent budget analyst found that the tax bill for an average homeowner will increase by less than $5.00 a month.

Proposition A is a small price to pay to preserve our investment in the city's valuable public facilities. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

We ask that you join with us in Voting YES ON PROP. "A". Your "Yes on A" vote will provide funds to protect the two remaining Police Stations which are not yet earthquake safe or provided for in previous bond issues.

In an emergency we can do our jobs only if our own police facilities are earthquake resistant and if we can get to those places in the City which most need our services. That is why it is important to us that as many City buildings as possible are made earthquake resistant. The less damage and street obstruction that results from a future earthquake, the better we can get to these parts of the City where we are most needed. The safer the public buildings in the City are made, the better we will be able to serve the rest of the City if we ever have to face a major earthquake emergency.

For security vote "Yes on A".

Michael Keys President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

The damage done by the October 17th earthquake to San Francisco's most important public buildings is considerable. To correct that damage and prepare for the future vitality of our City demands the kind of response represented by Proposition A. This proposition carefully earmarks funds to upgrade buildings such as City Hall, the War Memorial Opera House, and the Department of Public Health offices which are treasures that can never be replaced or reproduced. They not only need to be repaired, but strengthened structurally and improved, to meet today's building codes. The Federal Government will pick up some of the damage, but much more will be needed if these vital components of our City's daily life are to be improved and made ready for the next major quake.

Proposition A requests a large sum, but this is a time when we as a City have to agree to such a request. We strongly urge your support of Proposition A.

American Institute of Architects/San Francisco Chapter

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

We ask you to join us in voting “Yes on A”.

The primary purpose of Prop “A” is to protect lives and public buildings from the effects of the next earthquake. As San Franciscans we all share the responsibility of having to do all we can to avoid the loss of life, the suffering and the huge costs which another, perhaps stronger or longer quake would bring. Thus we see Proposition “A” as a necessary, prudent investment in all our future.

We have a special reason to support “Prop A” and to ask you to vote YES ON “A” as well. That special reason is the fact that 20 of the buildings which will be repaired or strengthened against future earthquakes if Prop “A” passes will also be made fully accessible to the disabled. We want our City’s buildings to be repaired, to be made safe and to be made accessible to all San Franciscans.

Vote “Yes on A”.

Kathy Uhl, Executive Director,
Independent Living Resource Center
Michael L. Comini, Executive Director,
Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition “A”.

Many city buildings were damaged in the October 17 earthquake. If these buildings are repaired and strengthened the Fire Department will be much safer when responding to future emergencies.

Please help the Fire Department do its job safely and effectively by voting “Yes” on Proposition “A”.

James D. Jefferson, President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn, Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bretz, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Souls, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Frederick F. Postel, Chief of Department

We urgently request that you vote “Yes on A”.

The War Memorial complex of buildings, dedicated to San Francisco’s veterans, are one of our city’s treasures, irreplaceable architecturally and economically. They are central to our history and we owe it to ourselves to make sure they are made as fully earthquake-resistant as possible.

The October 17 earthquake was a warning which we must heed. Proposition “A” is a prudent and necessary response. It will protect our treasured buildings and, even more importantly, it will protect the lives of those who use them and the memories of those whose lives they commemorate.

Harold F. Jackson, Chairman, American Legion War Memorial Commission
Claude M. Jarman, Jr., Vice-President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Mark Ryser, Executive Director, Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage

Save lives.
Support earthquake safety.
Vote YES on Propositions A and B.
Also vote YES on Proposition N. Limit San Francisco Supervisors to two four-year terms.

Terence Faulkner
Republican State Assembly Candidate
San Francisco Republican Party Chairman (1987-89)

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Candidate
Past San Francisco Democratic Party Secretary
Max Woods
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic County Central Committeeewoman
Public Safety Improvement Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for your safety. Let us learn from the October 17th earthquake. 15 seconds of moderate shaking resulted in the need for $32 million in repairs to city buildings in the Civic Center alone. We need to be better prepared. We need to reduce known safety hazards.

Please, vote YES on Proposition A.

Ken Dowlin, City Librarian
Steve Coulter, Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson, Library Commissioner
Lonni Chin, Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil, Library Commissioner
Dennis Normandy, Library Commissioner
Roselyne Swig, Library Commissioner

Help the City of San Francisco and the Zoo rebuild. The animals will benefit, too! Vote YES on A.

Susanne Barthell,
Zoo Advisory Committee member,
Zoo Volunteer
Sophie Papageorge,
Zoologist
Jorge L. Garcia, D.V.M.
Zoo Medicine Specialist
John J. Alcaraz,
Retired Zookeeper
Roni Joan Howard,
Educator

David J. Howe
Animalkeeper
Terrence J. Moyle
Linda Caratti
Animalkeeper
Anthony Sharp
Animalkeeper
Martin E. Dias.
A.K.A. Big Bison, Animalkeeper
Jack W. Castor
Lion House, Animalkeeper
Sandra Keller
Director, Citizens for a Better Zoo

Proposition A will help restore structural safety to the San Francisco County Jails in San Bruno, which were built in 1934 and are badly in need of repair. This is the oldest operating jail in California and sits near the San Andreas fault.

For the safety of City employees and county jail inmates, please vote YES on Proposition A.

Michael Hennessey
San Francisco County Sheriff
Deputy Albert Waters, President
San Francisco Deputy Sheriff's Association

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION A

This bond issue is iffy. It should have been presented to the voters as two separate bond issues.

One for $75 million — earthquake repairs to be partly refunded by F.E.M.A. for our present estimated damages. Another for

$257.4 million to take care of our needed capital improvements so neglected by this and past administrations.

Vote NO and get one issue back on the November ballot.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1990, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, TO PAY FOR THE COST OF PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION, ASBESTOS ABATEMENT, PROVIDING ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED, ALL RELATED TO PUBLIC SAFETY TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING RELATED ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT FOR THE FOREGOING PURPOSE; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT NO MORE THAN $65,000,000 OF SAID BONDED INDEBTEDNESS SHALL BE INCURRED IN ANY SINGLE FISCAL YEAR AND PROVIDED, FURTHER, THAT THE AUTHORIZATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $332,400,000 WILL BE REDUCED BY THE AMOUNT OF THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEMA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND THE CONTROLLER TO MONITOR THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEMA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION AND TO TAKE ANY APPROPRIATE ACTION SO THAT THE BONDS ISSUED WILL NOT DUPLICATE FEMA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; FINDING THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF THE ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 5th day of June, 1990, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the herein-after described municipal improvements in the amount and for the purposes stated:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, to pay for the cost of public safety improvements to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled, all related to public safety to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including related acquisition, construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purpose; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, Resolution No. 88-90, $332,400,000.

The special resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in said resolution are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. Authorizing and directing the Chief Administrative Officer and the Controller to monitor the issuance of the bonds and the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction and to take any appropriate action so that the bonds issued will not duplicate FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 4. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the results thereof made and the returns thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 5. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 5, 1990, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election before the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 31, 1990.

Section 6. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, 

(Continued on next page)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION A (Continued)

however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be
incurred in any single fiscal year and
provided, further, that the authorization
in the amount of $332,400,000 will be
reduced by the amount of the actual re-
cipt of FEMA or State of California
grants for earthquake repairs and haz-
ard reduction.

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby
submitted and in favor of the issuance of the
Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space
opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right
of said proposition, and to vote against said prop-
osition and against the issuance of the Bonds
shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space oppo-
site the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of
said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the
cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are
used at said special election, each voter to
vote for any said proposition shall punch the
ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to
the right of said proposition, and to vote against
said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the
hole after the word "NO" to the right of said
proposition.

Section 7. If at such special election it shall
appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on
the proposition voted in favor of and authorized
the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the
purposes set forth in said proposition, then such
proposition shall have been accepted by the elec-
tors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost
of the municipal improvements described herein.

Such bonds shall be of the form and character
known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a
rate not to exceed 12 per centum per annum,
payable semiannually, provided, that interest for
the first year after the date of any of said bonds
may be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective
proposition shall be counted separately and when
two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on
such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such
proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 8. For the purpose of paying the prin-
cipal and interest on said bonds, the Board of
Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general
tax levy and in the manner for such general tax
levy provided, levy and collect annually each
year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a
sum in the Treasury of said city and county set
apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming
due for the principal and interest on said bonds,
a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such
bonds as the same becomes due and also such
part of the principal thereof as shall become due
before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for
making the next general tax levy can be made
available for the payment of such principal.

Section 9. This ordinance shall be published
once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San
Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published
daily in the City and County of San Francisco,
being the official newspaper of said city and
county and such publication shall constitute no-
tice of said election and no other notice of the
election hereby called need be given.

Section 10. The appropriate officers, employ-
ees, representatives and agents of the City and
County of San Francisco are hereby authorized
and directed to do everything necessary or desir-
able to the calling and holding of said special
election, and to otherwise carry out the provi-
sions of this ordinance.
PROPOSITION B

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate of (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-51 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269
NO 272

Analysis
by City Attorney

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Some School District buildings were damaged by the earthquake. Some District buildings do not meet present earthquake and fire standards.

The State Mello-Roos law allows the Board of Education to submit to the voters a measure authorizing a special property tax to pay for repairs and other improvements to school buildings.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize a special property tax to pay for costs of repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety. Some of the money would also be used for deferred capital maintenance. The repairs and maintenance would be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis. Since no money would be borrowed, there would be no interest costs to pay.

The tax would last for 20 years. The tax on single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels could be no more than $46 for each of the first six years and no more than $32.20 for each of the last 14 years. The tax on other types of parcels could be no more than $23 for each dwelling unit for each of the first six years and $16.10 for each dwelling unit for each of the last 14 years. Dwelling units occupied by persons 65 years of age or older would be eligible for an exemption from this tax. The measure would also set an annual appropriations limit of $12 million.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to authorize this property tax to pay for repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety and you want to authorize this annual appropriations limit.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to authorize this tax.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed special tax levy be approved, in my opinion, it would increase revenues for the San Francisco Unified School District, net of estimated senior citizen exemptions, by approximately $8 million per year for the first 6 years and $5.6 million per year for the next 14 years, based on the current assessment roll of the City and County. The approximately $327.2 million generated over a 20 year period by this special tax levy would be restricted for use by the District for the repair, restoration, replacement, seismic upgrading and capital maintenance of School District facilities."

How "B" Got on the Ballot

On February 13, the Board of Education voted 5-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Board members voted as follows:


NO: Leland Yee.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When the earthquake struck last fall, our school buildings suffered. Sustaining major damage and at special risk in the future are our buildings that were not earthquake proofed in the 1970's. In that category are our child care centers serving our youngest students. Also, in the fall of 1988 the City Fire Marshall inspected our schools and reported that the majority of our school buildings do not meet fire safety standards. Our 63,000 students and the community groups that meet at our schools in the evenings and on weekends must have buildings that can withstand earthquakes, and meet fire safety standards.

Proposition B will authorize a tax to provide for: repairing earthquake damage at 131 sites including the reconstruction of John O'Connell High School, seismic improvement of nine Children's Centers, correction of fire code and safety violations at 97 sites and seismic improvement of John Swett, Jean Parker and Bessie Carmichael Elementary Schools and Parkside Curriculum Center. In addition, there will be funds for deferred capital maintenance.

Two years ago the citizens of this City voted to support major repairs for our school buildings. Now we must protect that investment by repairing the present earthquake damage and seeing that all our schools can withstand future earthquakes, be as safe as possible in case of fire and be well maintained into the next century.

Civic organizations who have joined in supporting Proposition B include: San Francisco League of Women Voters, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SF/PTA, Parents' Lobby, San Francisco Labor Council, United Educators of San Francisco, and Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth.

Submitted by Superintendent Ramon C. Cortines, San Francisco Unified School District, and Fred Rodriguez, President, Board of Education.

---

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition B
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California
February 13, 1990
(For Board Meeting February 13, 1990)


REQUESTED ACTION:

WHEREAS, the Board of Education (the "Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "District"), did, on January 9, 1990, adopt its Resolution of Intention (the "Resolution") to form Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "Community Facilities District"), and levy a special tax therein, pursuant to Chapter 2.5 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 commencing with Section 53311 of the California Government Code, commonly known as the "Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982," as amended, (the "Act"); and

WHEREAS, a copy of the Resolution (which sets forth a description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, the name of the Community Facilities District and the types of facilities proposed to be financed by the District (the "Facilities")), providing that except where funds are otherwise available, a special tax sufficient to pay for all Facilities and the financing thereof (to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all non-exempt real property in the Community Facilities District) is proposed to be levied within the proposed Community Facilities District specifying the rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the proposed Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, and setting a hearing thereon, is on file with the Clerk of this Board and is incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, notice of said hearing was duly published as required by law, as evidenced by the affidavit of publication on file with the Clerk of this Board; and

WHEREAS, on February 13, 1990 this Board held the noticed public hearing as required by law relative to the proposed formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, prior to the noticed public hearing a report (the "Report") containing a descrip-

tion of the Facilities and an estimate of the cost of providing the Facilities, including the estimated fair and reasonable cost thereof, was filed with this Board as a part of the record of said hearing; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing all persons desiring to be heard on all matters pertaining to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution, including all interested persons or taxpayers for or against the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extension of the Community Facilities District, or the furnishing of specific types of public facilities, were heard and considered, and a full and fair hearing was held thereon; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing evidence was presented to this Board on the matters before it, and this Board at the conclusion of the hearing was fully advised as to all matters relating to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, written protests against the establishment of the District, the furnishing of specified type or types of facilities within the Community Facilities District as listed in the Report, or the levying of the special tax have not been filed with the Clerk of this Board by fifty percent (50%) or more of the registered voters, or six registered voters, whichever is more, residing within the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District, or the owners of one-half (1/2) or more of the area of land in the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District and not exempt from this special tax;

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District, in regular session assembled on February 13, 1990, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE, DETERMINE AND ORDER as follows:

Section 1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.

Section 2. Written protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, or the extension thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are insufficient in number and in amount under the Act, and this Board hereby further orders and determines that all protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extension thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are hereby overruled.

Section 3. As proposed in the Resolution, a community facilities district is hereby established pursuant to the Act, designated "Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District."

Section 4. The map and legal description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, filed with the Clerk of this Board on January 24, 1990, are hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the boundaries of the Community Facilities District.

Section 5. The Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District, set forth in Exhibit "B" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, shall be the Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District.

Section 6. As provided in Exhibit "B", it is the intention of this Board, subject to the approval of the qualified electors of the Community Facilities District, to levy a special tax sufficient to acquire, construct and improve the Facilities including administrative expenses to be incurred by the District and the Community Facilities District in connection therewith; said tax to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all non-exempt real property in the Community Facilities District.

The rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax, in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, is described in Exhibit "A" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.

Section 7. The description of the proposed voting procedure, as set forth in the Resolution, is hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the voting procedure to be used in these proceedings.

Section 8. The special tax has not been precluded by majority protest pursuant to Section 53324 of the Act.

Section 9. The Facilities to be funded from the special tax are identified in Exhibit "B" hereto.

Section 10. In accordance with Section 53340.1 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the consolidated election proceeding in Sections 15 and 16 heretofore, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, this Board shall designate the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District as the office, department or bureau which will be responsible for annually preparing the current roll of special tax levy obligations by assessor's parcel number on non-exempt property within the District and which will be responsible for estimating future special tax levies pursuant to Section 53340.1 of the Act.

The name, address, and telephone number of the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District, and the person responsible for administering the District, is as follows:

Director of Fiscal Services
Fiscal Services Department
135 Van Ness Avenue, Room 215
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 241-6480

Section 11. In accordance with Section 53328.3 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the
consolidated election, the Board may levy the special tax within the territory of the District in the amount and for the purposes as specified in this resolution. The special tax may be levied only at the rate and may be apportioned only in the manner specified in this resolution, subject to the Act, except that the special tax may be levied at a lower rate.

Section 18. The Clerk of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution, a certified map of the boundaries of the Community Facilities District, a sufficient description to allow the election official to determine the boundaries of the District, and the assessor’s parcel numbers for the land within the District to the Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco within three business days after the adoption of this resolution.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 13th day of February, 1990.
President of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District
ATTTEST:
Clerk of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District
Recommended by:
Ramon C. Cortines
Superintendent of Schools

EXHIBIT A
The annual special tax shall be levied on each separate parcel within Community Facilities District No. 90-1, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco County, California (CFFD 90-1") as shown on the San Francisco County Assessor’s records, subject to the maximum rates specified below, as established by the Board of Education ("Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District ("District").

DETERMINATION OF PARCELS SUBJECT TO SPECIAL TAX
The records of the County Assessor of San Francisco County shall be used to determine the parcels subject to the special tax. The basis for determining the parcels will be the Secured Property Tax Roll. The land use code contained in the Secured Property Tax Roll, in combination with records maintained by the Assessor, will be the basis for assigning the appropriate tax rate to each parcel. If the District determines that the records maintained by the Assessor are incorrect with respect to one or more parcels, the District will assign the appropriate land use code and dwelling unit count based on its review of the property. All special taxes shall be based on parcels established in the County Assessor’s records as of March 1 of each year and all land use categories shall be based on building permits and other relevant development approvals granted by the City and County of San Francisco or any successor jurisdiction as of June 1 of each year.

Using the records of the County Assessor, the District shall prepare a list of the parcels subject to the tax. The District shall establish the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.

1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which, supported publicly-owned and non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that leasehold/possessory interests shall be taxed.

2. From the parcels remaining identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor’s data, and the District’s review of building permits issued, and other changes in development status:
   a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
   b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
   c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
   d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on the parcel will be classified based on the uses that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX
The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $52.20 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CFFD 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CFFD 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the deter-
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B (Continued)

ministration of the parcels subject to the tax and their special tax assignments.

SENIOR CITIZEN EXEMPTION

A property owner may apply for a Senior Citizen Exemption which would provide an exemption from the special tax for the applicable tax year on dwelling units occupied by senior citizens, if the following conditions are met:

1. The applicant must show evidence that the dwelling unit is owned or rented by a citizen who is at least 65 years of age.
2. The applicant must show evidence of ownership of the property subject to the Exemption.
3. The Senior Citizen Exemption must be applied for annually.
4. If the applicant is a landlord, then he or she must certify that the entire tax exemption will be reflected only in the rent for the exempted dwelling unit(s).

EXHIBIT B
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO.

90-1 — Description of Facilities to be financed:
(i) Repair, restoration, and/or replacement of District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), to the extent that (A) such repair, restoration, or replacement is outside the scope of work approved by federal and state agencies for assistance from such agencies; (B) costs incurred in such repair, restoration, or replacement are ineligible for federal or state assistance; or (C) insufficient federal or state funds are appropriated, obligated, or approved to pay for repair, restoration, or replacement which would otherwise be eligible for federal or state assistance. Pending receipt by the District of disaster assistance from federal and/or state agencies, the Community Facilities District may advance funds to the District to pay costs eligible for federal or state disaster assistance; provided that upon receipt by the District of federal or state disaster assistance relating to such costs, the District shall promptly reimburse the Community Facilities District for any such advances.

(ii) Seismic upgrading of children's centers and other District facilities.

(iii) Correction of fire safety violations of District facilities.

(iv) Deferred capital maintenance of District facilities. Incidental expenses, including the cost of planning and designing the Facilities and the cost of environmental evaluations thereof; all costs associated with the creation of the proposed Community Facilities District, the determination of the amount of and collection of taxes, the payment of taxes, and costs otherwise incurred in order to carry out the authorized purposes of the Community Facilities District; and any other expenses incidental to the construction, completion, and inspection of the Facilities and permitted under the Act.
BOUNDARIES OF SPECIAL TAX DISTRICT

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THIS _____ DAY OF __, 19__

RAMON C. CORTINES, CLERK
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE WITHIN MAP SHOWING PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, WAS APPROVED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AT A REGULAR MEETING THEREOF HELD ON THE 9TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1990, BY ITS RESOLUTION NO. 90-001.

RAMON C. CORTINES, CLERK
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

FILED THIS _______ DAY OF ________, 1990, AT THE HOUR OF _______ O'CLOCK _______ M. IN BOOK _______ OF MAPS OF ASSESSMENT AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICTS AT PAGE _______ IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER IN THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

BRUCE JAMESON
COUNTY RECORDER
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE: TITLE 3 DIVISION 1 CHAPTER 2 ARTICLE 2, 23138 - SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY LIMITS

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER, BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN MATEO IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN, ON THE EXTENSION OF NORTHERN LINE OF 71/2 DEGREES 26'-1" TO MOUNT DIABLO BASE, THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE PACIFIC COAST TO ITS POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE WESTERNLY EXTENSION OF THE LOW-WATER LINE ON THE NORTHERN SIDE OF THE ENTRANCE TO SAN FRANCISCO BAY, THENCE WESTERLY TO THE SOUTH CORNER OF MARIN AND NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE, EASTERLY, THROUGH POINT BONITA AND POINT CAVALIO, TO THE MOST SOUTHEASTERN POINT OF ANGEL ISLAND, ALL ON THE LINE OF MARIN; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERN LINE OF MARIN, TO THE NORTHWEST POINT OF GOLDEN ROCK (ALSO KNOWN AS RED ROCK), BEING A COMMON CORNER OF MARIN, CONTRA COSTA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE DUE SOUTHEAST FOUR AND ONE-HALF STATUTE MILES TO A POINT ESTABLISHED AS THE CORNER COMMON TO CONTRA COSTA, ALAMEDA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, ON THE WESTERN LINE OF ALAMEDA COUNTY TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF 71/2, 8TH, M.D.B. & M., THENCE WESTERLY ON THE TOWNSHIP LINES AND AN EXTENSION THEREOF TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING. THE ISLANDS KNOWN AS THE FARALLONES (FARALLON) ARE A PART OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY.

PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1
OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

KCA ENGINEERS, INC.
CONSULTING CIVIL ENGINEERS

JANUARY 1990
Equipment Lease Financing

PROPOSITION C
Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277
NO 278

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City obtains computers, telephone systems and other equipment by paying for it all at once or by leasing it until it is paid for, which is called "lease financing." The City may not enter into long-term leases for financing equipment unless (1) the voters approve it, or (2) the lease requires the Board of Supervisors to approve the payments each year. When the Board of Supervisors must approve the lease payments each year, interest rates are higher than when the lease payments are not subject to annual approval. Also, interest rates charged by for-profit companies are generally higher than interest rates charged by non-profit corporations.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment. Under Proposition C, the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval, could authorize the lease financing of equipment without the lease payments being subject to annual approval. A non-profit corporation would be created to buy the equipment and would issue tax-exempt debt to pay for it. The City would lease the equipment from the non-profit until it was paid for. The total principal of the debt issued by the non-profit corporation could not be more than $20 million in the first year. This limit on the outstanding principal would increase five percent each year. The Board could approve this type of lease financing only if the Controller certified that the interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

Controller’s Statement on “C”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application, costs could be increased or decreased in presently indeterminate but probably not substantial amounts."

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would allow the City to lease finance needed equipment at the lowest possible interest rates. The City would establish a non-profit corporation, which would buy equipment approved by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors and lease it to City departments.

The charter currently requires the voters to approve lease financing if done through non-profit corporations. Financing through a non-profit is the less expensive method because interest rates are tax-exempt. The City has had to occasionally use the more expensive method because it is not always possible to delay purchasing critical equipment until an election is held.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Saves the City money by allowing current and future leases for equipment to be financed at lower interest rates (currently 6% to 7%) than must now be used with private corporations (ranging 9% to 16%).

By simply refinancing existing leases, the City could save over $500,000.

Additional money could be saved on any future leases.

Gives the City the option to pay cash for equipment or to finance it expeditiously at a low cost to the City.

Allows quicker replacement of inefficient and outdated equipment, which will reduce maintenance costs, decrease downtime, and increase productivity for equipment which has outlived its economic useful life.

Provides restrictions to insure prudent use of this financing mechanism.

Requires the Controller to certify that the lease is the least costly financing method.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition C
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition C
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated
by bold face type; deletions are indicated
by strike-out type.

7.309 Voter Approval of Lease Financing
(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve
the lease financing of public improvements or
equipment unless a proposition generally de-
scribing the public improvements or equipment
and the lease financings arrangement is approved
by a majority of the voters voting on the propo-
sition. The board of supervisors may by resolu-
tion submit such a proposition to the qualified
voters of the City and County of San Francisco
at a general or special election.

(b) For the purposes of this section, "lease fi-
nancing" occurs when the city and county leases
land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a
Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Rede-
velopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing
Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority,
or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the
purpose of financing the construction or acquisi-
tion of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not
apply:
(1) to any lease financing which was approved
in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance
adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April
1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordi-
nance approved the lease financing only in prin-
ciple, the resolution or ordinance must describe
in general terms the public improvements or
equipment to be financed; or
(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease
financing arrangement or to the refunding of
lease financing bonds which results in lower total
rental payments under the terms of the lease; or
(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit
corporation established for the purposes of this
subsection for the acquisition of equipment,
the obligations or evidence of indebtedness
with respect to which shall not exceed in the
aggregate at any point in time a principal
amount of $20 million, such amount to be in-
creased by five percent each fiscal year follow-
ing approval of this subsection; provided,
however, that prior to each sale of such obliga-
tions or evidence of indebtedness, the Control-
ler certifies that in his or her opinion the net
interest cost to the City will be lower than other
financings involving a lease or leases.

Remember to VOTE on Election Day, Tuesday June 5, 1990.
Your polling place is open from 7:00 in the morning to 8:00 in the evening.
RECYCLING IS EASIER THAN YOU THINK.

Recycling is not only easier than you might think, it's a simple way you can do your part for environmental conservation—and feel good about it, too.

All you need is an ordinary brown paper bag.

Each time you set up your kitchen garbage, place an extra brown bag or two out for recycling. Then every day just drop your newspaper into a recycling bag—a week's worth of papers fits perfectly (and your newspapers will stop piling up on the floor!).

When you're finished with an aluminum soda or beer can simply pop it in a separate bag. The same goes for bottles; just put them in a bag, labels and all. Then when you're on the way to the supermarket or heading out for the day, drop off the bags at a Recycling Center near you. Or, you can tie your newspaper with string and the garbage company will collect it free of charge.

That's it. When you think about it, isn't recycling almost as easy as not recycling?

And it really is the right thing to do.

For a free Recycling Guide and a list of Recycling Centers near you, call:

San Francisco Recycling Program
CITY HALL
554-6193
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no special City fund to pay for neighborhood beautification projects or graffiti clean-up. Money can be spent for this purpose only when the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors approve it in the City's budget.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is an ordinance that would create a "Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund" ("the Fund") to pay for cleaning up graffiti on public buildings and beautifying the neighborhood.

The Chief Administrative Officer would manage the Fund. Businesses could pay up to one percent of their payroll or business taxes into the Fund. Grants or money donated for graffiti clean-up would be deposited in the Fund. The goal of the ordinance is to produce for the Fund $1,000,000 each year, adjusted annually for inflation. The Controller would change the percentage of taxes businesses could pay into the Fund to produce $1,000,000 in the fund each fiscal year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this fund.

Controller's Statement on "D"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, General Fund revenues could decrease by as much as $1.4 million in fiscal 1990 and as much as $1 million per year, adjusted for inflation, thereafter."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D asks the voters to make the revitalization of our neighborhoods and the wiping out of graffiti a top city priority without raising taxes.

Proposition D will permit those employers currently eligible in San Francisco to earmark up to 1% of their payroll or gross receipts tax bill to establish The Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

The fund will be used to award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city. The Budget Analyst has estimated that approximately one million dollars would be available every year.

Proposition D creates a unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers to keep our city attractive. It will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting and graffiti clean-up.

Also, Proposition D will fund public information and education campaigns to combat litter, and instill in our youth the old-fashioned virtue of respect for public and private property.

The fund created by Proposition D will be administered by the Chief Administrative Officer with public input from environmental organizations and neighborhood committees.

Proposition D was authored by Supervisor Jim Gonzales and has been submitted to the voters with the support of the Sierra Club, San Francisco Beautiful, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

According to their ballot argument, the Board of Supervisors wants to create a “unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers” to reduce graffiti. What’s stopping them from doing that now?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

The supervisors also say they want to provide “seed money” for planting trees and improving street lighting. Well, why haven’t they placed items in the city budget to do so?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

In their rebuttal argument, the supervisors claim that “many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle.” Whose fault is that, if not their own?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

Finally, the supervisors have the temerity to state: “With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark” funds for graffiti. What would be “fair” is if San Francisco businesses paid lower taxes. But no one should be “earmarking” tax dollars except elected representatives of the people.

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

There’s no question that graffiti is a serious problem demanding serious solutions. But what good is it to divert $1,000,000 a year from other city programs? That’s robbing Peter to pay Paul! It’s bad government!

Why do we need Proposition D? We don’t.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

I know something about graffiti. I wrote the city ordinances prohibiting the sale of spray paint and large, felt-tip pens to minors. I also authored the state law to allow police officers greater latitude in arresting juveniles who deface public transit vehicles. This year, I’m pursuing a bill to revoke for one year the driver’s license of any person convicted of graffiti vandalism.

Proposition D is not about graffiti or “neighborhood beautification”. It’s about diverting millions from the city’s General Fund. It’s about depriving existing city programs of critically needed revenue. Proposition D is a financial shell game.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Proposition D would allow any city business to designate up to 1% of its payroll tax check for deposit in a special fund. According to the supervisors’ Budget Analyst, Proposition D could divert up to $1,440,260 from the General Fund in the program’s first year. Thereafter, annual diversions would approximate $1,000,000, plus inflation.

That’s over $1,000,000 per year which cannot be spent on police services, fire protection, libraries, and public health.

As you can plainly see from my legislative record, I’m no soft touch when it comes to graffiti prevention and clean-up. But Proposition D is the wrong approach. “Special funds” and “segregated accounts” have no place in our city budget.

Graffiti programs deserve adequate city funding, and the Board of Supervisors and Mayor should move promptly to appropriate such funds in the next regular budgetary cycle.

The voters, meanwhile, should move promptly to reject Proposition D on June 5th!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We need a city plan that invests in the quality of our neighborhoods . . . Now. It’s obvious laws banning the sale of spray paint and felt pens have done nothing to stop the sprawl of graffiti or create a climate of cooperation between city officials and neighborhood groups to find real solutions.

Proposition D is about beautifying our neighborhoods consistently. Proposition D is about wiping out graffiti permanently. With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark a mere one-hundredth to be poured back into the neighborhoods.

Out of a greater than two billion dollar annual budget, the city can afford a guaranteed million dollars to help keep our city beautiful, clean, and graffiti-free. Year in and year out, many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle. Proposition D will provide a solid foundation for the revitalization of our neighborhoods, which no one can tamper with and that requires no new taxes.

Over the last few years, individual Supervisors have spent many weekends planting trees and removing graffiti with neighborhood groups. Working with groups such as SF ALIVE, San Francisco Conservation Corps, 24th Street Revitalization Committee and the West Portal Merchants Association to make our neighborhoods shine has taught us one thing . . . neighborhood environmentalists and city departments working together as partners will be a winning combination for San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

When City Hall and neighborhood organizations work together, problems can be solved.
Vote YES on D.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

There is a reason that the San Francisco Beautiful, the Sierra Club and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, along with dozens of neighborhood groups support placing PROPOSITION D on the ballot.

San Franciscans are united in wanting to preserve and enhance our city’s attractiveness and keep San Francisco one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

Our Supervisors put PROPOSITION D on the ballot for your approval because they realize that a more attractive city starts with people like you and me and our neighbors who truly care about San Francisco.

YES ON PROPOSITION D creates a working partnership between our neighborhoods and city government;
YES ON PROPOSITION D means a more beautiful city and enhancement of your neighborhood and mine;
YES ON PROPOSITION D accomplishes this with NO NEW TAXES, allowing large employers to earmark up to 1% of their current payroll tax for beautification and graffiti cleanup;
YES ON PROPOSITION D pays for neighborhood-generated projects, giving residents a say in how these reserved funds are spent;
YES ON PROPOSITION D is the first step to guaranteeing more beautiful and attractive neighborhoods.
Join your neighbors, business owners and environmentalists by voting YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Al Pross, Chair
COMMITTEE FOR BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBORHOODS

The quality of life in our neighborhoods will truly become a top city priority with the passage of Proposition D.

* Proposition D will provide over a million dollars a year from the business community to stop neighborhood decay (through a voluntary checkoff on their payroll or gross receipts tax bill).
* Proposition D will award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city.
* Proposition D will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting, and graffiti clean-up.
* Proposition D will fund an educational campaign to teach our youngsters a new respect for public and private property.
Let’s protect our city’s special livability. Let’s foster civic pride.
Let’s invest in the long term health of San Francisco’s residential neighborhoods. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Supervisor Jim Gonzales

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

Graffiti is a blight on the beauty of San Francisco. We strongly encourage the continued generosity of grants and donations to eradicate this problem. However, during the current deficit-ridden period, it is irresponsible for the City to direct at least $1,000,000 a year from the General Fund for this purpose.

The San Francisco Republican Party urges you to vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley
William E. Grayson

Anna M. Guth
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”

Why add more government to your taxes. $1 million per year to be funded from Payroll taxes which has a sunset clause to expire in 1990.

Then who pays the tab? You do.

If the police would assert their powers and nab the violators, instead of the City offering to pay to clean up their “works of art” this ordinance would not be necessary.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Marguerite Warren

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

[Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund]

AN ORDINANCE, ADDING SECTIONS 10.98 AND 10.98-1 TO THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO ESTABLISH A NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND AND SPECIFYING THE PURPOSES THEREFOR AND AMENDING PART III, SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, BY ADDING ARTICLE 12B-1 THERETO, TO PROVIDE THAT ANY BUSINESS WHICH OWES A PAYROLL EX-PENSE TAX OR BUSINESS TAX MAY ELECT TO DESIGNATE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE TAX FOR DEPOSIT IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND.

NOTE: All sections are new.

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Sections 10.98 and 10.98-1 thereto, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.98. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: FINDINGS AND INTENT.

(a) Findings.
The proliferation of graffiti on public buildings and other public property has created a blight which offends both citizens of and visitors to San Francisco. The removal of such graffiti will enhance the beauty of the city in which we live and will encourage others to visit and relocate here.

Removal will thus both reflect and renew our civic pride and contribute to our economic viability. Providing a source of funds for the promotion of neighborhood beautification projects will support the efforts of local residents and businesses to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and the local economy, and assist in reducing the amount of graffiti in San Francisco.

(b) Statement of Intent.
The Board of Supervisors wishes to address the above concerns by establishing a neighborhood beautification and graffiti clean-up fund which will promote neighborhood beautification projects, including projects designed to improve the environmental quality of neighborhoods, and finance the clean-up of graffiti on public property.

SEC. 10.98-1. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: ESTABLISHMENT; ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS; DUTIES.

(a) Establishment of Fund. There is hereby established a special fund for the purpose of receiving all donations of money which may be collected by the City and County of San Francisco for the purposes enumerated in Section 10.98(b). Monies deposited in the fund shall only be expended for the purposes enumerated therein, provided that such expenditures shall include reimbursement to City and County departments for expenses incurred in the administration of the fund. The special fund shall be known and designated as the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

(b) Acceptance of Gifts. All donations of money which may be offered to the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund are hereby accepted for such purposes. Any grants, gifts and bequests from private sources for this purpose shall be deposited into said special fund.

(c) Duties of the Chief Administrative Officer.
1. The Chief Administrative Officer, or his or her designee, shall be responsible for the administration of the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund, and shall have all such authority as may be reasonably necessary to carry out those responsibilities.

2. The Chief Administrative Officer shall promulgate such rules and regulations as he or she may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Section and Section 10.98. Before issuing or amending any rules and regulations, the Chief Administrative Officer shall provide a thirty (30) day public comment period by providing published notice in an official newspaper of general circulation in the City of the intent to issue or amend the rules and regulations. The rules and regulations shall be approved by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. Such rules and regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the qualifications of applicants and factors to be considered in the award of grants to fund programs to help remove graffiti and promote neighborhood beautification projects, including preference for the following projects: youth programs and innovation projects that are neighborhood generated and projects designed to benefit areas of San Francisco that are economically disadvantaged.

3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall submit a semi-annual report to the Board of Supervisors setting forth an accounting of the amounts disbursed and the uses for which said funds were made.

(d) Budgetary and Fiscal Provisions of the Charter.
The monies in this fund are subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter and may be expended only when authorized by appropriation ordinance of the Board of Supervisors.

(e) Interest. Interest earned from the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund shall become part of the principal thereof, and shall not be expended for any purpose other than that for which said fund is established.

(f) Accumulation of Monies in Fund. The balance remaining in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Charter Section 6.306 and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said fund for the purposes recited herein.

Section 2. Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code is hereby amended by adding Article 12B-1 thereto, to read as follows:

ART. 12B-1 NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND TAX OPTION.

SEC. 1030. Initial Option. Commencing in tax year 1990, any business, as defined in Section 1002.1 of this Code, that is subject to the Payroll Expense Tax or the Business Tax may elect to designate up to one per cent (1%) of its tax liability for deposit in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

SEC. 1031. Amount of Fund Annually. It is the intent of the voters of the City and County of San Francisco that one million dollars ($1,000,000.00), derived from tax proceeds designated by the taxpayers pursuant to Section 1031, shall be deposited annually into the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund. The Controller shall annually adjust this figure for inflation to reflect changes in the most recently available U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose Metropolitan Area, or its successor index.

SEC. 1032. Subsequent Option. For each tax year after 1990, the Controller shall determine the amount of fund revenues actually generated in the prior year, including the interest thereon and the balance, if any, remaining at the close of the tax year. On the basis of the prior year's experience of taxpayer contributions and total revenues generated by the payroll expense and business taxes, the Controller shall calculate a percentage ceiling of total tax liability which taxpayers may designate for deposit in the fund in the following tax year. The Controller shall set the percentage ceiling so that the revenues produced thereby are most likely to generate a total of one million dollars (adjusted for inflation) in the fund for the forthcoming tax year. The Controller shall transmit his or her calculation to the Board of Supervisors, which shall adopt a new tax designation ceiling, if necessary, in advance of the tax year to enable the Tax Collector to perform his or her collection duties.

SEC. 1033. Severability. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective. In addition, the voters declare their intention that should any portion of this initiative ordinance or all of it be declared invalid in whole or in part, such invalidity shall have no effect upon the continued validity of the Payroll Expense Tax and Business Tax.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PROPOSITION F

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 284
NO 285

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Fire Commission has the authority to decide the number and staffing of fire companies and the number and location of fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors may change the number of firefighters. The Fire Commission may close or move fire stations or reduce the number of fire companies if it decides they are no longer needed. A fire company typically consists of a fire engine or other emergency vehicle and the firefighters needed to operate it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would specify a minimum number of fire stations and fire companies and minimum levels of staffing for those fire companies. Proposition F would increase the number of firefighters assigned to some types of fire companies. This means that the number of firefighters on duty at all times would increase from 297 to 322. Where necessary, Proposition F's minimum level of staffing would be met by firefighters working overtime. Overtime pay for firefighters is one and one-half times their normal salary.

Proposition F would limit the power of the Fire Commission, Mayor and Board of Supervisors to set the number of fire stations and staffing levels.

Before closing any fire station or reducing the number of fire companies or units required by Proposition F, the measure would require (1) a recommendation by the Fire Chief; (2) approval by the Fire Commission, after public hearings; (3) approval by the Board of Supervisors; and (4) approval by the voters.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current salary rates and staffing levels of the Fire Department, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $4.9 million per year."

How “F” Got on the Ballot

On March 2, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition F to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,485* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 21 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 56,364 of the signatures submitted were valid, 15,879 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
**OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F**

**WHAT IS PROP F?**

**PROPOSITION F IS A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WILL ESTABLISH A MINIMUM LEVEL OF FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS FOR SAN FRANCISCO. IT GIVES THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE FIRE CHIEF THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MANAGE THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITIZENS.**

**SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT BECAUSE IT WILL:**

1. **GUARANTEE THAT THE PRESENT 41 FIRE STATIONS STAY OPEN**
2. **GUARANTEE FULLY-STAFFED FIRE TRUCKS AT ALL TIMES**
3. **GUARANTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BEFORE ANY FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED**
4. **GUARANTEE THAT YOUR FIREBOAT WILL BE STAFFED WITH A FIREFIGHTING CREW OF TWO**
   - **THE 7.1 QUAKE OF OCTOBER 17 WARNED US AGAIN — WE MUST BE PREPARED!**

**ITEM A — MAYOR AGNOS CUT THE FIRE DEPART-**

MENT ON-DUTY STAFFING BY 19 PERSONS A DAY IN 1989.

**PROP F RESTORES THOSE CUTS.**

**ITEM B — SIX FIRE STATIONS HAVE ALREADY BEEN CLOSED BY THE MAYOR FROM 1972-1980.**

**ITEM C — PROP F DOES NOT REQUIRE “GUARANTEED OVERTIME” AND, IN FACT, BY JULY 1992 NO OVERTIME WILL BE NEEDED FOR THE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS OF PROP F.**

(Overtime is now caused by large numbers of vacant positions. New hiring will eliminate all vacancies and overtime by July 1992. Prop F will safeguard this full-staffing.)

**PROP F IS A COMMON SENSE MEASURE TO GIVE ADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION TO ALL CITIZENS.**

**VOTE YES ON F!**

**SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F; COMMITTEE FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS**

**JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN**

**JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN**

---

**REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F**

It is clear that Proposition F is not a Fire Safety Issue. It is clearly an issue to guarantee overtime.

1. This Mayor and Board of Supervisors have never closed a single fire station and have no intention to close firehouses.
2. Most major cities in America consider five firefighters per truck to be fully-staffed. More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire.
3. Proposition F will not restore cuts in firefighters. We are mandated by law to provide 90 new firefighters this year. Proposition F only guarantees overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day, $3.5 million per year.

Our firefighters do a tough job! But we compensate them well! We need new equipment — not more overtime. Following the earthquake, a fire truck had to be taken from the fire museum to fight fires. Let's not waste money which could be used for new firefighting equipment.

San Francisco voters rejected a similar proposal in 1987 and it should be rejected again in 1990.

**VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!**

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will waste millions of your tax dollars. Just look at the facts.

Fact: Proposition F does not hire new firefighters. The Federal Consent Decree already sets hiring standards — 90 new firefighters will be hired this year without Prop. F.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that Assistant Chiefs and Battalion Chiefs will continue to have chauffeurs.

Fact: Proposition F is not needed to save fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors have no intention of closing any fire stations.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that 18 current firefighters will get daily time-and-a-half overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day . . . or more than $3.5 million extra per year.

Fact: Proposition F is not a fire safety issue. Virtually every major American city deploys five or fewer firefighters on fire trucks. A sixth firefighter is featherbedding, not firefighting. More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire. That's enough people to raise ladders, ventilate rooftops and carry out lifesaving tasks.

FACT: Our firefighters do a tough job. But they are well-compensated already and do not need additional guaranteed overtime . . . especially when there are so many other pressing needs in San Francisco.

FACT: Firefighters in San Francisco are currently paid $300 more per month than the average salaries of firefighters in the four largest California cities. But the other firefighters work 15 percent more hours than San Francisco.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters already receive 23 percent more vacation, sick and holiday leave than other city workers. A recent study by the Controller shows that increased overtime results in increased sick leave and disability.

Study the facts and you'll agree. Proposition F is nothing more than $7 million per year in unnecessary guaranteed overtime.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

FACT: PROP F does:
• Guarantee that the 90 new firefighters cannot later be eliminated by politicians.
• Require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people before cutbacks can be made to the minimum staffing.

FACT: The Mayor DID cut back Fire Department staffing in August 1989 from 315 to 296.

FACT: Assistant and Battalion Chiefs DO NOT have “chauffeurs.” They DO have an operations and communications assistant.

FACT: Prop F IS needed to guarantee public review and input before any fire station can be closed.

FACT: SIX fire stations have been closed by the Mayor’s office since 1972 without any public review.

FACT: Prop F DOES guarantee that the 19 on-duty firefighters cut by the Mayor in 1989 will be restored. When sufficient new firefighters are hired, NO OVERTIME will be required.

FACT: PROP F IS A FIRE SAFETY ISSUE!

FACT: San Francisco firefighters ARE REQUIRED to work overtime because previous policies of politicians allowed large numbers of vacant positions to occur.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters DO NOT get a paid health plan for dependents, nor do they get longevity pay or other benefits enjoyed by firefighters in the four largest California cities.

FACT: ALL city employees, including firefighters, receive EXACTLY THE SAME vacation, sick and holiday leave. This is a city Charter requirement.

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I STRONGLY SUPPORT PROP F!

Prop F will benefit all the people of San Francisco. Over 71,000 voters from every part of the City signed the petition to put Prop F on the ballot. They expressed enthusiastic support for a stronger Fire Department.

The City is becoming increasingly built-up, causing greater congestion. This means that fire hazards are increasing and adequate fire protection will be even more important to us than ever.

The October 17th earthquake was an urgent reminder of how fragile our city is and how important our Fire Department is to all of us.

When you, the people, call for help, whether it is for a medical emergency, a rescue, or fire, the firefighters come.

PROP F MAKES SENSE FOR ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

It allows you to participate in fire safety decisions that affect your neighborhood.

Our neighborhoods are the “heart” of San Francisco. OUR FAMILIES, HOMES, CHURCHES, FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS NEED SATISFACTORY FIRE PROTECTION.

PROP F WILL MAKE SAN FRANCISCO A SAFER PLACE TO LIVE IN.

VOTE YES ON F!

Bill Maher, Member
Board of Supervisors

I STRONGLY SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!

They provide vital services to our San Franciscans. Last year, our firefighters answered a record-breaking 58,000 alarms and saved thousands of lives. The greatest number of calls came from the Tenderloin, the Inner Mission, the Fillmore, Civic Center/Hayes Valley, Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley. I WANT TO BE SURE YOU GET THE HELP YOU NEED — WHEN YOU NEED IT!

Over the past 20 years, unlike other city departments, Fire Department staffing has been slashed by 40%! THREE FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT AGREE THAT THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY ARE TOO FEW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS! THEY AGREE THAT NO MORE FIREFHOUSES SHOULD BE CLOSED.

We NEED Proposition F. It will:

• Put firefighters back on the ladder trucks
• Put firefighters back on our fireboat
• Bring daily staffing up to an adequate level
• Guarantee that any proposed closings of fire companies will be subject to a public review and vote by the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people
• Guarantee the SFFD the funding it needs

THE COST OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT IS ONLY 2 CENTS A DAY FOR EACH OF US! That 2 cents could easily save a life — maybe yours, or that of a loved one. PROP. F WILL BENEFIT ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

I STRONGLY SUPPORT IMPROVED FIRE PROTECTION IN SAN FRANCISCO!

I SHARE THE CONCERNS OF THE 71,000 VOTERS WHO PUT THIS PROPOSITION ON THE BALLOT. Fire Department daily staffing has been forced so low that our safety is threatened. WE MUST KEEP OUR FIREFHOUSES OPEN AND FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED.

In addition to fighting fires, our firefighters perform many services for our elderly, disabled and low income families that no one else does. FIREFIGHTERS RESPONDED TO OVER 58,000 EMERGENCIES LAST YEAR, INCLUDING 26,000 MEDICAL CALLS.

We depend on our firefighters to protect our families, homes, and businesses. Our narrow streets, steep hills and rows of wood frame buildings make firefighting very difficult. SAN FRANCISCO HAS SPECIAL FIREFIGHTING AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL NEEDS! We are different from other California cities with their wide streets, flat terrain and detached buildings!

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING FOR PROPOSITION F. THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL BENEFIT ALL OUR CITIZENS.

WENDY NELDER, Member
Board of Supervisors

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

STOP REDUCTIONS IN CITY FIRE PROTECTION! VOTE YES ON F!

Over 71,000 San Francisco voters from every neighborhood, ethnic group and economic level joined to put PROPOSITION F on this ballot. They are concerned because politicians have reduced daily staffing to a dangerous all-time low while emergency calls reached an all-time high of 58,000 last year. People want their neighborhood firehouses to stay open and their fire engines, aerial ladder trucks and fireboat fully staffed to meet their emergency needs. They want a Charter amendment to take politics out of fire safety decisions.

Remember October 17! We learned that we need a strong Fire Department to fight fires, perform rescues and coordinate civilian volunteers. When both bridges are down, we need a strong SFFD!

THIS IS A COMMON SENSE PROPOSITION — IT IS SUPPORTED BY 3 FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT!

Join your friends and neighbors! VOTE YES ON F!

John L. Molinari
Former member of the Board of Supervisors

ONLY YOU CAN STOP FURTHER DANGEROUS CUTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

Over the years, the San Francisco Fire Department has assisted hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans in time of great personal need. The people understand how important the SFFD is in their lives, and OVER 71,000 OF THEM SIGNED THE PETITION TO PLACE PROPOSITION F ON THE BALLOT. The citizens want to be heard!

SFFD EMERGENCY RESPONSES ARE INCREASING DRAMATICALLY EVERY YEAR! Fiscal year totals have gone from 28,000 in 1970 to over 58,000 in 1989, while politicians have slashed daily on-duty staffing from 482, when I was Fire Chief, to today's all-time low of 296. Department resources are being stretched thinner and thinner despite greater and greater needs. THIS DANGEROUS TREND MUST BE STOPPED!

The Department must be able to meet the complex and highly varied needs of today's San Francisco. These include fighting structural fires, providing medical assistance, performing cliff and water rescues, responding to BART and MUNI fires and accidents, controlling hazardous materials emergencies, assisting victims of industrial accidents, and responding to many other emergency needs.

Many seniors, low income families and handicapped people rely on the SFFD to help them. THE PERSONAL ATTENTION THAT THE SFFD PROVIDES CAN NEVER BE CONVERTED TO SELF-SERVICE OR AUTOMATED! Firefighters, now machines, put out fires, perform rescues and meet all the other emergency needs of our city. You need these firefighters! THE NEXT CALL HELP MAY BE YOURS!

The need for Fire Department services crosses all social, ethnic and economic strata. We can all get behind this quality of life issue. Proposition F will strengthen your Fire Department and take politics out of fire safety.

William F. Murray
Chief of Department, SFFD, Retired

VOTE YES ON PROP F!

It takes teamwork to put out a fire. Without it, lives and property can be lost. Without it, firefighters can pay a hard price, for their lives, when in danger, may depend on having a buddy to lend a hand or go for help. As much a part of their job as hose, ladders, and water is that firefighters work in pairs when possible. It can be critical where dense smoke obscures vision or — as so many San Francisco neighborhoods well know — when trying to maneuver on a steeply pitched roof.

Current staffing of aerial ladder trucks leaves one firefighter without a buddy, the team short one vital hand. Proposition F will restore the balance that a fire — and time-tested system needs.

It also will mean two firefighters ready to move out with the fireboat when it has a job to do. Because they weren't readily available, the fireboat was delayed in pumping bay water to put out the disastrous Marina fire after last October's earthquake.

That's why I'm voting "Yes" on Prop F and am urging all San Franciscans to do the same.

Edward J. Phipps
Chief of Department, SFFD (Retired)
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I OWE MY LIFE TO THE QUICK AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS STATIONED AT MY LOCAL FIREFHOUSE.

Over 26,000 San Franciscans received emergency medical assistance last year by the SFPPD. Many lives were saved because firefighters were on the scene in 3 minutes or less. The neighborhood firehouse is an essential part of San Francisco's complex fire protection system.

The October 17th earthquake and the great Marina fire showed us how vital it is to have our Fire Department maintained at an adequate level. There were no firefighters on board the Fireboat Phoenix when it arrived in the Marina, and for over 1 1/2 hours firefighting and search and rescue operations were hindered by a lack of firefighters, as well as by a lack of water. UNDERSTAFFING CAN CAUSE FIRE DEATHS.

Proposition F will answer these critical needs by restoring funds for adequate staffing of fire companies, including the fireboat, and it will require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission and Board of Supervisors before any further cutbacks in fire protection can be made.

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING YES ON F!

John Barbagelata

PENNY-POWER! LOOK — HOW CAN YOU BUY SOMETHING PRICELESS FOR ONLY PENNIES A DAY?

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F!

FOR ONLY 2 CENTS PER DAY, YOU WILL:

• KEEP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIREFHOUSE OPEN
• KEEP FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED
• KEEP YOUR FIREBOAT IN SERVICE AND STAFFED WITH FIREFIGHTERS
• GUARANTEE THAT NO FIREFHOUSES OR FIRE COMPANIES WILL BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT
• REMOVE POLITICS FROM FIRE SAFETY

THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL COST EACH OF SAN FRANCISCO'S 732,000 RESIDENTS JUST PENNIES A DAY:

YEAR 1 — COST $5.3 MILLION = 2 CENTS PER DAY!
YEAR 2 — COST $2.8 MILLION = 1 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 3 — COST $0.8 MILLION = 1/2 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 4 — NO ADDITIONAL COST!
THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE POLICY YOU WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY.
DON'T MISS THE CHANCE!

VOTE YES ON F!

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

WE STRONGLY SUPPORT PROPOSITION F!

No one worries more about costs than working people. For their hard-earned dollars, breadwinners demand value in return.

Value is what Proposition F is all about. It restores adequate staffing of engine and ladder truck companies, staffs the fireboat, and assures that you and I will have a voice in any proposed closing of a fire company or firehouse.

Proposition F is an insurance policy that is clearly a benefit to all San Franciscans. And, there is no question that the benefits greatly exceed the cost — to each of us, just 2 cents a day for the first year, 1 cent a day for the second year, and no cost thereafter.

Without adequate fire protection, San Francisco has too much to lose.

VOTE YES ON F!

Walter L. Johnson
San Francisco Labor Council
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
THEY PROVIDE ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL SERVICES FOR OUR CITIZENS, AND NO ONE ELSE CAN DO THEIR JOB! We have 500 high rise buildings, BART and MUNI tunnels, and large business, school and hospital complexes where firefighting requires many firefighters.

On October 17, we were lucky! It was just a warning.
The present 296 firefighters on duty each day is too low to meet our daily and our DISASTER NEEDS!
Let's all get behind Proposition F! It will assure stability in Department funding, guarantee adequate staffing for our firehouses and apparatus, and permit long-range planning and improvements. Our firefighters need your vote!

James A. Hood
Chairman
San Franciscans for Fire Safety

VOTE YES ON F!
SAN FRANCISCO IS A FRAGILE CITY. OVER 90% OF ALL STRUCTURES ARE OF WOOD FRAME CONSTRUCTION. YOUR HOMES ARE BUILT IN SOLID BLOCKS OF WOODEN BUILDINGS. THIS SITUATION PRESENTS THE POSSIBILITY OF A DISASTEROUS FIRE OR CONFLAGRATION OCCURRING, ESPECIALLY FOLLOWING AN EARTHQUAKE.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS THE LIFELINE FOR ALL OF US WHO LIVE IN THIS CITY. THE EARTHQUAKE ON OCTOBER 17TH AND THE GREAT FIRE IN THE MARINA SHOW HOW IMPORTANT THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS TO SAN FRANCISCO.

POLITICIANS ARE USING SHRILL RHETORIC AND OTHER OFFENSIVE TACTICS IN AN ATTEMPT TO MISLEAD THE PUBLIC AS TO WHAT THE REAL MEANING OF PROP F IS. DO NOT BE MISLED! PROP F PROVIDES THREE MAIN POINTS:

- ESTABLISHES THE PRESENT 41 NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS AS A MINIMUM STANDARD
- PUTS A FIREFIGHTING CREW ON THE FIREBOAT
- REQUIRES PUBLIC HEARINGS AND APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE CITIZENS BEFORE A FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED.

THESE ARE COMMON SENSE MEASURES THAT PROVIDE A MINIMUM LEVEL OF PUBLIC SAFETY FOR OUR FAMILIES AND CITY.

PLEASE JOIN ME, AND THE 70,000 OTHER SAN FRANCISCANS WHO SIGNED THE PETITIONS TO PUT PROP F ON THE BALLOT, AND VOTE YES ON "F!"

FRANK T. BLACKBURN
ASSISTANT FIRE CHIEF

VOTE YES ON F!
Fire protection is vital for our families and businesses.
Prop F will stabilize protection and prevent further cuts in the Fire Department.
Protect our city. Vote Yes on F.

Robt. E. Donohue
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
Charles D. Cresci
Deputy Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Charles H. Lee
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON’T TAKE YOUR FIREFIGHTERS FOR GRANTED!
San Francisco firefighters answered a record 58,000 calls for help last year. Of these, 26,000 were for medical emergencies. Heart attacks, auto accidents, building collapses, childbirths were just a few. BUT EVERY YEAR THERE ARE FEWER AND FEWER FIREFIGHTERS TO HELP YOU!! In 1970 there were 482 firefighters on duty each day — in 1990 there are only 296!! Six firehouses and 12 fire companies have been closed.

FIRE SAFETY DECISIONS MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE HANDS OF POLITICIANS! Only a Charter amendment will assure that your Fire Department is adequately staffed to meet San Francisco’s special needs — now and in the future. FOR JUST 2 CENTS A DAY, WE CAN KEEP OUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS OPEN AND OUR FIRE APPARATUS ADE-QUATELY STAFFED.

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE WE WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON’T MISS THE CHANCE! VOTE YES ON F!

Walter G. Jebe
John J. Figone
Caesar A. Churchwell
Alessandro Baccari
Virgil Caselli
Marsha Garland
Tom Creedon
Ed Farrah
Michael Salarno

NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS
Pride, trust, reliance. They’re all wrapped up in a San Francisco institution. The neighborhood fire station turns out to be more — it’s a rock, an anchor, a point of reference in people’s lives.

City residents have said so loud and clear in endorsing Proposition F. Besides setting a minimum number of firefighters to be on duty each day, the June ballot measure guarantees a public hearing in the area concerned and a vote of the people, if needed, before any fire station may be closed.

Seventy thousand people petitioned to put F on the ballot. Their reasons all had a common core. It’s not THE fire station but OUR fire station, they said — a place to expect and get help in a fire or medical emergency, a place the local community can turn to and rely on if the earth shakes, buildings fall, and other resources break down.

Neighborhoods and fire stations. The one requires the other, San Franciscans say.

John W. Flaherty
Mark L. Kaplan
Robert L. Barisone
Elvera Jane Barisone
William A. Roberts Jr.
Maureen Porter
William Porter Jr.
Homer G. Miles
Dorothy L. Miles
Peter C. Gardner
Joan M. Gardner
John Daly
Lucia R. Flaherty
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T BE MISLED BY MAYOR AGNOS!
PROP F IS A LIFE AND DEATH ISSUE!
FIRE, INSURANCE AND EARTHQUAKE EXPERTS
AGREE: SAN FRANCISCO FACES THE HIGHEST RISK OF
CONFLAGRATION OF ANY CITY IN THE UNITED STATES!
FIRE RISK IS HIGHER THAN IN 1906!
SAN FRANCISCO'S FIRE PROTECTION NEEDS ARE DIC-
TATED BY THE NATURE OF OUR CITY, with its:
• Blocks and blocks of adjoining wood frame buildings
• Steep hills
• Narrow streets
• Traffic congestion
• Network of overhead electrical, trolley and telephone lines
• Prevailing winds
• 500 high rise buildings
• High density residential areas
• Large population of seniors and low-income families
• High vulnerability to severe earthquake damage
• Isolation from outside help in time of disaster
SAN FRANCISCO IS IN TROUBLE BECAUSE THERE ARE
NOT ENOUGH FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY. Former SF Fire Chief Emmet Condon in his book "Denial of Disaster":
"THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT IS BELOW
THE DAILY MANNING LEVEL THAT ANY EXPERIENCED
CHIEF OFFICER KNOWS IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE
ADEQUATE SERVICE TO THE CITY." Condon continues:
"I WOULD AGREE THAT THE HAZARD OF FIRE TO THE
CITY AFTER A SIMILAR DISASTER TODAY IS MUCH
GREATER THAN IN 1906." And,
"SYNTHETIC MATERIALS HAVE GREATLY IN-
CREASED THE FIRE RISK IN MODERN BUILDINGS AND
WILL MAGNIFY THE FIRE PROBLEM IN THE MULTIPLE
FIRES THAT WILL BREAK OUT AFTER A SERIOUS
EARTHQUAKE."

At least 400 of the city's 500 high rise buildings do not have modern life-safety systems! HIGH RISE FIRES CAUSE A
HUGE DRAIN ON FIRE DEPARTMENT RESOURCES.

PROP F IS STRONGLY SUPPORTED BY INDIVIDUALS;
CITIZEN, BUSINESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS;
FIRE SAFETY EXPERTS, AND A BROAD SPECTRUM OF
KNOWLEDGEABLE CIVIC LEADERS.

There is no significant opposition to Prop F.

PROTECT YOURSELF, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR FRIENDS
— YOU HAVE A LOT TO LOSE! VOTE YES ON F!

GERRY LONG
Concerned Citizen

WHY VOTE YES ON F? WHY A CHARTER AMENDMENT?
City politicians have been consistently unresponsive to your fire
safety concerns. It is the duty of the City to provide its citizens with
adequate fire protection and earthquake preparedness. Instead,
Fire Department staffing has been cut to a dangerous level.

THE POLITICIANS SAY, "TRUST US!"

We can see that this has not worked, and a Charter provision is
necessary. YOUR EMERGENCY NEEDS ARE TOO VITAL TO
BE LEFT VULNERABLE TO POLITICAL GAMES.
You hear the sirens every day — BUT HAVE YOU COUNTED

THE FIREFIGHTERS? Fewer firefighters means greatly reduced
firefighting capacity. FIRE DEPARTMENT STAFFING IS NOW
AT AN ALL-TIME LOW AND CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO
FALL FURTHER!

WE NEED A STRONG FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES
ON F!

John Flaherty
Battalion Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Past President, S.F. Fire Chiefs Assn.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

HIGH RISE BUILDINGS AND BART AND MUNI UNDERGROUND FACILITIES MAKE SPECIAL FIRE PROTECTION DEMANDS

Today, San Francisco has over 500 high rise buildings. Fires in these buildings require many firefighters because equipment must be carried by hand to the fire — often up many flights of stairs.

In 1988 in Los Angeles, a fire on three floors of a high rise building required 383 firefighters to bring it under control. In San Francisco, our entire on-duty force would be required, leaving the rest of the city completely unprotected. Mutual aid from neighboring communities would be totally inadequate to cover our needs.

BART and MUNI underground facilities present special fire and rescue problems. Large numbers of firefighters are required to fight these fires and perform rescue and evacuation operations.

In July 1989, Mayor Agnos forced reductions in truck company staffing — the key players in rescue and ventilation operations. Now these aerial ladder teams can no longer function properly.

Building ventilation is delayed, greatly increasing the risk of deadly backdrafts.

The Department’s daily staffing has fallen to 296 firefighters, the lowest in history, while fire, medical and other emergencies are higher than ever. Proposition F will bring SFFD staffing up to 320. This is critically needed to meet these ever-increasing demands.

In the past, some Fire Chiefs have thought that you could safely relocate or close a firehouse, but I now recognize that this is dangerous. The SFFD can now get to most emergencies within 3 minutes, but if we close a firehouse we lose that prompt response. With our rows of wood buildings, our large population of elderly citizens, we must get there quickly.

The SFFD is your lifeline. Protect it! I strongly urge all citizens to vote YES on F!

James P. Olson, President
San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

Any firefighter responsible for any racist act or statement on duty, after due process, should be disciplined. Repeat occurrences must result in severe penalties.

Expensive overtime can be largely eliminated by adding more firefighters.

Differences between the union and the mayor should be resolved through good faith negotiations, not through the election process. Maintaining high morale is the only way to insure efficiency.

The neighborhood service cuts need to be restored.

Vote YES on F.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Becoming a victim in another major earthquake or runaway fire in one of San Francisco’s densely populated neighborhoods continues to be a hazard for all of us.

Nonetheless, because the Firefighters Union did not endorse him, Mayor Agnos has seen fit to reduce the staffing levels of the Fire Department in any twenty-four hour period from 315 to 296. The San Francisco Republican Party believes these cuts are penny-wise, pound-foolish, and politically motivated.

Vote YES on Proposition F. DO NOT let the Mayor’s political vendetta jeopardize public safety.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkeley

William E. Grayson
Anna M. Guth
Tina H. Frank
Christopher L. Bowman
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition F. This proposition, if passed, will require twenty-five extra firefighters to be hired each day — five of these firefighters will have no specific functions — their daily assignment will be at the discretion of the Chief of Department. It will also require that daily truck staffing be increased from five to six persons and the fireboat staffing be increased by another two firefighters daily. These increases are unnecessary and are not required — fire suppression units are now staffed to provide effective and efficient fire service for San Francisco.

Proposition F will take management control and responsibility away from the Chief of Department by requiring organizational changes to be approved by the voters at a regular election. This would not allow the Chief, through the Fire Commission, to respond to the changing demands placed on the Fire Department. Fire protection decisions can’t wait until an election. To provide for and maintain the most cost effective and efficient fire department, I urge you to vote NO on Proposition F.

Frederick F. Postel
Chief of Department

Overtime pay is bleeding the Fire Department’s budget dry!
Over 92 percent of the budget goes for personnel costs. In 1988-89 uniformed personnel were paid salaries totaling $53,567,000 plus mandatory fringe benefits of $53,543,000 and still another $11,893,000 for overtime!

Proposition F would increase that bleeding by creating new positions not necessary for the safety of San Franciscans despite the scare statements made by the firefighters’ union.

Proposition F would cost $4,900,000 in overtime thereby siphoning away money needed to make major improvements!

We already have excellent protection but we want to upgrade it by developing a comprehensive earthquake program, by improving our response to emergency medical calls (over 4 1/2 times the number of fires) and by purchasing more modern fire equipment.

During the October quake 522 off-duty firefighters reported back immediately yet there were not enough engines and trucks for them; in fact, one old piece had to be taken out of the Fire Museum to help fight the Marina District fire.

Our firefighters work nine days out of 31 in shifts of approximately 24 hours on and 48 off.

Many are “double-dippers” holding down well paid outside jobs such as contractors, lawyers, plumbers and electricians. They still put in overtime because the Charter provides for such generous pay.

Overtime pay for a firefighter is $585 per shift, for a Captain $776 and for an Assistant Chief $1077! Last year the average firefighter’s cost to the City was $90,000, including salary, fringe benefits and overtime.

Do not pay out more money just for overtime.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

James Jefferson
President, Fire Commission

Frank Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission

Henry Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Sharon Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Ted Souls
Commissioner, Fire Commission
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

San Francisco has the finest fire protection in California. Now is not the time to jeopardize it with Proposition F. Proposition F is an ill-advised and wasteful measure.

First, it would wrest management of the Fire Department away from the Fire Commission and the Chief, where management properly and historically belongs.

Management of the Fire Department should remain accountable to the citizens of San Francisco, through its appointed Fire Commission. This principle is violated when rigid language is placed in the Charter.

Second, Proposition F would unnecessarily increase the Fire Department's budget by approximately $4.9 million a year.

The San Francisco Fire Department already has staffing levels on its fire engines and aerial ladder trucks that are equal to the best in California.

To overstaff the engines and trucks would be counterproductive as well as wasteful, especially in a time of limited resources and ever-increasing demands for City services.

Let life and death decisions of fire protection in San Francisco remain in the control of the Fire Commission and the Chief.

Let the buck stop where it has always stopped — with the Fire Commission and the Chief. And let San Francisco's first-rate fire protection continue.

We can't afford to play around with fire, or with Proposition F. A similar Proposition was defeated in November, 1987. Vote NO on this Proposition in 1990. Vote NO on Proposition F.

James D. Jefferson
President, Fire Commission

Frank A. Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission

Henry E. Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Sharon L. Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Ted N. Soulis
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Vote No on Proposition F.

Proposition F has little to do with fire protection and earthquake preparedness and a lot to do with unnecessary Fire Department staffing.

Vote No on Proposition F. Don't tie the hands of the Chief and Fire Commission, preventing them from managing the department and our tax dollars. Proposition F will take $6 million a year from health services, libraries, homeless programs and other vital city services. Why? Because Proposition F will require the city to pay more overtime to firefighters who already receive higher salaries than those in Los Angeles, San Jose, Long Beach or San Diego.

Employment of unnecessary personnel is called "featherbedding." Proposition F is just that — at a cost of $6 million.

San Francisco has the best fire protection services in the country. We already pay more per person for that service than any other city in California.

Stop a $6 million raid on the City Treasury. Vote No on Proposition F.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Like all San Franciscans, we want a safe and healthy city. But Proposition F could jeopardize our safety and health.

By spending more than $7 million on unnecessary overtime, Proposition F will take money away from other vitally needed services like fire equipment, police protection, health care and children’s programs.

The annual fire department budget is already $150 million. Firefighters are already getting a pay raise of almost 10%. That’s more than most city workers — and most of us.

San Francisco already has more firefighters per thousand residents than any other major Western city.

Yet San Francisco has fewer fire and emergency alarms than other cities. In 1986, San Francisco had 78,000 emergency calls.

Oakland had 95,000.

We appreciate the job that our firefighters do. But we cannot support this multi-million dollar attempt to win back overtime for just 18 firefighters per day.

Susan J. Bierman
Agar Jaicks
Mauri Schwartz
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Sunset Democratic Club
Margaret Brodkin, Director Coleman Advocates for Children
Carole Migden, chair, San Francisco Democratic County
Central Committee

I respect and admire the work done by San Francisco’s firefighters.

It’s a dangerous job.

That’s why they’re paid more than firefighters in any other large city in California, even though our firefighters work 15 percent fewer hours.

But today our average cost per firefighter has hit $96,000 per year.

We have been reducing this amount — and improving fire service at the same time — by hiring more new firefighters and reducing costly overtime payments.

That overtime runs as much as $585 per day for a fourth-year firefighter, and up to $1077 per day at the higher ranks.

When they argue for Proposition F, the union avoids mentioning this fact. They raise a false alarm about closing down firehouses, when in reality we are adding new firefighters as quickly as we can train them.

Ninety new firefighters are being hired this year alone. We have full classes in the Fire Academy for the first time in years.

Prop F asks you, the voters, to put an unnecessary sixth firefighter back on every fire truck, in order to give current firefighters millions in guaranteed overtime.

There’s no need for it. Even a one-alarm fire in San Francisco draws 30 firefighters in response.

It’s easy, when you think about the heroic work firefighters do, to justify giving them whatever they ask for.

I made the same mistake myself three years ago, before I was mayor. As a State Assemblyman and a strong union supporter, I lent my name to a measure that was similar to Proposition F.

But no group, however much we appreciate their work, is entitled to millions of taxpayer dollars a year in guaranteed, unnecessary overtime — especially when they are trying to feather their own nests by keeping out women and minorities.

With all the pressing needs facing our city, we can’t afford to give away $7 million and get nothing in return. Please vote No on Proposition F.

*Mayor Art Agnos

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: This entire section is new.
The Proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

NEw CHARTER SECTION: 3.548:
MINIMUM LEVELS OF FIRE PROTECTION FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Notwithstanding any other section of this Charter, the minimum levels of fire protection for the City and County of San Francisco shall be specified as follows:

A. The MINIMUM level of Fire Protection for the City and County of San Francisco, in fire suppression, effective July 1, 1990, except as specified in Section C shall be as follows:

1. Engine Companies 41
   Truck Companies 18
   Rescue Companies 2
   Fireboat Companies 1
   Battalion Districts 10
   Divisions 3
   Service Units 1
   Bureau of Equipment 2
   High Pressure System Tank (staffed)
   (Jones St. Tank) 1
   Assigned Firefighters
   (At Chief's Discretion) 5

2. Fire station: The minimum number of stations shall be 41, at locations listed on the SFFD Station Directory for July 1, 1987.

B. MINIMUM daily staffing of Fire Companies and other Units:

1. Engine Companies: 1 Officer and 3 Firefighters
2. Truck Company: 1 Officer and 5 Firefighters
3. Rescue Company: 1 Officer and 3 Firefighters
4. Fireboat Company: 1 Officer, 1 Pilot, 1 Marine Engineer and 2 Firefighters
5. Service Units: 1 Firefighter
6. Bureau of Equipment: 2 Firefighters

7. Battalion District: 1 Battalion Chief, 1 Chief's Aide
8. Division: 1 Assistant Chief, 1 Chief's Aide

Required minimum staffing shall be maintained on a constant basis, 24 hours per day. Sufficient personnel and positions shall be authorized and funded to maintain MINIMUM required staffing levels established in this section. When assigned personnel are not available, then staffing shall be maintained by working of overtime.

C. CLOSURE AND RELOCATION OF FIRE STATIONS, DEACTIVATION OF FIRE COMPANIES OR OF UNITS REQUIRED BY THIS SECTION:

1. Fire Stations, Fire Companies or other Units required by this section may be closed or deactivated only when each of the following procedures is completed:
   a. It is recommended by the Chief of Department and approved for consideration by the Fire Commission.
   b. The Fire Commission shall hold at least two public hearings on the matter so that affected citizens may appear to express their views.
   c. At least one of the public hearings shall be held in the neighborhood of the Station, Company, or Unit to be closed or deactivated. Such meeting to be held at a time and place most suitable for maximum public attendance.
   d. Except as provided by this section, other facilities or units may be closed or deactivated by majority of the five members of the Fire Commission upon recommendation by the Chief of Department.
   e. Upon conclusion of public hearings and approval by a majority of the five members of the Fire Commission for the closure or deactivation of a Company or Unit, the Fire Commission shall forward its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors within 30 calendar days.
   f. Upon receipt of the Fire Commission recommendation, the Board of Supervisors may hold public hearings on the matter and may approve or disapprove of the recommendation of the Fire Commission for closure or deactivation of a Station, Company or Unit. Such approval or disapproval shall be by majority vote of the Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors approves of the Fire Commission recommendation, then they shall direct the Clerk of the Board to have the matter put on the ballot of the next regular election for final determination by the voters of the City and County.

D. DEFINITIONS — EQUIPMENT

1. ENGINE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying hose and a pump to pump water of at least 1,500 gallons per minute.
2. TRUCK COMPANY: A tractor-trailer vehicle carrying ladders and rescue equipment with a 100-foot aerial ladder or equivalent device to reach upper floors of buildings.
3. RESCUE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying rescue equipment capable of heavy rescue and diving equipment for underwater rescue.
4. FIRE BOAT COMPANY: A boat equipped with pumps, hose, monitor nozzles and able to navigate San Francisco Bay for firefighting and rescue duty along the shorelines of the City and County.
5. SERVICE UNIT: A vehicle carrying spare supply of air and equipment for self-contained breathing apparatus and resuscitators.
6. HIGH PRESSURE SYSTEM PUMP STATION: A facility capable of pumping at least 10,000 gallons per minute from San Francisco Bay or other water source into the mains of the high pressure water system.
7. BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT: A vehicle capable of carrying equipment for emergency repairs or towing of fire apparatus under emergency conditions.
Former Supervisor Health Benefits

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost? YES 288  NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Health Service System provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Supervisors may not continue to receive health insurance from the Health Service System after they leave the Board of Supervisors.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Board of Supervisors could allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System.

Controller's Statement on "G"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.

75
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G will allow former Supervisors to buy health insurance coverage from the City's Health Service system, when they leave office. THERE WILL BE NO COST TO THE CITY.

The Health Service System now provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Proposition G simply allows former Supervisors to BUY continued health coverage in the City's Health Plan, at their own expense.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition G
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “G”
Former supervisors are either those who have decided not to run; or those the electorate voted out of office.
Even as it claims they will pay their own health plan benefits, why continue to have them in the system.

Cut bait.
Vote NO.

Marguerite Warren
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.425 Persons Covered
Each plan may make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system by the dependents of members, retired city and county employees, temporary city and county employees, such other dependents of deceased and retired city and county employees as the board of supervisors may authorize by ordinance, teachers and other employees of the San Francisco Unified School District retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees of the city and county and resigned teachers and employees of the school district whose resignations occur after June 15, 1955, and within 30 days immediately prior to the date on which, but for their resignations, they would have become retired members of the said retirement system, on whose relinquishment of retirement allowances as permitted by the charter occurs after such date and resigned employees of the San Francisco Unified School District not otherwise included. A resigned employee or teacher is one whose employment has terminated other than by retirement, discharge or death or who has relinquished retirement allowances. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system to the aforementioned resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District is to enable them, subject to the health service board's exercise of its power, to participate in the benefits of the system after transferring to the State Teachers' Retirement System from the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for participation in the benefits of the system by the aforementioned resigned employees of the city and county and other resigned employees of San Francisco Unified School District is to permit the health service board to have power to treat them the same as it treats resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District.

As used in this section, and for the purpose of this section, the terms "city and county employees" and "employees of the city and county" shall include officers and employees of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco.

The board of supervisors may also provide by ordinance for the continuation in any plan by former supervisors who agree to and do pay the full cost of such benefit.
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PROPOSITION H

Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?

YES 290
NO 292

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers belong to the City’s Retirement System. Under the charter, the Board of Supervisors may contract with the State’s Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) to allow certain safety employees to be members of PERS instead of the City’s Retirement System, if there is no additional cost to the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City’s Retirement System, if there would be no additional cost to the City.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City’s Retirement System.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want these employees to continue to be covered by the City’s Retirement System.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This Charter Amendment would provide for safety retirement for eighteen civilian Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers employed by the San Francisco Fire Department, at no additional cost to the City.

Fire Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers are classified by the State of California as safety personnel and properly belong in a safety retirement program that is not offered by the City’s Retirement System for non-uniformed employees. Instead, the City contracts with the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) for its public safety officers who are not police officers or firefighters.

Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers, along with their counterparts in the uniformed firefighter ranks, provide the professional expertise necessary for the City’s fire prevention program. Proposition H provides a retirement plan for this small group of civilians equivalent to the retirement plan for their uniformed firefighter counterparts, at no additional cost to the City.

Voters approved similar measures in recent years that provided for safety requirement for probation officers, investigator groups and various other safety personnel.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition H
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.506-2 Miscellaneous Safety Employees
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the board of supervisors or the community college board shall have the power to contract with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System of the State of California to provide that the probation officers, airport police officers, district attorney and public defender investigators, coroner investigators, juvenile court counselors, and institutional police, fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers who are not members of the Section 8.506 plans, shall be members of the public employees' retirement system, and the board of supervisors, the community college board and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such contract.

The power to contract created herein shall be limited to a contract with no net increase in cost to the city and county or the community college district.

Any person who shall become a member of the public employees' retirement system pursuant to such contract shall have the right to be a member of the health service system and the health board shall make provision for the participation in the benefits of the health service system by such persons.

Out of town on June 5, 1990? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
THANKS, SAN FRANCISCO
Residents are recycling in record numbers!

Nearly 70,000 homes in the southern and eastern parts of the City have curbside recycling. By 1991, every resident will have curbside collection service.

Until curbside reaches your neighborhood, you can recycle at our many community recycling centers.

For a free Recycling Starter Kit and information on where to recycle call:

San Francisco Recycling Program
CITY HALL 554-6193
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

PROPOSITION I

Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits? YES 293
NO 295

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the State Retirement System are allowed to work for the San Francisco Unified School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. Retired San Francisco teachers in the City Retirement system are not allowed to do so.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow retired teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. While they are consultants they would not make retirement contributions or earn additional retirement credits.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "I"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, costs could increase, the amount of which, being dependent upon the dollar amount and the number of personal service contracts executed, cannot be determined, but should not be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Jim Gonzalez and Richard Hongisto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is necessary to correct an inequity that exists between teachers in the State Teachers' Retirement System and those in the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. Teachers in the state system can retire up to three years early and supplement their reduced retirement income by serving as consultants to the school district developing curriculum, orienting new teachers, substituting for absent teachers, tutoring students, etc. The Charter denies the right to the four hundred teachers in the city retirement system to continue serving students and schools in these ways. Proposition I would correct this inequity by extending the same right to teachers in the city retirement system.

Proposition I will save taxpayers' money by encouraging teachers at the top of the salary scale to retire early. New hires at the low end of the salary scale will earn little more than half as much as those at the top.

Proposition I will also improve education in San Francisco schools by continuing to take advantage of the experience and expertise of retired teachers. It will also help to solve the shortage of qualified substitute teacher.

Vote YES on Proposition I for equity, economy, and educational excellence.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition I
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition I

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

Proposition I will bring equity and fairness to retired teachers, save the taxpayers money and improve the educational system in San Francisco.

Assemblyman Willie Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John Burton
Supervisor Wendy Neider
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Jim Gonzalez
San Francisco Democratic Party
Fred Rodriguez, President of the Board of Education

United Educators of San Francisco, Joan-Marie Shelley
Judy Dellamonica
Joanne Miller, vice-president of the San Francisco Board of Education
Thomas Ammiano
Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council
Larry Martin, Transport Workers of America
Robert Barnes
James Wachob
Jose Medina
Harry G. Britt, President of the Board of Supervisors

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police department as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under Section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System as created in Section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in Section 3.670 of the charter.

"Charter" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural; and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(b) Any member who completes at least 20 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 50 years, or at least 10 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 60 years, said service to be computed under Subsection (g) hereof, may retire from service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after reaching the age of 60 years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of two percent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of 65 years, if the allowance available to such member, pursuant to the provisions of Subsection (f) of this section, shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this Subsection (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this Subsection (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said Subsection (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of 60 years, after rendering 20 years or more of such service and having attained the age of 50 years, computed under Subsection (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under Subsection (g):
calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

(d) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

(e) If a member shall die, before retirement, (1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection:

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of 12 months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(2) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired from service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated-beneficiary at the date of his death, until such surviving spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under Subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) shall be paid in lump sum as follows:

(A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election, but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 years, may make the election herein provided before benefit has been paid under this Subsection (e), for and on behalf of such children if, in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this Subsection (e), any allowance payable under this Subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

(f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redepot of withdrawn contributions, for miscellaneous members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least 10 years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed $1,000, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service

(Continued on next page)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION 1 (Continued)

retirement, but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1-2/3 percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

(g) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

(1) Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.

(2) Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitling him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contributions standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member, to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding, which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of Section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under Section 8.507.

(5) The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and service rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefor shall be required of the city and county.

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation paid to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to 7-1/2 percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of Subsection (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members, and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this Subsection (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, with which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), Subsection (h), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodic actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement, and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year, and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this Subdivision (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(i) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said Subsection (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(j) Except as otherwise provided in Section 8.511 of this charter, nNo person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(l) Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsections (b), (c), (f), and (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and

(Continued on page 92)
PROPOSITION J
Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Human Rights Commission was created by an ordinance. Under that ordinance, the Human Rights Commission has 15 members.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment that would make the existing Human Rights Commission a charter commission; it would reduce the number of members from 15 to 11.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you want to reduce its size to 11 members.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you do not want to reduce its size to 11 members.

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government in an amount not to exceed $4,200."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisor Thomas Hsieh.
Human Rights Commission

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Let us make human rights a fundamental part of the fabric of San Francisco.

San Francisco is the birthplace of the United Nations and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, our Human Rights Commission is not even a part of our constitution — the Charter.

Proposition J will make the Human Rights Commission a charter commission. Proposition J will take the position of the Human Rights Commission out of politics and ensures its place in the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Please vote in favor of Proposition J to recognize the importance of human rights to San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition J
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition J

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

As Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department and a candidate for Municipal Court Judge I urge you to vote for Ballot Measure J. The Human Rights Commission has been a positive voice for 25 years. Thousands of San Franciscans have directly benefited from the Commission's efforts. Its mandate will be greatly strengthened by extending Charter status through this measure. Please join me and vote yes on J!

James Harrigan
For Municipal Court

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “J”
We have a Human Rights Commission NOW, appointed by the Mayor. A new one in the charter would have the same appointing officer. We don't need a confirmation of said committee. It will not take it out of politics. No reason for this. Just another layer of government — for what. Vote no on “J”.

Marguerite Warren
NOTE: This entire section is new.

PART TWENTY-FOUR: HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
3.699-5 Commission; Composition
A human rights commission is hereby established. The human rights commission shall consist of eleven members broadly representative of the general public to be appointed by the mayor. Three of the members who are first appointed shall be designated to serve for terms of one year, three for two years, three for three years and two for four years from the date of their appointments. Thereafter, members shall be appointed as aforesaid for a term of office of four years, except that all of the vacancies occurring during a term shall be filled for the unexpired term. Members of said commission shall be compensated for each commission or committee meeting actually attended by said members in an amount as may be established and amended, from time to time, by ordinance of the board of supervisors, but not less than $50 per meeting provided, however, that no member shall be paid for attending more than two commission or committee meetings in any one calendar month.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION J (Continued from page 88)

County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system, an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

§ 511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an elected officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

§ 584-10 Limitation on Employment During Retirement
(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.584 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an elected officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subject him to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.584, he shall re-enter membership under Section 8.584 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.584. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for service or disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 60 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he held the position which he held at the time of his retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he held the position from which he was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
Seven Member Commissions

PROPOSITION K
Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members? YES 298 NO 299

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department, Fire Department, Social Services Department, Port of San Francisco, Public Utilities Commission, Board of Permit Appeals, Civil Service Commission, Airports Commission and Parking and Traffic Department are managed by a board or commission. Each of these boards and commissions has five members appointed by the Mayor.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K is a character amendment that would increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the size of these boards and commissions to stay the same.

Controller's Statement on "K"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $18,800 annually beginning January, 1991."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh, Bill Maher, and Wendy Nelder.
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K expands the opportunity for San Francisco’s varied communities to participate in City government. Proposition K increases, from five to seven, the membership of the Board of Permit Appeals and seven City commissions: Police, Fire, Social Services, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports, and Parking and Traffic. It also includes the Port Commission, subject to amendment of state law to authorize such an increase.

Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities. Only five members of these crucial commissions is insufficient to address the diversity of concerns in our City; seven members will provide greater representation and greater leadership from a variety of communities. The expansion of the size of these commissions enhances the possibility for all San Franciscans to be part of decision-making and policy-making processes at every level.

The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions. Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor, but instead of the many under-represented voices in San Francisco.

Proposition K would make these commissions representative of the interests of more San Franciscans, while maintaining the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants. San Franciscans want accessible, responsive, and active commissioners. We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns, and Proposition K is a method for achieving these goals.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

You need a decoder ring to read the Supervisors’ argument in favor of creating 18 new commissioner slots. Here’s what the Board says, and here’s what they really mean.

The Board says: “Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities.”

The Board means: All you interest groups out there, it’s time to get yours.

The Board says: “The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions.”

The Board means: With 18 more political appointments, a mayor won’t offend as many supporters by passing them over for city jobs.

The Board says: “Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor.”

The Board means: Adding 18 new city commissioners isn’t really a boon to the incumbent mayor — unless he’s re-elected.

The Board says: “Proposition K would . . . maintain the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants.”

The Board means: Increasing commission memberships by 40% isn’t that big a deal.

The Board says: “We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns.”

The Board means: A fair hearing before city commissions isn’t enough; we want guaranteed results!

Let’s stop speaking in code and talk plainly. Proposition K is based on the notion that people should be treated as groups — not individuals — in the political process. That’s offensive, and so is Proposition K.

Please vote NO on K!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is a textbook example of what’s wrong with contemporary San Francisco politics.
Proposition K demeans us because it lumps city residents into groups, rather than respecting their rights as individuals.
Proposition K divides us because it stresses what such interest groups (the polite euphemism is “communities”) disagree about, rather than what all San Franciscans share in common.
Proposition K debases us because it is premised on a “quota system” for city boards and commissions. There shouldn’t be “white seats” or “black seats”, “gay seats” or “straight seats” on city commissions. There should be but two qualifications for service as a city commissioner: San Francisco residency and individual ability!
Vote NO on Proposition K!
San Francisco is indeed a polyglot and richly diverse community. City residents come from all corners of the country and the globe. Their political opinions range from radical to reactionary and all points in between.

It’s impossible for each point of view, each ethnic group, each political persuasion, each neighborhood to be represented on city commissions. Increasing the membership on those bodies from five to seven persons is like buying a bigger umbrella in a hurricane. It won’t make a bit of difference.
It is possible, however, for city commissioners from all walks of life to represent views and interests other than their own. It happens all the time in countless actions by city boards and agencies. And if we want to encourage consensus and better understanding among San Francisco’s many “communities”, we must resist attempts — such as Proposition K — to make the labels we all wear easier to read.
Three years ago, Mayor Agnos campaigned on the slogan, “One City, One Future”. The supporters of Proposition K have failed to heed those words.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The opponents of Proposition K are clearly on the wrong page of the textbook of contemporary San Francisco politics.
Proposition K values us because it gives city residents greater ability to be heard, individually and as a community.
Proposition K unites us because it reinforces what we all share in common: respect for democracy. If, as the opposition claims, the ability to have more access to representation is divisive, democratic ideals such as checks and balances must therefore also be divisive and undesirable.
Proposition K elevates us because it originates from that respect for democracy. This does not limit or allocate, but reasonably expands available seats on the commissions. Proposition K effectively dilutes the influence of special interests in favor of more broad-based views.
San Francisco is an extremely diverse city and that diversity should be reasonably represented. Democracy requires the opportunity for representation of all points of view. Good government demands that the number of appointed officials be limited so that debate can be functional. Proposition K addresses these two needs: increased citizen participation, and reasonable size to facilitate getting work done.
If you take the opposition’s argument — that it is not meaningful to have representatives from different neighborhoods, ethnicities, political persuasions — to its logical extreme, you could have one member commissions achieving a consensus at the price of democracy.
Proposition K is good government, since it integrates the multiplicity of voices into a united future for the residents of San Francisco.
Vote YES on Proposition K!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

We need to create an open, democratic, and participatory local government.
This measure will encourage more participation.
Vote YES on K.

Individuals and community groups strongly support K. Increasing the membership on these bodies expands the opportunity to participate for all San Franciscans.
Vote YES on K!

Mayor Art Agnos
Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John L. Burton
State Senator Milton Marks
Fr. James Goode
Carole Migden
Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes
Political Action Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Catherine Baccari
Bob Dockendorff
Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Robert McCarthy
Ruth Picon
President, Latino Democratic Club
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead, Pres.
Bernal Heights Community Foundation
Jake McGoldrick
Arnie Scher
Natalie Berg
Sodonia Wilson,
San Francisco Board of Education
Alma Jackson
Margaret Brady
Reverend Amos Brown
Yori Wada

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

Vote No on Proposition K.
Proposition K unnecessarily tinkers with our commission system for managing city departments.
Many of the most important city functions — police and fire services, libraries and health care — are governed by five-member city commissions. Proposition K would increase the size of these commissions to seven members. The Planning Commission would be expanded to nine members.
For what reason? The supporters say that the commissions cannot reflect our diverse community unless we allow the mayor to appoint more commissioners. They miss the point of the commission system. Commissioners are not advisors or members of a community-wide study panel. They are managers. They set city policy, recommend hundreds of millions of dollars in spending, and hire and fire key departmental personnel.
Preserve our system of citizen management. Don’t make city commissions debating societies.
Vote No on Proposition K.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Are not seven Deputy Mayors at the rate of $94,000 a year a sufficient number of political plums for the Mayor? Does he really need eighteen more commissioners to achieve good government in San Francisco?
Do not give the Mayor additional tools to promote his re-election efforts. The San Francisco Republican Party urges voters to Vote No on Proposition K.

San Francisco Republican Party
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Anna M. Guth

William E. Grayson
Honor H. Bulkley
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Brian Mavrogeorge
Ronald G. Kershaw
Sam T. Harper
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

No sound arguments have been presented which support the need for Proposition K. Enlarging Boards and Commissions would increase city costs without improving productivity. Indeed, extra members may impede efficiency and result in protracted proceedings.
Don’t give the Mayor additional opportunities for patronage. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw

Brian Mavrogeorge
Paul Kavouksian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence
Martin Keller
Seven Member Commissions

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

PROPOSITION K WILL ADD TO BUREAUCRACY

Proposition K will hinder quick and fair response to citizen concerns. Larger commissions do not mean better commissions; on the contrary, they mean a less efficient, more cumbersome process.

PROPOSITION K WILL NOT MAKE COMMISSIONS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INTERESTS OF SAN FRANCISCO

Present commissions serve a diverse San Francisco by appointment of individuals who reflect and possess sensitivity, respect for different backgrounds and points of views.

... Vote NO on Proposition K!

Sharon Bretz
Susann L. Danielson
Jean Kalil
Victor Makras
Esther Marks
Beverly Prior

Larger commissions and larger support bureaucracy are not the answer to better representation. The answer is less political patronage and more appointments based on experience and knowledge. This proposal only makes government more cumbersome and less effective.

Proposition K is not about democracy. It is about patronage. It is about creating many new commission positions to hand out as political plums. To whom? For what? And why should the taxpayers be forced to pay for it?

No one, not even the author, Supervisor Ward, claims that it will improve the efficiency of the government, yet it will certainly add to the costs. The true costs will include trips, staff time, expenses, etc., with no discernable benefit to the public.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "K"

If qualified commissioners were appointed who understood they represented ALL of San Francisco this charter amendment would not be necessary.

There are nine commissions listed for additional members — 18 more appointments. Just another avenue for political appointments.

... Vote NO on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

This measure will lead to longer meetings, more arguments, divisiveness and politics while providing less management oversight.

Proposition K is an insider's game. They gain and the voters pay. It is a costly bad idea and should be soundly rejected by the voters. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Bill Maher

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

PART FOUR: POLICE DEPARTMENT
3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, police force, an office of citizen complaints and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of five seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission to seven members, shall continue to hold their respective positions, subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the police department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The commission shall have the power and duty to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors who shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The police commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time to change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

PART FIVE: FIRE DEPARTMENT
3.540 Fire Department

The fire department shall be under the management of a fire commission, consisting of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor; and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years of 1948, 1949, and 1950, respectively, two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The chief of department shall have power to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for fire-fighting purposes.

The commissioners shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the fire department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the fire commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to exceed the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 firefighter shall be H-12 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter.

Positions of officers and employees of the fire department legally authorized shall be continued, and the incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall continue as the officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments, and except as in this charter otherwise provided.

PART EIGHT: SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
3.570 Composition of Department; Commission

There is hereby established a social services department. This department shall consist of a social services commission of five seven members, a director of social services, and such employees and assistants as may be necessary to carry out the work and functions of said department.

The members of the social services commission shall be appointed thereto by the mayor and shall be selected for their respective positions on the basis of their interest in and understanding of the problems of public welfare. The members of said commission shall serve without compensation and no person shall be eligible to serve on said commission while holding a salaried public office, position or employment.

The term of office of the members of the said commission, subject to the provisions hereof relative to removal and the terms of the first mem-

(Continued on next page)
numbers of the commission, shall be four years.

The mayor shall appoint five seven members to said social services commission, one member to be appointed for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1936; one for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1937; one for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1938; one for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1939; and two for terms to expire on the 15th day of January, 1940, and two for terms to expire on the 15th day of January, 1941; and two for terms to expire on the 15th day of January, 1946; and upon the expiration of the terms of each of said members of said commission so appointed, the mayor shall fill the vacancy arising by reason of the expiration of said term by the appointment of a member to said commission for a term of four years. Vacancies occurring in the membership of said commission shall be filled by an appointment to be made by the mayor for the unexpired term of said person in whose place said appointment is made; and when the term of any member of said commission shall expire, then said appointment shall be made for the full period of four years from the date of the expiration of the term. All vacancies shall be filled within 30 days of the occurrence thereof.

Members of the commission shall be subject to removal from office by the mayor for cause, but only upon written charges made and signed by the mayor, copy of said charges to be served upon the offending commissioner; and said charges shall be heard by the mayor and on said hearing of said charges the said commissioner so charged shall have the opportunity to appear and to be heard.

The commission shall be a policy-determining and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in Section 3.500 of the charter.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART NINE: PORT COMMISSION

3.580 Commission; Composition

The San Francisco Port Commission shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, their appointment being subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors. Each of said members shall serve for a term of four years. Vacancies on the commission shall be filled by appointment for the unexpired portion of the term. Initial appointive members of the commission shall consist of the incumbent members of the San Francisco Port Authority, who shall serve as commissioners for a term corresponding to the unexpired portion of their tenure as members of the port authority. Subject to amendment of state law to authorize an increase in membership, the port commission shall consist of seven members. The two additional members shall be appointed by the mayor after the eighth day of January, 1992. The initial term of office not to exceed four years shall be fixed by the mayor to insure that the term of office for a majority of the commission shall not expire in the same year. In addition, the director of finance and secretary of agriculture and services, or their designated representatives, shall be ex-officio members of the commission. Persons appointed to the port commission shall be subject to recall, suspension and removal in the same manner as an elected official.

The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3.590 Commission; Composition

A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o'clock, on the 8th day of January, 1932, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of two other commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936. The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992. On the expiration of these and successive terms, the mayor shall appoint their successors for four years. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS

3.650 Board Composition

The mayor shall appoint five seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $5,000 $7,000 per year. One such term shall expire at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934 and 1935, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1936, 1937 and 1938, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1996, and upon these and successive expirations the mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

3.651 Functions, Powers and Duties

Any applicant for a permit or license who is denied such permit or license by the department authorized to issue same, or whose license or permit is ordered revoked by any department, or any person who deems that his interests or property or that the general public interest will be adversely affected as the result of operations authorized by or under any permit or license granted or issued by any department, may apply to the board of permit appeals. Such board shall hear the applicant, the permit-holder, or other interested parties, as well as the head or representative of the department issuing or refusing to issue such license or permit, or ordering the revocation of same. After such hearing and such further investigation as the board may deem necessary, it may concur in the action of the department authorized to issue such license or permit, or, by the vote of a quorum of the board, reverse, modify or grant, in whole or in part, the permit or license granted, or refuse to grant it.

The board of permit appeals shall have and exercise the following powers:

(a) To hear and determine appeals where it is alleged there is error or abuse of discretion in any order, requirement, decision or determination made by the zoning administrator in the enforcement of the provisions of any ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors creating zoning districts or regulating the use of property in the city and county.

(b) To hear and determine appeals from the rulings, decisions and determinations of the zoning administrator granting or denying applications for variances from any rule, regulation, restriction or requirement of the zoning or setback ordinances, or any section thereof. Upon the hearing of such appeals said board may affirm, change, or modify the ruling, decision or determination appealed from, or, in lieu thereof, make such other additional determination as it shall deem proper in the premises, subject to the same limitations as are placed upon the zoning administrator by this charter or by ordinance.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SEVENTEEN: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county.

The civil service commission shall consist of five seven members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms of which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the 1st day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and provided further, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall be as follows; one shall expire on June 30, 1996 and one on June 30, 1998, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. No less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this

(Continued on page 128)
Commissioner Residency Requirement

PROPOSITION L

Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Candidates for elective office and members of charter boards and commissions must be San Francisco residents and electors. For other boards, commissions and advisory bodies, the law creating them may set residency requirements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L is a charter amendment that would require the members of all boards, commissions and advisory bodies to be San Francisco residents and electors.

This rule would not apply where a non-charter board, commission or advisory body requires a person with specific qualifications, and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found. Also, this rule would not apply to the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Fine Arts Museums, the Asian Arts Commission, the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission and the elected members of the San Francisco Retirement Board and Health Service Board.

Proposition L would delete the current requirement that candidates and members of charter boards and commissions be residents and electors for a certain length of time before assuming office, which courts have found unconstitutional.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “L”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh and Bill Maher.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

This charter amendment provides that all individuals serving on city boards and commissions and committees with few exceptions, must be citizens of voting age of San Francisco.

Members of boards and commissions and committees often have policy making and regulatory responsibilities. Clearly, San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco. With a population of 750,000 residents, surely we have enough qualified and talented San Franciscans who can get the job done.

This charter amendment offers the appointing officer with some flexibility. If a qualified candidate for a public post requiring specialized skills cannot be found in our city, then, following such a declaration, the appointing officer may search elsewhere.

Let’s open up more opportunities for our residents to serve San Francisco. VOTE YES FOR THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERSHIP ON CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I was mistaken in one of my objections to Proposition L. Some years ago, a court decision invalidated the voter-adopted Charter requirement that a person be a San Francisco resident for five years before appointment to a city commission. I disagree strongly with that decision, for the reasons cited in my ballot argument appearing on the opposite page. The inoperative language remained in our Charter, however, and Proposition L disingenuously removes it — like pruning a dead branch from a tree.

But, there are still plenty of reasons to vote against Proposition L.

(1) Proposition L eliminates the requirement that a commissioner be an “elector” of San Francisco (a voter, meaning also a U.S. citizen) for at least one year. This Charter provision has not been altered by a court, but Proposition L would strike it from the books.

A person could move into town, register to vote, and be appointed that day to a city post.

(2) Proposition L exempts three city commissions — Health System, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board — from any residency requirement whatsoever.

(3) Proposition L would allow non-residents to serve on any board or commission created by the Board of Supervisors. In fact, Proposition L could even be interpreted to allow the appointment of non-citizens to such posts!

Don’t be misled or confused. If you want San Franciscans to make decisions about San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition L!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

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

If you want San Francisco residents to serve on all city commissions established by the charter, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you think San Franciscans should serve on boards and committees created by the Board of Supervisors, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you favor city residents serving on the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees, vote NO on Proposition L.

The Board of Supervisors says "San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco." I agree completely. Trouble is, Proposition L weakens the existing residency requirement in our City Charter.

Charter Section 8.100 states that no person "shall be appointed as a member of any board or commission unless he shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years." Proposition L eliminates the fifteen-year residency requirement! Proposition L also exempts from any residency requirement whatsoever members of the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees.

The idea behind the five-year residency rule is that city commissioners should have first-hand knowledge and personal experience of San Francisco's people and neighborhoods, its problems and possibilities. City commissioners should not just rely on staff reports and statistical abstracts. Proposition L would destroy this sensible safeguard. Instead, a person could move into town and be appointed, that day, to a city post!

Finally, Proposition L purports to extend the Charter's residency rules to advisory boards and committees established by the Board of Supervisors. But the residency requirement can be waived for a person "with specific experience, skills, or qualifications". That's a loophole big enough to drive a truck through!

San Franciscans should make decisions about San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition L.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for most advisory panels of the City.

Under Proposition L, panel members MUST be residents of San Francisco.

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for membership on the Health System Board, Retirement Board and War Memorial Board.

Under Proposition L, there is no change. Membership on the Health System Board and Retirement Board is by DIRECT ELECTION of city employees. The Health Fund and Retirement Fund are operated by and for city workers. Because employees are not required to live in the city, there are serious constitutional problems with denying a worker the right to be a candidate for trustee of a fund controlled by employees.

The way things are now, the courts have thrown out San Francisco's five-year residency requirement. Reports the City Attorney:

"In the years since Charter Section 8.100 (residency rule) was originally adopted, the California courts have struck down all durational residency requirements applicable to candidates for elective or appointive office."

Most Supervisors like the duration requirement. But even Supervisors cannot overrule the Supreme Court.

The bottom line: Proposition L does not cover everything. Just most things. It's time San Franciscans were making the decisions about San Francisco. Proposition L is a major step in the right direction.

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S FUTURE. YES ON PROPOSITION L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

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

San Franciscans deserve to be represented by commissioners who live within San Francisco, not by employees filling in for their ex-officio bosses. Vote for San Francisco commissions made of San Francisco voters.

... Vote Yes on Proposition L!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Don't clutter the Charter with unnecessary provisions. Vote No on Proposition L.

Proposition L would require almost all commissions and advisory board members to be city residents. That makes sense — so much sense that, for most commissions, it is already the law.

This is one more example of a needless Charter amendment. If the Board of Supervisors wants to require members of any advisory body to be city residents, they can pass an ordinance to accomplish it.

Adding an unnecessary provision to a Charter that is already too long and complicated is not the answer.

Vote No on Proposition L.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out-type.

8.100 Qualifications

(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she is shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for at least one year immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retirement system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.680, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of Trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.

Notwithstanding this requirement, in the case of boards, commissions or advisory bodies established by legislative act, the residency requirement may be waived by the appointing officer, or entity upon a finding that the board, commission or body requires the appointment of a person with specific experience, skills or qualifications and after exercising due diligence, an eligible and willing appointee residing within the city and county could not be located.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 7 through Tuesday, June 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease. Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals. It's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be TOXIC FREE 554-4333

HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR YOUR HOME'S TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday
8 am to 4 pm. 554-4333
PROPOSITION M
Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by the Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?

YES 302
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter requires some City boards and commissions, such as the Police and Fire Commissions, to have at least one woman member. However, the charter does not have a general policy on balancing the number of men and women on City boards and commissions.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a charter amendment that would create a City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex. This charter amendment does not apply to the Commission on the Status of Women.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex.

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

Controller’s Statement on “M”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “M”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Bill Maher and Wendy Nelder.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The 1990s are here — but you would never know it by the few women serving on City boards and commissions. In fact, of ten major commissions — Police, Fire, Airports, Ports, Public Utilities, Parking Authority, Social Services, City Planning, Elections, Housing Authority — women hold just 18 percent of the seats. And only one woman serves as a president of these commissions.

Women do not fare much better on other key commissions. For instance, women hold just two seats on the seven-member Recreation and Park Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission. Three women serve on the eleven-member Small Business Advisory Commission.

Despite the enormous influence and regulatory controls most commissions have over the lives of all citizens, women's voices and leadership on city panels do not equal their numbers in society.

These gloomy statistics aside, women have begun to make gains during the past two years. Women are now being regularly considered and appointed to boards and commissions. But, clearly, much more needs to be done.

Proposition M will emblazon into the Charter a policy goal of gender equality on all boards and commissions. This amendment, authored by Supervisor Richard Hongisto, is a simple measure of justice.

Only the Commission on the Status of Women is excluded from the provisions of this charter amendment, since its sole purpose is to serve as an advocacy forum for women.

Increasingly, communities and groups are instituting gender parity provisions in their constitutions with much success. For instance, the Democratic Party has dramatically brought about near gender equality of delegates to its national and state conventions.

Let's start the 1990s off with a renewed commitment to fairness and equality.

VOTE YES ON THE GENDER PARITY AMENDMENT.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition M
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition M

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

Proposition M moves San Francisco into the 1990s. It is stunning to review the composition of our city boards and commissions and see just how few women are serving. Women comprise 18 percent of the seats on ten major commissions. This is an untold tragedy. Women have been making gains in recent time. We can do even better.

Proposition M is about fairness and equality. Iowa enacted a law in 1987 to require greater gender balance on all boards, commissions, committees, and councils.

Vote Yes for Gender Justice. Yes on Proposition M.

SF Chapter, National Organization for Women
Legal Advocates for Women
San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Creating political leadership opportunities for women will strengthen the public policy decision-making process.

Vote YES on M.

As a predominately lesbian and gay Republican volunteer organization we believe it is a travesty that after fifteen years of three liberal Democrat mayors only 38% of the city’s Commissioners are women. This negligence has prompted the need to enact gender parity. We support Proposition M.

In the future, the provisions of Proposition M should be amended to apply to the Commission on the Status of Women. Women and men must actively dialogue so that our city begins to address the concerns of all.

Judiciary Project/California
TJ Anthony
Mary C. Dunlap
Ruth Picon, President, Latino Democratic Club
Helen Greco, Director, SF NOW
Laura Campbell
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Agar Jaacks, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Greg Day, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Jean K. Harris
Geraldine Johnson
Joyce Newstat, Chair, Lesbian Caucus, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
James Harrigan

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw
Paul Kavouksorian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence

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

Requirement that any commission be comprised of a certain number of persons of any gender is as inappropriate as requiring a certain number of persons who have red hair or blue eyes. Please vote to maintain the mayoral prerogative to appoint the best San Franciscans for the job.

... Vote NO on Proposition M!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Vote No on Proposition M.
Like Proposition L, but only more so, Proposition M does not belong in the City Charter.
The power to make appointments to boards and commissions rests with the Mayor. Proposition M would write into the Charter a non-binding policy statement urging the Mayor to fill not more than 50% plus one of any commission with members of the same sex.
The City Attorney advised the Board of Supervisors that the Constitution prohibits the city from adopting a quota for male and female appointments. Instead, the Board of Supervisors proposes to clutter up the Charter with a non-binding, legally unenforceable policy statement.
If the Board of Supervisors wants to send a message to the Mayor it should be done by resolution, not costly and unnecessary Charter amendments.
Vote No on Proposition M.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “M”
There is nothing in the charter NOW that prevents the Mayor or Board of Supervisors to appoint more women to achieve gender parity now.

Why now does it have to be written in concrete.
Vote NO on “M”.

Marguerite Warren
NOTE: Entire section is new.
3.503 Composition of Boards and Commissions.
   It is the policy of the city and county, which shall be considered a goal when filling vacancies on boards or commissions appointed by the mayor, or otherwise provided by this charter, except for the Commission on the Status of Women, to achieve gender parity on these boards and commissions by limiting to a simple majority of board and commission membership the number of members who are of the same sex.

** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** **

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 24.

** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** **
MISSING SOMETHING IN YOUR LIFE?

If your life seems to be missing that special warmth that comes from having a pet, come and see us at the new San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department. We have a wide variety of dogs, cats and other animals available for adoption.

A waggly tail, a sweet meow or a gentle squeak - it'll make you glad to come home at night.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION N
Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?

YES 305
NO 307

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter does not limit the number of consecutive terms a person may serve on the Board of Supervisors. A full term on the Board of Supervisors is four years.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a charter amendment. Under Proposition N, no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors. After two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, a person must wait four years before serving again. Any person appointed to the Board of Supervisors to complete more than half a four-year term would be considered to have served one full term. A member of the Board of Supervisors who resigned with less than half a four-year term remaining would be considered to have served a full term. This charter amendment would go into effect July 1, 1990. Each Supervisor holding office on that date would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when his or her current term ends.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the charter so that no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors and you want to prohibit persons who served two consecutive four-year terms from serving on the Board of Supervisors again until four years after their second consecutive term in office.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to limit Supervisors to serving two consecutive terms.

Controller’s Statement on “N”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How “N” Got on the Ballot
On January 25, 1990, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition N to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,151* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 45,408 of the signatures submitted were valid, 5,257 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is a non-partisan, reasonable, fair and democratic measure to reform our government and improve the present citywide system for electing supervisors. Neighborhood, civic leaders, current and former elected officials, community activists, business owners, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, unionists, and minorities all support Proposition N.

Limiting politicians’ consecutive terms is not radical or extreme. In fact, it helps to prevent political corruption and power grabbing. More than 150 cities, towns and counties in the United States have laws limiting politicians terms. Governors in 30 states can only serve two terms. San Mateo county limits supervisors terms and for more than 30 years San Francisco’s mayors have been limited to two consecutive terms.

Proposition N is a very modest and reasonable proposal. Proposition N does not recall or force any current member of the board from office. Proposition N allows supervisors whose terms expire in 1991 to serve until January 1995 if they are reelected. Supervisors whose terms end in 1993 may serve until 1997 if reelected. Former supervisors may run for office again after 4 years.

The current system favors incumbent politicians and denies experienced newcomers a fair chance to serve. Since 1973, only 3 newcomers have been elected to the city-wide board. Supervisors have already served 10 years. By 1995 most board members will have been in office 14 years or more.

We know that a lake or pond will stagnate unless its waters are replenished from time to time. So too will an elected body grow stale without a regular infusion of fresh faces and new ideas.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Richard Bodisco
Chairman, San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
Steve Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu
Harold Hoogastan
Joseph L. Powell
Raymond Chalker
Robert A. Reveles
Robert C. Sanchez
Joel Veniresca
Barry Lastra
Daniel Willsan

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N backers have misrepresented the facts to get you to vote for N. Since just 1982 three non-incumbent supervisors have been independently elected to the Board. Proposition N is not true reform — it only tinkers with the citywide election process. It is not democratic — it takes power away from the people. It is not a solution — it’s an additional problem.

Supervisors are elected to carry out the will of the people. When they fail to serve, they are un-elected — by vote of the people. Appointed department heads, who are not supposed to have their own political agendas, are balanced only by the Mayor’s and the Board’s overseeing eyes.

With the Mayor already limited to two terms, the Board must not consist only of rookies and lame ducks, or department heads can consolidate their power and bide their time, waiting until watchdog Supervisors are automatically thrown from office. Proposition N threatens accountability and increases the chances for bureaucratic corruption.

Uninformed actions are foolish actions — closely examine the facts, and you’ll agree that blindly forcing change is a bad plan. If Proposition N passes, nothing can stop department heads from installing power bases immune to voter inspection. Voters have the right to choose — this measure permanently limits that right.

PROTECT YOUR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Two years ago, San Francisco voted on Proposition O, a recall of the Board of Supervisors thinly disguised as a ‘good government’ initiative. San Franciscans saw through this scheme, and sent the measure down to defeat.

Last year, the same group attempted to offer a similar proposal to the voters, but failed to collect enough signatures to qualify it for the ballot.

Now they’re at it again.

They say that Supervisors have lost touch with the people of San Francisco, and should automatically be thrown from office after they’ve served two terms — but by bringing up this rejected issue again and again, they’re proving that THEY are the ones who are out of touch.

San Francisco doesn’t need a two-term limit. When supervisors stop working for the people, they stop getting elected. If Board members are prematurely removed, more power falls into the hands of civil servants and department heads, who are unaccountable to the voters. These unelected officials who already hold great power must be balanced by supervisors free to do their jobs, or citizens lose their representation.

The diversity of our City is one of our greatest strengths. San Franciscans have always individually evaluated our city’s varied issues, judging each on its specific merits. The Board of Supervisors is similarly diverse, and should also be evaluated selectively. Citizens should use the election process to tell their representatives when they’re not doing their jobs — not by acting blindly and installing an arbitrary time limit. San Franciscans are smart enough to tell the difference between voting an incompetent out of office and firing a valuable employee without cause.

Proposition N denies San Franciscans the right to vote for legislators of their choice, and that’s not fair.

Vote NO on Proposition N.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Let’s talk about what WE want City Hall to do for US, not the politicians.

Politicians will tell you anything to advance their political careers.

They won’t tell you the TRUTH about the Two Term Limit.

The politicians say we failed to collect enough signatures last year to qualify for the ballot.

But here’s what their appointee, the city’s Chief Administrative Officer says:

“Last year’s Proposition removal was forced by an error, one which we admitted, apologized for and tried to repair . . .”

(Letter to Two Term Limit — Chairman — Richard Bodisco, dated February 7, 1990.)

We need new leadership in City Hall.

We have some hard and serious problems to solve in San Francisco and we can’t solve them with political rhetoric and name calling.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N removes experienced supervisors from the Board.

FACT:

Proposition N insures that San Francisco will always have 5 or 6 supervisors with seniority and experience on the Board.

Proposition N also gives experienced and concerned citizens an opportunity to serve without needing to become professional, career politicians.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N will take away your right to vote for a legislator of your choice.

FACT:

Proposition N gives you more choices because it removes the current system which favors incumbent politicians.

The politicians have spoken too long for themselves.

It is time City Hall spoke for us.

Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Submitted by San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Richard Bodisco
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Vote YES on N.
SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

... Vote Yes on Proposition N!
Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

The longer supervisors remain in office the more likely they become captives of special interests who bankroll their costly campaigns.

Entrenched incumbent politicians often end up working against the public interest, rather than for it.

Only two supervisors have been defeated at the polls since the end of 1980.

New faces, new ideas, new leaders, and new directions are needed at City Hall.

Vote YES on N.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

The Two-Term Limit is an idea whose time has come!
The United States Constitution limits the President to two terms in office. Similarly, the San Francisco Charter limits our Mayor to two terms.

Incumbent San Francisco Supervisors, however, continue to win re-elections year after year. This has made many of them less accountable to the voters.

Eight years is enough! Let's bring new people, new ideas, and new energy to our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Citizens for a Better San Francisco

It works for executive offices, let's put a limit on the terms of service for our supervisors. As Thomas Jefferson called it, "rotation in office". Let's have some healthy competition for these positions, let's take advantage of the many experienced people around who are willing to serve. Let's vote YES on Proposition N for reasonable reform.

John and Carol Maerske

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

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will ensure that we have a Board of Supervisors of concerned citizens, not career politicians.

For almost forty years, San Francisco has limited its Mayor to eight years in office. Many cities around the Bay Area, such as San Jose, Richmond, Mountain View and Redwood City, limit terms in office for their city councils. Yet we have had supervisors serve up to 16 years in office. Why? Because by raising large sums of money and using the power of incumbency, supervisors face little chance of defeat when running for re-election.

Proposition N will not remove any member of the Board of Supervisors from office. It is a fair proposal that allows each current supervisor to run for one more four year term. But in the future, each supervisor will be limited to eight years in office.

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will give the city fresh leadership on the Board of Supervisors. It will open up the city’s political processes, reversing the trend in recent years towards full-time professional politicians. Most importantly, it will mean that our elected representatives put the city’s needs and interests ahead of their desire for re-election.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

I’m supporting Proposition N because of my concern about the status of women and children in San Francisco.

As a long time supporter and treasurer of a shelter for battered women in the City, I have had the opportunity to closely observe how our City government works. I think there are more important things than politics.

San Francisco needs leaders in government who will show more compassion and concern about peoples’ lives as opposed to their reelection campaigns.

I don’t feel that every member of the Board of Supervisors is bad, but the two term limit will improve the current system and help our Supervisors do a better job for us.

That is why I am voting YES on Proposition N.

Millie Favetti

Over the past 20 years women have made enormous gains in electoral politics. The situation is far, far from ideal but some positive changes have taken place. Therefore, we think it is important to encourage and support the entry of women into elective politics.

We’re supporting Proposition N because it ensures that more women will have the opportunity to assume leadership roles in City government. The two year experiment with district elections produced more women supervisors than at any other time in San Francisco’s history.

The gains women have made could be easily lost under the current city-wide system. Proposition N will prevent the clock from being turned back because it allows newcomers a fair chance to compete without always having to run against entrenched incumbents.

Proposition N is equitable and fair to everyone. Join us and vote YES on Proposition N.

Helen Dawson
Miriam Smith

As a small business owner and long time resident of San Francisco, I’m supporting Proposition N because it makes good sense for our City.

Limiting Supervisors’ terms will create a Board of Supervisors more accountable to the needs of San Franciscans. Under the current city-wide system, to many Supervisors see service on the Board as a career.

They worry more about keeping their seats than about doing the job they were elected to do. As a result, politics is all too often put ahead of the City welfare.

Let’s get politics out of City Hall.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Zdenka Bodisco
Mike Salerno
Harold Hoogasian
Small Business Owners

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

We're supporting the Two Term Limit because San Francisco needs new political leadership. The Two Term Limit will open the "Door of Opportunity" for new candidates to serve on the Board of Supervisors.

The Two Term Limit will allow a new generation of civic leaders to represent our City. It is a fair and democratic way to reform the current system and to restore citizens' confidence in City Hall.

San Francisco's government should reflect the diversity of the people who live here. This is the meaning of a Democratic and free system. The Two Term Limit insures that new people with new ideas will have a fair chance to serve the City.

Don't be fooled by arguments of professional, career politicians. The Two Term Limit is good for our community and it is good for San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Steve M. Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu

---

WHY DIDN'T WE GET TO VOTE ON THE TWO-TERM LIMIT LAST YEAR?

Because Louise Renne found a legal loophole to get the measure thrown off the ballot after the Registrar of Voters had certified that it qualified for submission to the electorate.

Never mind that when Renne violated a number of election laws several years ago she got everyone to overlook the "technicality."

But what do you expect?

This is the same Louise Renne who sued the Olympic Club because it had no female members conveniently "overlooking" the fact that her husband Paul belongs to the all-white, all-male San Francisco Golf Club.

Say "No" to Renne's legal machinations!

Vote "Yes" on "N."

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

---

WHAT ARE THEY AFRAID OF?

Why are the Supervisors and their contributors fighting the two-term limit so hard?

Why did City officials use a legal loophole to get this same measure thrown off the ballot last fall?

Are they afraid they won't be able to give away another city street worth $9 million to the Rockefellers for free like they did in 1987?

Are they afraid that the people might vote to turn them out?

Clean up City Hall! Yes on N!

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic Senate Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The Two-Term Limit is a reform whose time has come!
At the Federal, State, and Local levels, political reformers agree
that the powers of incumbency virtually preclude incumbents from
being defeated at the polls, and that term limitation is the only way
to ensure turnover in legislative bodies. Even Attorney General
John Van de Kamp has proposed a twelve-year limit for State
legislators.

Since the return to City-wide elections in 1980, only two incumbent
Supervisors have been defeated at the polls. They were re-
placed by Wendy Nelder and Angela Alioto — the daughters of a
former Police Chief and Mayor, respectively. Because of this trend,
Supervisors have become burned-out, complacent, less account-
able to the voters, and more beholdind to the special interests who
contributed to their re-election campaigns.

Proposition N would limit San Francisco supervisors to two
consecutive terms of office, just like the mayor. It's a modest
reform that deserves your vote.

Proposition N would not force any incumbent out of office. All
current supervisors could run for one more term after their present
term expires. And after four years, they could run again and hold
office for two more terms.

The President of the United States has been limited to two consecutive
terms of office since 1951. The Mayor of San Francisco has
been limited to two consecutive terms since 1953. San Mateo County
has a term limit for its board of supervisors. Proposition N is not a
new or radical idea: it's an overdue reform for a stagnant system.

The founders of our city charter envisioned supervisors as part-
time citizen legislators, not full-time professional politicians. Prop-
osition N respects and revives that tradition.

A bit of fresh air never hurt anybody — even two-term supervi-
sors!

Please vote YES on Proposition N.

Senator Quentin Kopp

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

The current system of electing supervisors in San Francisco
badly needs reform. But Proposition N is not the answer. The Board
of Supervisors is not accountable to the people, largely because of
the pernicious influence of large monetary contributions. A two-
term limit would only exacerbate the problem. All supervisors
would either be rookies or lame ducks, resulting in a tremendous
shift of power to the bureaucracy, without lessening the powerful
influence of money in campaigns.

Dennis Antonore
Robert Barnes
Ron Bralthwaite
Supervisor Harry Britt
Gordon Chin
Brother Kelly Cullen
Catherine Dodd R.N.
Noah Griffin
Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Geraldine M. Johnson
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-
Treasurer, San Francisco
Labor Council
Leslie Katz
Tony Kilroy
Myra G. Kopf
Steven M. Krefting
William J. Brandy Moore
Jim Morales
Connie O'Connor
Ruth Picon
Mauri Schwartz
Yori Wada

Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead
Harold T. Yee
San Francisco Democratic
County Central Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943 and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and a public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, 11 members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected to a term of four years, from the commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the eighth day of January, 1981, shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on said date and the 11 persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said eighth day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms. Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four-year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four-year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four-year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the eighth day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the eighth day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor, or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service. The effective date of this section as amended is July 1, 1990. All supervisors holding office on that date shall be deemed to have served one full four-year term upon the expiration of their then current terms of office.
Hypodermic Syringes

PROPOSITION O
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles? YES 309 NO 310

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law regulates the sale, distribution and use of hypodermic syringes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

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

Controller’s Statement on “O”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

“Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “O” Got on the Ballot
On September 15, 1989 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,173 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,774 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.
Hypodermic Syringes

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

The connection between AIDS and unclean needles is unchallenged. Virtually every authority on the subject agrees that sharing needles increases the chances of contracting AIDS. San Francisco has an estimated 13,000 IV drug users, each of whom is at risk of contracting AIDS and spreading it to their sexual partners or their unborn children. Tens of thousands of people are being directly threatened with contracting AIDS because it is illegal to obtain clean, safe needles.

Some groups are trading clean needles with addicts for their dirty ones. This removes contaminated needles from circulation and can dramatically cut the infection rate among drug users and their partners. But these groups face up to a six months in jail and a $1,000 fine. One member of this group, who lost her mother to AIDS, contracted through a dirty needle, said, "I lost a parent to this because this bureaucracy sits around and talks while lots of people are dying." Dr. John Newmeyer of the Haight Ashbury Free Medical Clinics said, "People are dying because of our institution's resistance to AIDS risk reduction methods."

In an attempt to stop this disease from spreading more to drug users and their partners AIDS prevention workers are risking legal persecution. Jerry DeJong, who works with substance abusers and is a member of the Mayor's Narcotic's Task Force, said "... with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what's sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives." But in a sane, free society it shouldn't be necessary to break the law to save lives.

The only way this deadly policy can be changed is for the state legislature to change the law. These State laws should be repealed.

Pamela Willard Pickens
Secretary San Francisco Libertarian Party

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition O
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition O

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

Dr. John Watters of the Urban Health Study says that, "The middle class have access to clean needles." Poor people can't get clean needles, because they are illegal. Black and Latino IV drug users have a more difficult time finding clean needles and are thus more likely to be infected with AIDS. Because minorities are more likely to be infected with AIDS a higher proportion of their sexual partners or unborn children are being infected. AIDS is likely to become the leading cause of death in young Blacks and Latinos if things continue as they have. Legal clean needles will help save their lives.

Christina Groth

The San Francisco Department of Health estimates that there are 13,000 IV drug users in the city. If clean needles remain unavailable to them the AIDS infection rate can easily reach over 60%. If these 60% infect just two other people either through shared needles or sex, the total number of infected people can reach 23,400. San Francisco can't afford the financial burden it is under today from AIDS cases. Prevention through clean and legal needles can save us millions of tax dollars without costing us a cent. Legal needles make financial sense.

Isaac Klein

The San Francisco Chronicle has reported on the use of needles for IV drug use in Scotland. The newspaper said that in Edinburgh police launched a crackdown on the availability of clean needles. Within 18 months of the crackdown 50% of all IV drug users were infected with AIDS. Soon their sexual partners and unborn babies were infected with the disease. But 30 miles away in Glasgow the police took no action against the availability of clean needles and only 4 to 7 percent of needle users were infected. Dr. Roy Robertson, Edinburgh's leading authority on AIDS said, "Making needles available to addicts is not the only answer to the problem of AIDS among drug users but certainly, it has to be part of the solution." VOTE YES!

George Meyer

WHAT IS CANADA DOING RIGHT?
In Canada, fewer than 1% of AIDS cases are from needles!
In the United States, about 50% of new cases now involve needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners and babies, (up from about 20-30% in the beginning of the epidemic).

What is Canada doing right?

The AIDS epidemic has hit here many times worse than there. Why?
In Canada, drug-users can buy sterile needles in drugstores.

GRASSROOTS
Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

SURGEON GENERAL KOOP ON CLEAN NEEDLES

"One of the strongest advocates of making needles legal is Surgeon General Koop who addressed that issue last November (1987):

"I’m asked about clean needles every place I go. I’ve always said the same thing. If clean needles will do anything to contain a part of the epidemic, we should not have any foolish inhibitions about so doing."

(S.F. Sentinel 1/22/88)

Wm. Schwartzman, M.D.

Clean needles cause no diseases.
Legal needles are clean needles.
Vote Yes.

William Schwartzman, MD

Does this initiative “condone drugs”?
If you vote Yes, that could be interpreted as condoning drugs.
But if you vote No, that could equally well be interpreted as condoning the spread of AIDS (and hepatitis, and many other diseases).

The present state law is like the “death penalty” — not just for drug abusers, but also their spouses, their babies, transfusion recipients and others. Who can “condone that”?

GRASSROOTS

The AIDS epidemic was caused by a combination of germs, working together to collapse the immune system.
N.Y.’s health department has concluded that the HIV epidemic already existed among New York addicts in the 1970's.
That epidemic existed only because New York has laws against addicts buying clean needles.
If we keep these deadly laws, no one can predict what future epidemics might result.

GRASSROOTS

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES ENCOURAGES STERILE NEEDLES

The National Academy of Sciences the country’s most prestigious scientific organization in 1986, issued a major study titled “Confronting AIDS”. Many lives could have been saved if California had promptly implemented the conclusion drawn by America’s leading scientists:

"IT IS TIME TO BEGIN EXPERIMENTING WITH PUBLIC POLICIES TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF STERILE NEEDLES AND SYRINGES BY REMOVING LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS TO THEIR POSSESSION AND USE."

Wm. Schwartzman, MD
Wm. Steinsmith, MD

The issue is not "free needles".
Some of us believe that mass giveaways of clean needles is best. Others of us believe it would be enough if doctors and pharmacies were allowed to sell needles, as with diabetes.
Legal needles are as cheap as ballpoint pens, so cheap that price would be no barrier.
This initiative takes no position on "free needles" programs, only for legalization — a prerequisite for either approach.

GRASSROOTS
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Under present California law, even doctors aren’t allowed to provide needles except for approved purposes. So far “stopping AIDS” is not an approved purpose.

Under “legalization”, needles are a medical question, not a police question. A doctor’s prescription could still be required, as with diabetes. Whatever controls are adopted, needles will be better controlled under legalization than they are now.

William Steinsmith, M.D.

Dr. Don Francis, an epidemiologist with the Centers for Disease Control said, “We can’t overstate the threat of AIDS among addicts in the minority population in the inner city.” Dr. Francis says that there is no evidence that legal, clean needles increase the use of drugs. The only thing stopping clean needles is the law. It’s time for Sacramento to repeal the law and save lives.

Will Wohler

According to the New York Times a new, rare virus known as HTLV-II is spreading through the IV drug community because of needle sharing. Spread in the same manner as AIDS, this virus “could cause leukemia or other serious diseases and may exact a rising toll in future years.” Surveys have found that 20% of addicts in New Orleans were infected and in San Francisco a preliminary survey of blood donors showed this new disease has a higher rate of incidence than the AIDS virus. Because it can take as long as 20 years to develop no one can know for sure how many people have been infected. Clean, legal needles will stop the transmission of this disease. VOTE YES!

John Whisman

Clean needles save the lives of innocent victims of AIDS. Not everyone who gets AIDS because people share needles is an addict. Some are small babies. The Centers for Disease Control says 314 babies were born in 1988 with AIDS because their mothers used infected needles. Dr. James Buchler of the CDC said “We need to do what we can to prevent the sharing of dirty needles. Sharing dirty equipment is the worst problem.” In California it is illegal to obtain clean needles so addicts share. Because they share, babies are born with AIDS. Save lives. Legalize needles. VOTE YES!

Mark Pickens

Illegal needles, which force IV drug users to share unclean needles, is now the cause of over one-third of all AIDS cases in the United States according to the federal government’s Centers for Disease Control. In 1988, 10,747 people contracted AIDS because of sharing unclean needles. Some of these people never used needles themselves. 226 were men who had sex with women who used needles, 623 were women who had sex with men who used unclean needles and 314 were unborn babies. Over 1,000 people who don’t use drugs were infected because clean needles are illegal. VOTE YES FOR LEGAL, CLEAN NEEDLES!

Pamela Williard Pickens

Proposition O was endorsed by the Central Committee of the Democratic Party of San Francisco on March 21, 1990. VOTE YES!

John Whisman
Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Clean, legal needles will save lives. Jerry DeJong of the Mayor's Narcotics Task Force said, "The bottom line is that this is not a moral or legal issue. Unfortunately with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what's sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives." Something is very wrong when its illegal to save lives; and that wrong must be corrected. Tell Sacramento that we want to legalize saving lives. We need clean, legal needles now!

Ron Dorsey

Illegal needles are the primary means of spreading AIDS to minority communities. Most of the IV drug users and their partners who have been infected with AIDS are Black or Latino. Most of the babies born with AIDS because of needle sharing by their mothers are also Black and Latino. Blacks and Latinos are now more likely than ever before to become infected with AIDS because clean needles are illegal. Legal, clean needles will slow down the infection rate and decrease the number of deaths in minority communities. Illegal needles hurt Blacks and Latinos more than they hurt others. Support legal needles.

Jim Peron

Prof. Ethan Nadelman, in the Washington Post, reported that "The governments of England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, the Netherlands and several other countries have actively attempted to limit the spread of AIDS by removing restrictions on the sale of syringes ...." Dr. Nadelman notes that there is growing evidence that legal needles do not increase the use of drugs but they do save lives.

George O'Brien

A former prosecutor of high-level drug dealers, Ben Clark, said in The Daily Recorder, a law newspaper, that legal restrictions on clean needles "have had the disastrous effect of forcing drug users to share syringes. Over half the addicts in New York State are infected with AIDS, and the rate of infection among intravenous drug users in Illinois is growing dramatically."

While some people may say addicts deserve to die, Clark notes, "... the issue is not simply whether society should sit back and watch addicts kill themselves off: AIDS transmitted by needles does not stay within the druggie population. Unborn children of AIDS-infected female users may become infected. The sex partners of persons with AIDS are exposed to the disease. Needle-sharing prostitutes interact with the drug-free heterosexual community on a daily basis." Clark says that clean, legal needles have never been proven to increase drug use but they do save lives. VOTE YES!

Sam Grove

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

There is no scientific evidence that unlimited and uncontrolled availability of hypodermic syringes/needles will stop the spread of AIDS. Proposition “O” would open the floodgates to the purchase and distribution of hypodermic syringes, without prescription, in drug stores, supermarkets and in the streets without medical supervision under the guise of stopping the spread of AIDS. Addicts will continue to commit crimes to pay for the dope since possession and sale of drugs, such as crack cocaine and heroin, will still be illegal.

Latest statistics show that over 80 percent of inmates in our already overcrowded jails are there for illegal drug offenses. Who will protect the public against the careless disposition of these used needles by addicts?

Black communities in San Francisco are under siege from the sale of illegal drugs and the crime this produces. Approval of Proposition “O” by the voters permitting use of unprescribed legal needles and illegal drugs could leave the City open to millions of dollars in lawsuits for unsupervised use of a medical procedure by intravenous drug addicts from death and other causes.

WE URGE A “NO” VOTE ON PROPOSITION “O”. It should not be City policy to support the removal of all restrictions in the distribution, sale and use of hypodermic syringes.

Rev. Amos Brown
Hon. Naomi Gray
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Senator Quentin Kopp
Dr. Raye Richardson
Lulann McGriff
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Melvin Miles

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We, the people of the City and County of San Francisco, California, call upon the California State Legislature to eliminate all sanctions, criminal, regulatory, or civil, on the manufacture, use, sale or other distribution of hypodermic syringes. We do this to reduce the spread of AIDS and other diseases.

**TEXT OF PROPOSITION K (Continued from page 100)**

charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of $100.

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such a time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission after the regular daily working hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

This amendment shall become operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

**PART TWENTY: AIRPORTS COMMISSION 3.690 Commission; Composition**

An airports commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on September 1, 1996. On the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

All rights, claims, actions, orders, obligations, proceedings and contracts relating to the airport department under the public utilities commission existing prior to the effective date of these amendments shall not be affected by the adoption thereof, and shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the airports commission.

This amendment shall become operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

**PART TWENTY-TWO: PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION 3.698 Commission — Composition**

A parking and traffic commission and the department of parking and traffic are hereby established. The parking and traffic commission shall consist of five members. If not in conflict with state law, members of the parking and traffic commission shall serve ex-officio as members of the parking authority.

The term of each member shall be for four years; provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided further, that terms of the two commissioners created by the amendment of June, 1990 shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 5th day of December, 1992; and on the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month. Any person may serve concurrently as a member of the San Francisco parking authority and the parking and traffic commission.
Did you know that you can vote before Election Day? Vote absentee in person at City Hall (Room 158) starting May 7 or by mail — fill out the application on the back cover.
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IS GOING TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON ELECTION DAY A PROBLEM?

If you are unable to go to your polling place to vote on Election Day (Tuesday, June 5, 1990), you may vote by absentee ballot in one of two ways:

1. **Vote at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.** Starting on May 7 through June 5, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., you can vote in Room 158 at City Hall.

2. **Vote by mail.** Complete the application for an absentee ballot on the back cover. Tear or cut off the back cover, fold it in half with the address of the Registrar of Voters on the outside, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated, and mail the form.

Voters who have specified disabilities may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Please refer to page 24.

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside
(do not cut or tear off)

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
158 CITY HALL
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
GERMINE O. WONG

Return Address

Stamp

25¢
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
158 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

DO NOT REMOVE LABEL

BALLOT TYPE

N6 51

NON-PARTISAN
16th Assembly District

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
1200's, 1300's,
1400's, 1500's,
2100's, 2700's

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside

(Do not cut or tear off)

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION

Must be received by the Registrar of Voters
no later than May 29, 1990

June 5, 1990 Consolidated Primary Election

FIRST NAME

MIDDLE INITIAL

LAST NAME

DATE OF BIRTH

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX OR MAIL DROP ADDRESS)

NUMBER AND STREET

CITY

ZIP CODE

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (if different from above)

P.O. BOX OR STREET

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

I HAVE NOT AND WILL NOT APPLY FOR AN ABSENTEE BALLOT BY ANY OTHER MEANS.

X

SIGNATURE (DO NOT PRINT)

DATE

DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER

EVENING PHONE NUMBER

▷ I understand that voters with specified disabilities may qualify as Permanent Absent Voters. See page 24.

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
VOTE!

Polls are open from 7 am to 8 pm
See the label on the back cover for the location of your polling place.

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:30 a.m. to about 9:00 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

------------------------------------------------------------------
APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL
I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________ Apt. #________
Telephone No. (required) ____________
Do you have an automobile? yes [ ] no [ ]
Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s): __________________________
Second choice locations (if any) __________________________
Signature __________________________
------------------------------------------------------------------
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## PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 5, 1990 election. The Pamphlet includes:
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

**STEP 1**

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

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

**B 第一步**
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

**STEP 2**

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

**C 第二步**
請確認將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

**STEP 3**

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

**D 第三步**
請把鉛筆之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

**STEP 4**

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

**E 第四步**
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，供空白格預備為投票人應用。
This is a Non-Partisan Ballot. You may only vote for Non-Partisan local offices, and for State and local propositions.

Non-Partisan voters in the Primary election do not vote for:

- Governor
- Lieutenant Governor
- Secretary of State
- Controller
- Treasurer
- Attorney General
- Insurance Commissioner
- Member, State Board of Equalization
- United States Representative
- State Senator
- Member of the State Assembly
- Member, County Central Committee

You will be able to vote for those offices in the General Election in November.

To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL, Retired Judge, Educator</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ, College Education Dean</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG, State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARK ISLER, Retired Teacher, Businessman</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO, Judge Municipal Court</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY, Municipal Court Judge</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
<td>CARLOS BEA, Incumbent/Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KAY TSENNIN, Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON, Superior Court Judge</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS, Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDICIAL</td>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL DEPARTAMENTO #1</td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O'CONNOR</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Law Teacher / Abogada / Maestra de Derecho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney / Fiscal Asistente del Distrito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
<td>Sheriff's Department's Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL DEPARTAMENTO #3</th>
<th>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>ASESOR 評估司</th>
<th>Assessor</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Supervisor / Supervisor</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td>Deputy Assessor / Asesor Asistente</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td>Real Estate Portfolio Manager / Administrador de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogada; Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIUDAD Y CONDADO</th>
<th>DEFENSOR PUBLICO 公設辯護律師</th>
<th>Public Defender</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### City & County of San Francisco, Consolidated Primary Election, June 5, 1990

**Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters — State Propositions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td>Housing and Homeless Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.</td>
<td>YES 185</td>
<td>NO 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td>Passenger Rail and Clean Air Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.</td>
<td>YES 189</td>
<td>NO 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td>Governor’s Review of Legislation. Legislative Deadlines. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.</td>
<td>YES 192</td>
<td>NO 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td>Property Tax Exemption for Severely Disabled Persons. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.</td>
<td>YES 195</td>
<td>NO 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td>The Traffic Congestion Relief and Spending Limitation Act of 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.</td>
<td>YES 200</td>
<td>NO 203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
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CUIDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 Sí


Esta acta dispone un emisión de bonos por ciento ciento cinco millones de dólares ($1,050,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de los inmuebles en la ciudad, para transporte e infraestructura para el transporte diario, y para la renovación de los mismos. Se asignan dos tercios del Fondo General del acta para estos fines. Resumen del análisis de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal en el Gobernador puede reflejar la legislación propuesta. Cualquiera de lo que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

187 No


Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ciento ciento cinco millones de dólares ($1,050,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de los inmuebles en la ciudad, para transporte e infraestructura para el transporte diario, y para la renovación de los mismos. Se asignan dos tercios del Fondo General del acta para estos fines. Resumen del análisis de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal en el Gobernador puede reflejar la legislación propuesta. Cualquiera de lo que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

188 Sí

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990.

Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ciento ciento cinco millones de dólares ($1,050,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de los inmuebles en la ciudad, para transporte e infraestructura para el transporte diario, y para la renovación de los mismos. Se asignan dos tercios del Fondo General del acta para estos fines. Resumen del análisis de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal en el Gobernador puede reflejar la legislación propuesta. Cualquiera de lo que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

189 No

ACTA DE LEGISLACIÓN PARA EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIÓN PARA LEGISLACIÓN. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en el que el Gobernador puede revocar la legislación propuesta. Cualquier fecha en que entre en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

190 Sí

ACTA DE LEGISLACIÓN PARA LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Adelgaza el impuesto del impuesto base a viviendas de alquiler o personas severamente incapacitadas. Impact fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para el gobierno estatal o local.

191 No

ACTA PARA EL DESCONEGACIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS EMBARCADEROS DE 1990. Esta medida establece un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para el estado y permite al estado aumentar la comodidad en la vía pública. Se proporcionan nuevos ríos para ser usados para reducir el impacto del tránsito mediante la construcción de nuevas pistas, calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establece un aumento del 5% en los cobros por paso a los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1990, y un centro adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en la legislación que establece el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tiempo en gran escala, cuidado de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al tiempo que también dispone de una reducción en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuaría disponiendo la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reclamar el 50% de los rodados del presupuesto del estado y, a continuación, que las réditos se encejo de los límites en las asignaciones sean repartidas por igual ante la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

192 Sí

ACTA PARA PREVENIR VIOLACIONES AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — 1990. Esta acta establece un programa de prevención de violaciones al voto de los electores para el estado y permite al estado aumentar la comodidad en la vía pública. Se proporcionan nuevos ríos para ser usados para reducir el impacto del tránsito mediante la construcción de nuevas pistas, calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establece un aumento del 5% en los cobros por paso a los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1990, y un centro adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en la legislación que establece el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tiempo en gran escala, cuidado de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al tiempo que también dispone de una reducción en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuaría disponiendo la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reclamar el 50% de los rodados del presupuesto del estado y, a continuación, que las réditos se encejo de los límites en las asignaciones sean repartidas por igual ante la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

193 No

REUNIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN PARA EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIÓN PARA LEGISLACIÓN. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en el que el Gobernador puede revocar la legislación propuesta. Cualquier fecha en que entre en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

194 Sí

REUNIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN PARA EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIÓN PARA LEGISLACIÓN. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en el que el Gobernador puede revocar la legislación propuesta. Cualquier fecha en que entre en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

195 No

REUNIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN PARA EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIÓN PARA LEGISLACIÓN. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en el que el Gobernador puede revocar la legislación propuesta. Cualquier fecha en que entre en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

196 Sí

REUNIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN PARA EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIÓN PARA LEGISLACIÓN. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en el que el Gobernador puede revocar la legislación propuesta. Cualquier fecha en que entre en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

197 No

REUNIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN PARA EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIÓN PARA LEGISLACIÓN. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en el que el Gobernador puede revocar la legislación propuesta. Cualquier fecha en que entre en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

198 Sí

REUNIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN PARA EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIÓN PARA LEGISLACIÓN. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en el que el Gobernador puede revocar la legislación propuesta. Cualquier fecha en que entre en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

199 No

REUNIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN PARA EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIÓN PARA LEGISLACIÓN. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en el que el Gobernador puede revocar la legislación propuesta. Cualquier fecha en que entre en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

200 Sí

REUNIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN PARA EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIÓN PARA LEGISLACIÓN. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en el que el Gobernador puede revocar la legislación propuesta. Cualquier fecha en que entre en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

203 No

REUNIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN PARA EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIÓN PARA LEGISLACIÓN. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en el que el Gobernador puede revocar la legislación propuesta. Cualquier fecha en que entre en vigencia la legislación. Impact fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

112 STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandated public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure. YES 211


114 MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands "peace officer" definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder. YES 218

115 CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact. YES 222

116 RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million). YES 226

117 WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs. YES 230

NO 213

NO 217

NO 220

NO 224

NO 228

NO 232
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATUALES, ÉTICA. Establezca leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crear una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales. Ordena sistemas de contratación pública. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependerán de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

211 SI 贯成
213 NO 反对


215 SI 贯成
217 NO 反对

ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO, PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redacta el nombre de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

218 SI 贯成
220 NO 反对

DERECHO PENAL, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos civiles con las indicaciones legislativas sobre los derechos obligados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida afecta significativamente cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondría en ejecución y se interpretará la medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menores en los gastos estatales y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

222 SI 贯成
224 NO 反对

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligaciones generales por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requerirá del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $100 millones).

226 SI 贯成
228 NO 反对

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir nuevos territorios. Prohibe el cazar el puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectue otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

230 SI 贯成
232 NO 反对

PUBLICACIÓN 51, 52 & 53
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT
AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee
created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by
costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.

118  YES 236  NO 238

REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STAT-
UTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legisla-
tive seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars
each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.

119  YES 240  NO 242

NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred
fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the
Youth Authority facilities through new construction.

120  YES 243  NO 245

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of
four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of
facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s
nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community
Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of
the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July
1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction
or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other
health or safety improvements.

121  YES 248  NO 250

EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This
act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the
reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government
buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.

122  YES 254  NO 256

1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars
($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

123  YES 258  NO 259

N 51, N 52 & N 53 16-1N
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

236 SI 贊成

LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, EMHENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a los 2/3 partes de la relación de las millas de los distritos con los distritos. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los efectos de la redistribución en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser competitivos parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos por las disposiciones para la ética son probablemente menores.

238 NO 反對

240 SI 贊成

REDISTRIBUCIÓN POR COMISIÓN. EMHENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criteios de población en los distritos en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los salarios.

242 NO 反對

243 SI 贊成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuarenta millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para atender al congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

245 NO 反對

118

119

120

121

122

123

N 51, N 52 & N 53
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263
NO 265

SHALL COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO FINANCE (I) REPAIR, RESTORATION, AND/OR REPLACEMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT FACILITIES DAMAGED BY THE EARTHQUAKE OF OCTOBER 17, 1989 (OR ITS AFTE SHOCKS), (II) SEISMIC UPGRADING OF CHILDREN'S CENTERS AND OTHER SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT FACILITIES, (III) CORRECTION OF FIRE SAFETY VIOLATIONS OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT FACILITIES, AND (IV) DEFERRED CAPITAL MAINTENANCE OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT FACILITIES, AND CERTAIN INCIDENTAL EXPENSES RELATING TO THE FOREGOING THROUGH THE LEVY OF A SPECIAL TAX TO BE COLLECTED FOR TWENTY (20) YEARS WITH A MAXIMUM ANNUAL RATE (A) FOR SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PARCELS AND NON-RESIDENTIAL PARCELS OF $46.00 PER PARCEL FOR THE FIRST SIX (6) YEARS AND $32.20 PER PARCEL FOR THE FOURTEEN (14) YEARS FOLLOWING THE SIXTH YEAR AND (B) FOR MIXED-USE PARCELS (PARCELS WITH ONE OR MORE RESIDENTIAL UNITS IN ADDITION TO ONE OR MORE COMMERCIAL USES) AND MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PARCELS OF $23.00 PER DWELLING UNIT FOR THE FIRST SIX (6) YEARS AND $16.10 PER DWELLING UNIT FOR THE FOURTEEN (14) YEARS FOLLOWING THE SIXTH YEAR, WITH THE DEFINITIONS OF SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, MIXED-USE AND NON-RESIDENTIAL PARCELS, AND PARTICULARS RELATING TO THE METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT AND MAXIMUM RATES, EXEMPTIONS FOR SENIORS, CERTAIN PUBLICLY-OWNED PROPERTY AND OTHER USES, AS MORE PARTICULARLY SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION NO. 02-13-B1 ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT ON FEBRUARY 13, 1990; AND SHALL AN APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT IN THE AMOUNT OF $12,000,000 PER FISCAL YEAR IN CONNECTION THEREWITH BE ESTABLISHED FOR THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT?

YES 269
NO 272

SHALL THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, WITHOUT VOTER APPROVAL AND SUBJECT TO SPECIFIED DEBT LIMITS, BE AUTHORIZED TO APPROVE THE LEASE FINANCING OF EQUIPMENT FROM A NONPROFIT CORPORATION, IF THE CONTROLLER CERTIFIES THAT THE NET INTEREST COST TO THE CITY WOULD BE LOWER THAN UNDER OTHER TYPES OF LEASE FINANCING?

YES 277
NO 278

SHALL THE CITY CREATE A NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND TO PAY FOR BEAUTIFYING CITY NEIGHBORHOODS AND CLEANING UP GRAFFITI, ALLOWING BUSINESSES TO DIRECT UP TO ONE PERCENT OF THEIR BUSINESS TAX TO THE FUND, THIS PERCENTAGE TO BE ADJUSTED ANNUALLY SO THAT $1 MILLION IS AVAILABLE IN THE FUND EACH YEAR?

YES 280
NO 281

WITHDRAWN

SHALL A MINIMUM NUMBER OF FIRE STATIONS AND LEVELS OF STAFFING FOR THE FIRE DEPARTMENT BE SPECIFIED IN THE CHARTER, AND SHALL THE CLOSING OF ANY FIRE STATION OR DEACTIVATION OF ANY FIRE COMPANY OR UNIT BE SUBJECT TO PRIOR APPROVAL BY THE FIRE COMMISSION, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND SAN FRANCISCO VOTERS?

YES 284
NO 285
**BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE**

**CUIDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990**

**PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO**

---

**263 SI**

**BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PUBLICA, 1990**. Para construir una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la construcción, mejora y reconstrucción de edificios y sistemas de seguridad que sean propiedad de la Ciudad y Condados de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros para los mismos. La deuda se pagará en 12 años, si el costo supera $60,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y se pagará en 20 años si el costo supera la cantidad de $332,400,000, se ha reducido de la cantidad de $322,400,000 que es la cantidad resultante de las concesiones del FEMAP y del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

---

**265 NO**

---

**269 SI**

**Tendrá el Distrito No. 80-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el replanteo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco datadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (o choques subsiguientes), (ii) la mejora técnica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iii) la restauración de las viviendas de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la extensión de gobernador de capítulos de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco.**

---

**272 NO**

---

**277 SI**

**Tendrá el Consejo de Superintendentes, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de suelo especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin líneas de luz, y el Consejo certificará que el costo neto en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler.**

---

**278 NO**

---

**280 SI**

**Crear la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpiar de las Escrituras para pagar por embellecer las vecindades de la Ciudad y limpiar las escenas en las calles con lavadoras de los pañoles, permitiendo que los mismos sean dispuestas en un porcentaje de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje en una tasa que el $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año.**

---

**281 NO**

---

**ELIMINADA**

---

**284 SI**

**Se realizará una emisión a la Cartera Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 40.7 horas (después de la cual el empleado gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre Incentivos, sujeto a un máximo establecido, para permitir la duración y los horarios de tiempo de los empleados, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 8 a.m.**

---

**285 NO**

---

**DIEZ DE MAYO DE 1990.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Proposition Text</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290</td>
<td>NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293</td>
<td>NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298</td>
<td>NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305</td>
<td>NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309</td>
<td>NO 310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
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288 SI 赞成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permisos para los ax-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que pague el costo completo?

289 NO 反对

290 SI 赞成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jabilación de Empresas Públicas del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jabilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?

292 NO 反对

293 SI 赞成
¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados del sistema de jubilación de la ciudad celebren contratos con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?

295 NO 反对

296 SI 赞成
¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?

297 NO 反对

298 SI 赞成
¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?

299 NO 反对

300 SI 赞成
¿Serán requisitos que los miembros de la comisión y los comisionados de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que no sean empleados a los miembros de otra comisión, comisiones y cuerpo asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito se aplique a otros comisionados y comisionados a los que se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o habilidad especializada y no puede encontrar ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estos requisitos?

301 NO 反对

302 SI 赞成
¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrado por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?

304 NO 反对

305 SI 赞成
¿Se prohibirá que algún proveedor durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona presto servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un periodo completo de cuatro años cuando termine su periodo actual?

307 NO 反对

309 SI 赞成
¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles relacionadas a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?

310 NO 反对

N 51, N 52 & N 53
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ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — If you do not wish to go to your polling place to vote, you may vote by mail or by going to the Registrar’s Office in City Hall in person. This is called absentee voting.

BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest.


CHARTER BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (PROPOSITION J, K, L) — Boards and commissions created by the Charter, either directly or indirectly.

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

DEFERRED CAPITAL MAINTENANCE (PROPOSITION B) — Major building repair projects that have been postponed.

ELECTOR (PROPOSITION L) — A person who is eligible to register to vote.

FINANCE (PROPOSITION C) — Various ways to pay for something over time. This may include raising money or offering something in trade.

FISCAL YEAR (PROPOSITION A, D) — The twelve months from July 1 to June 30 make up a fiscal year. The City budgets revenues and expenses on a fiscal year basis.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INITIATIVE (PROPOSITION F, O) — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE (PROPOSITION D, J) — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters. For such a law to be passed by the Board of Supervisors, a majority, (or in some cases, three-fourths) of the Supervisors must vote to approve the law at two consecutive meetings.

OUTSTANDING PRINCIPAL (PROPOSITION A, C) — The actual amount of borrowed money, not yet paid back. Principal does not include interest charges.

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A person who has turned in the required papers and signatures with the Registrar of Voters to run for an office as a write-in candidate. The name of this person will not be on the ballot. Voters who want to vote for this person can do so by writing the name of the person on the inside of the grey envelope given with the ballot.

SPECIAL PROPERTY TAX [MELLO-ROOS DISTRICT] (PROPOSITION B) — A flat tax on a parcel of land, which is not based on the property’s value. The special tax would be in addition to current property taxes. This tax requires a two-thirds majority vote.

STAFFING LEVEL (PROPOSITION F) — The number of employees on duty at any one time.

TAX EXEMPT DEBT (PROPOSITION C) — Money borrowed by the City which is paid back with interest. The lenders are not taxed on the money earned from these loans.

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas de Luca, Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters
Vincent Chao
San Francisco Unified School District Reading Specialist
Beverly Ornstein
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, Northern California Chapter
S.M. Rileau
The Newspaper Guild, Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now," "The Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters’ rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.
CUT OUT THIS COUPON AND TAKE IT WITH YOU TO THE POLLS. After reading this pamphlet, write down the names of the candidates of your choice, and circle the numbers corresponding to "YES" or "NO" on the propositions. Completing this coupon will help you vote faster and help reduce lines at the polls. PLEASE NOTE — This is a Primary Election. You can only vote for partisan offices if you are registered as a member of a party, and if there are candidates from your party running.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE — OFFICE 15</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNOR</td>
<td>(Check Ballot for the number of candidates to vote for)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT. GOVERNOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARY OF STATE</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROLLER</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURER</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE COMMISSIONER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, BOARD OF EQUALIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>STATE SUPT. OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE — OFFICE 3</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE — OFFICE 5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PUBLIC DEFENDER</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>WITHDRAWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, and Molly Wood

Board of Supervisors appointees: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gillham, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that absentee ballots be mailed to them or they may vote in person at City Hall from May 7 through June 5 during normal working hours (see “Your Rights as a Voter” section of this pamphlet). In addition, voters with specified disabilities enumerated below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library’s Branch for the Blind at 3150 Sacramento Street produces and distributes tape recorded copies of the State and Local Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually-impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voter’s office by calling 554-4386.

ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them. The persons providing assistance may be someone who came with the voter, or poll workers can be asked to provide needed assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the sidewalk in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If your polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park on the driveway while voting, provided that this will not impede the flow of traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large print instructions on how to vote and magnifying sheets to enlarge the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows for seated voting.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip tool and pen to be used in punching the ballot and signing in.

APPLICATION TO BE A PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

The physically disabled may apply to be permanent absentee voters. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, you will automatically receive an absentee ballot every election until you move or re-register.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the form below and return it to the Registrar of Voters. Room 158, City Hall, San Francisco, 94102. Each time you move or re-register to vote, you must apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases you do not need to re-apply.

I hereby apply for “Permanent Absentee Voter” status in San Francisco by reason of:

(__) Lost use of one or more limbs.  ____(__) Lost use of both hands.

(__) Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g. cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair).

(__) Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease.

(__) Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities.

(__) Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

(__) PLEASE SEE EXPLANATORY LETTER ATTACHED.

Name

FIRST  MIDDLE  LAST

#  STREET  APT.

Residence Address

#  STREET  CITY  ZIP CODE

Mailing Address

(if different than residence address given above)

I declare under penalty of Perjury that the above is true and correct:

Date __________________ Signature __________________

(Return only this page; do not return the whole book)
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens over 18 years old who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 8, 1990.

Q — I moved before May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 8 and June 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — If you are registered as a member of a political party you may choose a candidate for:
Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Member-State Board of Equalization (District 2), Member-State Assembly, State Senator if you live in Senate District 8, United States Representative, and members of the County Central Committee.
Non-partisan offices are:
Superintendent of Public Instruction, Superior Court Judge, Municipal Court Judge, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 5, 1990. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let us know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help you.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don’t know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to my polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 5 by:
• going to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall from May 7 through June 5, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday; or
• mailing in a request for an absentee ballot. You may send in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. The application must be received by the Registrar of Voters before May 29, 1990.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include:
• your home address
• the address to which you want the ballot mailed
• your printed name and your signature.
Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR.
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is paid $98,670 a year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is paid $102,882 a year.
The Public Defender represents the following persons unable to pay for their own lawyer: 1) persons accused of crimes, 2) juveniles in legal actions, and 3) persons in mental health hearings.
Candidates for Assessor

PAUL E. SCHWENGER

My address is 16 Ord Court, Apt. #4
My occupation is Deputy Assessor
My age is 53
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan, Mission High School graduate, and San Francisco State University graduate. I have been a Deputy Assessor for San Francisco for the past 22 years. I have been awarded the SRPA, Senior Real Property Designation, which is one of the highest awards for professional appraisers. My 22 years of experience will enable me to effectively represent homeowners' and renters' concerns before State Legislative Committees. I will analyze property values to make sure business pays its fair share and I will oversee the operations of the Assessor's office in an experienced and professional manner.

Paul E. Schwengen

The sponsors for Paul E. Schwenger are:

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: With 28 years of public service, I am the only candidate with real management experience.
As Sheriff of San Francisco, I managed 399 employees; as Police Chief, 2,500; as New York Prison Commissioner, 13,000. While this would be the largest managerial responsibility faced by the other candidates, it would be my smallest.
I want to be your assessor so I can make it a model agency. I know government and real estate. I am dedicated to public service and to lower taxes for you.
Mayor Agnos agrees I am the rational choice.
I would appreciate your vote.

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Attorney/Supervisor
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have absolutely no ownership or income interests in real property which create any conflict of interest as Assessor.

As attorney for 25 years, Supervisor for three terms, and past President of the Board, I have a proven record of unique, practical accomplishments.

Just as I’ve fought for reduced local government spending, I’ll work for new statewide lower assessment formulas with the same energy that created the nationally copied No-Smoking Ordinance; the Police Fingerprint Computer which reduced our crime rate; laws allowing earthquake victims to quickly replace damaged buildings.

My goal is to achieve fair, reduced property assessments.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:


RONALD G. KERSHAW

My address is 3533 21st Street
My occupation is Real Estate Portfolio Manager
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are: B.S. Accounting, Brigham Young University 1975

MBA Real Estate, Golden Gate University 1986

Eleven years experience in all aspects of property management, appraisals, renovation and property sales

Currently responsible for supervising a real estate portfolio of $150,000,000

Past President SF Chapter, Institute of Internal Auditors

Currently, President, Log Cabin Club of San Francisco

San Francisco homeowner and resident since 1975.

San Francisco needs a fiscal conservative who is the only qualified candidate to become the City’s new Assessor.

Ronald G. Kershaw

The sponsors for Ronald G. Kershaw are:

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender represents people in trouble who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. The responsibility must be performed ethically, competently, and efficiently. During three terms in office, with the help of a superb staff of men and women, that duty has been fulfilled with compassion, dignity, and with the highest professional standards of the American legal system.

In the next term, I pledge to continue to carry out the special trust of this office: to guarantee that everyone in this City has the full benefit of our Constitution and is treated with fairness and with justice.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

ALEX SALDAMANDO

My address is 700 Arkansas Street
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: In my 11 years presiding as a Municipal Court Judge, I have worked to protect the citizens of San Francisco. I have delivered justice swiftly and firmly, in a fair and impartial manner. As a Superior Court Judge, I would bring the same approach to felony criminal cases and complex civil disputes. I am currently President of the California Judges Foundation. My background includes experience as a prosecutor and a public interest lawyer. A graduate of the University of California (Berkeley) and Hastings College of Law, I live with my wife and two children on Potrero Hill.

My sponsors include: Judge Ira Brown, Jr.; Judge John Dearmian; Judge Isabella Grant; Judge Ed Stern; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Lillian Sing; Former Judge Charles Renfrew; Mayor Art Agnos; Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein; Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi; Assemblyman Willie Brown; Assemblyman John Burton; Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Harry Britt; Supervisor Jim Gonzalez; Supervisor Terence Hallinan; Supervisor Willie Kennedy; School Board Member Rosario Anaya; School Board Member Libby Denebeim; School Board Member Fred Rodriguez; Commissioner Paul Melbostad; Larry Mazzola, President, Local 38; Thelma Shelley, Director, Performing Arts Center; Benny Yee; Susan Smith, Building Trades Council; and Police Commissioner John Keker.  

Alex Saldamando

J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY

My address is 340 Magellan
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a Municipal Court Judge since 1974, native Californian, resident San Francisco since 1937; attended local schools, N.D.V., St. Ignatius, USF and USF School of Law; married Patricia M. Berti, admitted State Bar 1960, devoted thirty years to public service; adjunct Professor of Law, USF, participant, member and/or lecturer for many organizations — Salesian Boys Club, 44 years — Municipal Court Speakers Bureau — California Judges Association — California Center for Judicial Education and Research — San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project; Supervising Judge, Preliminary Courts, Presiding Judge, Assistant Presiding Judge, Court Administrative Committee member eight years; honored by: San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Irish-Israeli-Italian Society, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, Lawyers Club, USF School of Law and USF Law Society for outstanding community service.


J. Dominique Olcomendy

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #5

KAY TSENIN

My address is 637 Steiner Street
My occupation is Attorney and Counselor at Law
My age is 43 years
My qualifications for office are: B.A., San Francisco State University (Dean’s List), graduate, University of San Francisco School of Law. Attorney for sixteen years specializing in civil litigation. Pro-Tem Municipal Court Judge in San Francisco for five years.

Born in China, moved to San Francisco as a child, graduate of George Washington High School.

Broad Community service includes founding of environmental law societies while in law school, Vice President for Legal Affairs for California National Organization for Women (NOW), Board Member for the Russian American Credit Union and San Francisco Trial Lawyers and Board Advisor for the Legal Advocates for Women. Vice-President, Alamo-Square Neighborhood Association.

Strong commitment to equal justice for all without prejudice or bias. The following San Franciscans support me because they feel that the Superior Court needs a judge with my background, legal expertise and perspective on the law:


Kay Tsenin

CARLOS BEA

My address is 2727 Pierce Street
My occupation is Judge Superior Court #5
My qualifications for office are: I am a Superior Court Judge in San Francisco and author of articles in several professional journals, such as California Trial Lawyers and Defense Research Institute’s. Am recognized by the State Bar for pro bono work with members of the Hispanic Community. Have served two terms as a member of the Board of Visitors, Stanford Law School. Was a panelist and lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar. Was an adjunct professor, Hastings College of Law and Stanford Law School. I graduated from Stanford Law School and have been an attorney in San Francisco since 1959.

Sponsors include: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Ollie Marie-Victoire, all the judges of the Superior Court, Angela Alioto, Ernest Chuck Ayala, Willie Brown, Jr., John Burton, Jim Gonzalez, Quentin Kopp, H. Jesse Arnelle, James Herman, Mary Noel Pepys, Robert McDonnell, G. Joseph Bertain, Edward McFetridge, Zeppelin Wong, Paul Renne, Leo Murphy, Jr., Gina Moscone, James Brosnahan, Barbara Caulfield, Robert Morales, Paul Haerle, Michael Hardeman, Howard Nemerovski, Edwin Heafey, Jr., Larry Mazzola, Vincent Priia, Putnam Livermore, William Coblentz.

Carlos Bea

Kay Tsenin

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DONNA HITCHENS

My address is 468 30th Street
My occupation is attorney
My age is 42 years
My qualifications for office are: Over the past thirteen years, I have represented clients in San Francisco courts, taught law to San Francisco students and served on the Boards of Directors of private and public agencies designed to further the cause of justice in our city.

My experience as a mediator, counselor and advocate demonstrates my willingness to pursue alternative dispute resolutions. Judicial leadership and integrity are standards that the community should demand. My record attests to my ability to meet those standards.
• J.D. UC Berkeley 1977
• Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates, a public interest firm specializing in sex discrimination cases. 1978 – 1984
• Co-founder, Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom
• Staff Counsel, ACLU. 1984 – 85
• Partner, Hitchens & Brenner. Small Business, non-profit corporations, civil rights and family law. Presently
• Former chair, San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women.
• Member, Board of Directors, Pacific Primary PreSchool.

SUPPORT: Assemblymember John Burton; Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisors Nancy Walker, Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, and Terence Hallinan; Judge Lillian Sing, Judge Mary Morgan, and Judge Herbert Donaldson; Commissioners Jim Jefferson, Adrian Bermudez, Jr., James Morales, Paul Melbostad, Richard Grosboll, and Leni Marin; Hon. Libby Denebeim; Hon. Leland Yee; Carol Migden; Will Leong; Catherine Dodd, R.N.; Jeff Mori, and Mauri Schwartz

JEROME T. BENSON

My address is 187 Robinhood Drive
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the Superior Court
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are:
• 23 years public service in the courtroom protecting victims, litigants and the community.
• 7 years as Chief of the Criminal Division in the District Attorney’s Office including:
  • 65 felony jury trial prosecutions for murder, rape, child abuse, drugs, white-collar fraud.
• Stanford Law School graduate 1964.
• Chairman, State Bar of California Subcommittee on Jury Instructions (Criminal).
• Member, Project Safer California.
• Fair and equal application of the law without regard to race, sex, or economic status.
• I am a native San Franciscan and homeowner living with my wife and two daughters near Miraloma Park.
• My judicial office is dedicated to fair rulings, hard work, human sensitivity, and legal equality.

CITYWIDE SUPPORT:
State Senator Quentin Kopp; Justice Harry Low; District Attorney Arto Smith; Public Defender Jeff Brown; Sheriff Michael Hennessy; Former Chief of Police Alfred Nelder.
SUPERVISORS:
Angela Alioto, Tom Hsieh, Wendy Nelder;
JUDGES:
John Ertola, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Ina Gyemant, Paul Alvarado, Isabella Grant;
LABOR:
Mike Hardeman, Stan Smith, Kevin Ryan;
ATTORNEYS AND COMMUNITY:
William Coblenz; Harold Dobbs; Charles Breyer; Airport Commission President Morris Bernstein; Wayne Friday; Benny Yee; Louis Giraudo; Doris Thomas; Christopher Bowman; Haddie Redd; Elizabeth Aguilar-Tarchi; Ron Huberman;

Donna Hitchens

Jerome T. Benson

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge  
Office #1

JAMES HARRIGAN

My address is 494 Mangels St.
My occupation is Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department.
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: I live in Glen Park with my wife, Serena Lee, and our three children.
I received my law degree with academic awards and Law Review distinction in 1975 from Golden Gate University, San Francisco.
I have completed more than 80 jury and court trials in Municipal and Superior Court, representing thousands of citizens and victims of crime in civil and criminal cases in private practice, as a public defender, and as Legal Counsel to the Sheriff.

My expertise includes: employment law, labor relations, criminal, landlord/tenant, and constitutional law. As Counsel to the Sheriff, I resolve the legal affairs of a major law enforcement agency. My work brings me before the civil and criminal justice system each day.

"James Harrigan is by far the best qualified candidate. No other candidate has his broad range of experience: public service and private practice; law enforcement and defense law; extensive courtroom experience and administrative expertise. I strongly urge your vote for James Harrigan."

— Sheriff Michael Hennessey

I have not listed my sponsors. I firmly believe the voter's decision should be based on one's qualifications and experience — not on political connections.
I pledge equal application of the law. I ask for your support.
Thank you.

James Harrigan

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Ave.
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My qualifications for office are: What I am in life, I owe to my family and to an excellent education: M.A., counseling, Stanford University; B.A., psychology, University of San Francisco; Juris Doctorate, Hastings College of Law. I began practicing law in 1982 and have been an assistant district attorney since 1983: with experience in criminal prosecution and family law enforcing child support. I have served 10 years on the College Board; my colleagues elected me president three terms because of my firm but fair judgment. My duties include equitably settling conflicts, grievances and contracts. In my years of public service, compassion, integrity and common sense have always guided my decisions; and as a judge that will continue to be the case.

My supporters:
Justice Harry Low
Judges: Isabella Grant, Lenard Louie, David Garcia, Larry Kay, Mary Morgan, Bill Mallen, Herbert Donaldson.
District Attorney: Arlo Smith
Public Defender: Jeff Brown
Senators: Milton Marks, Quentin Kopp
Attorneys: Charlie Cliford, Harriet Ross, William Coblenz, Cedric Chao, Roberta Achtenberg
BART Director: Mike Bernick
Commissioners: Rosario Anaya, Tim Wolfred, Chuck Ayala, Naomi Gray.
Supervisors: Thomas Hsieh, Angela Alioto
Walter Johnson; Alex Esclamado; Reverend Amos Brown; Carole Migden;
UC Regent Yori Wada.

Julie Tang

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: I’m honored that MAYOR ART AGNOS and 8 PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION — who know my courtroom experience and qualifications in civil and criminal law — endorse me.

As a lawyer in private practice 18 years, mother of 2 children, married 19 years, I care about the strength and integrity of San Francisco’s courts.

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred community trust — not a consolation prize for a restless politician. A lawyer lacking courtroom experience is unqualified to be judge.

In HUNDREDS of court appearances and trials, as chair of the Bar Association Criminal Justice Advisory Council, as a San Francisco Delinquency Prevention Commissioner, and as a Hastings Law School teacher, I have demonstrated a longstanding commitment to professional excellence.

Community and law enforcement leaders who acknowledge my legal service and endorse me:

SPEAKER Willie Brown
SUPERVISORS Nancy Walker, Bill Maher, Harry Britt, Terrence Hallinan
JUDGES Dorothy vonBeroldingen, John Dearman, Edward Stern
COURT COMMISSIONER George Colbert
SENATOR Milton Marks
SCHOOL BOARD JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Libby Denebeim, Myra Kopf
POLICE COMMISSIONER John Keker
FIRE COMMISSIONER Sharon Bretz
SHERIFF LIEUTENANT Connie O’Connor
POLICE OFFICERS VICE PRESIDENT Paul Chignell
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY Charles Wood
BUSINESSMAN Mel Swig
PUC COMMISSIONER Rodel Rodis

WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR

My address is 3615 Buchanan St. #206
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: I am the most qualified candidate for this office. I have had judicial experience, serving as Municipal Court judge pro tem for over five years, and have been commended by the Presiding Judge for the quality of my service. I have been a journeyman lawyer for 15 years, with both criminal and civil experience, and have done over 30 jury trials.

With Amnesty International and Church representatives, I have been an International Trial Observer.

I have been a Board Member of the Elizabeth Frye Center and the Irish Forum, and a volunteer on the Bar Association’s free legal services panel.


William J. O’Connor

Ellen Chaitin

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
OFFICE #3

LILLIAN K. SING

My address is San Francisco Municipal Court,
400 Van Ness Ave.
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the San Francisco
Municipal Court
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: I am an incumbent judge, and
have been a judge since 1981. I am the first Asian-American
woman judge in the history of Northern California. In 1988, I
was awarded Trial Judge of the Year by San Francisco Trial
Lawyers Association, one of the highest awards a Bar Associa-
tion can bestow. Last year, I was unanimously elected as Munici-
pal Court’s Presiding Judge. As Presiding Judge, I implemented
the Pro Tem Judge Program, drastically reduced backlog in
civil/criminal cases, brought Trial Court Funding to San Fran-
cisco, spearheaded San Francisco’s first judicial forum “Access
To Justice” attended by 680 people. I served as a faculty member
with the California Center for Judicial Education/Research
which trains all new judges in California and am a faculty judge
with the National Institute for Trial Advocacy which trains trial
lawyers. In 1988 I lectured throughout China on the U.S.
Legal/Judicial System.

Join San Francisco judges led by Presiding Judges Choppelas,
and Marie-Victoire, Mayor Art Agnos, President Harry Britt,
and the entire 11 Board of Supervisors, Assembly Speaker Willie
Brown, Assemblyman John Burton, Senator Milton Marks, For-
mer Police Chiefs Nelder/Cahill, DA Arlo Smith, PD Jeff
Brown, Sheriff Michael Hennessey and retain me as judge.

Lillian K. Sing

JEROME A. DEFILIPPO

My address is 1534 38th Avenue
My occupation is Attorney at Law
My qualifications for office are: A third generation San Fran-
ciscan. I have practiced law in The City since 1973, served as
the Legal Officer of the San Francisco Police Department and a
Deputy City Attorney. I am committed to the impartial appli-
cation of our laws in all judicial proceedings. Having served twenty
years as a Police Officer attaining the position of Lieutenant, I
am well aware of the frustrations each of us feel by the impact
of crime in our City. If elected, I am committed to the imposi-
tion of the maximum sentence allowed by law for persons convicted
of violent crimes or narcotic sales.

Partial list of sponsors follows:
Ann Alberigi, Catherine Archbold, Alfred Amaud, Martin
Bastiani, Chief Thomas Cahill, Ann Carrick, Peter Ciremichelli,
Hon. Antone Cincotta, Clement Collins, Jean DeFilippo, Cantor
Martin Feldman, Nancy Feldman, H. Welton Flynn, John
Fracchia, Carol Fujioka, John Gallagher, Judith Gallen, Kath-
leen Gee, Dr. William Gee, Susanna Lee, Margaret Leong,
Maureen Mahoney, Carmelita Mathais, Phyllis Moylan, James
Pagano, Renzo Panelli, Timothy J. Riordan, Rollin Schroth, Joan
Swendsen, Spirion Tentes, Paul Vigo, Rita Young

Jerome A. DeFilippo

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against these measures. All arguments, "official" and paid, are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None of them has been checked for accuracy by this office or any other city official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

"Official Arguments"

There is one "official" argument for and one against each measure, and they are published at no cost. "Official" arguments are selected by the Registrar of Voters in accordance with the priorities set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code as summarized below:

For:
1. Person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee supporting the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Against:
1. For a referendum, person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee against the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Rebuttals

Authors of official arguments may each prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. As with official and paid arguments, rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Each rebuttal follows immediately after its corresponding official argument.

Paid Arguments

All paid arguments are accepted for publication upon (1) deposit of an amount equal to $50 plus $1.50 per word, (2) submission of a petition containing valid signatures of registered voters in lieu of the printing fee at the rate of two signatures for each dollar of the fee, or (3) a combination of a printing fee and signatures which together equal the number of signatures and/or amount of money required to qualify the argument for publication.

For each measure, paid arguments follow after the official arguments and rebuttals. All paid arguments supporting a measure are printed together followed by all paid arguments against that same measure. Paid arguments within each group (e.g. all paid arguments in favor of Proposition Z) are not printed in any particular order. Rather they are arranged so that each page is fully utilized.

There is one ballot measure for which paid arguments were not accepted. The School Facilities Safety Special Tax measure is being proposed under state law; only one argument for, one argument against, and respective rebuttals for this measure are allowed.

Again, arguments and rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked by this office or any other city official or agency.
PROPOSITION A
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263
NO 265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City buildings were damaged by the October 17, 1989 earthquake and many may not survive another strong earthquake. Many City buildings contain asbestos and many are not accessible to disabled persons. Many City buildings do not meet current health, safety and building codes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $332,400,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This total would be reduced by the amount of grants the City receives from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the State of California for earthquake repair and hazard reduction. No more than $65,000,000 of bonds could be sold in any fiscal year.

This money would be used to pay for safety improvements to some City buildings, including repairing earthquake damage, making the buildings better able to survive earthquakes, removing or reducing the danger of asbestos in these buildings, making them more accessible to the disabled and bringing them up to current codes.

The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds for not more than $332,400,000 to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue bonds to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

Controller's Statement on "A"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that the approximate costs would be as follows:

- Bond redemption $332,400,000
- Bond interest 244,314,000
- Debt service requirement 576,714,000

The bond authorization limits the issuance of bonds to no more than $65 million per year. Assuming a single sale on a 20 year basis at current interest rates with no reduction for possible FEMA or State funding, annual debt service on each $65 million increment would amount to $5,838,750, which amount is equivalent to one and forty-eight hundredths cents ($0.0148) in the current tax rate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"
On February 26, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A the earthquake repair and protection measure.

Proposition A provides $332.4 million to repair earthquake damaged city buildings and to seismically reinforce many of them so that they would not sustain as much damage (or worse) during a future earthquake. This improves public safety while it also protects the investment we are making in repairs.

Your “Yes on A” vote will provide for:

Repairs of earthquake damage, asbestos removal and handicapped accessibility work in over 200 earthquake damaged city buildings.

Seismic strengthening of the Civic Center complex including City Hall, the Veterans Building, Opera House, Department of Public Health and Civic Auditorium.

Seismic strengthening for the Palace of Fine Arts/Explorationum, nine additional branch libraries, two additional police stations, two jails and the services building at San Francisco General Hospital.

Replacement of the broken and earthquake damaged water and sewer lines at the Zoo.

Proposition A represents a prudent investment which would protect many irreplaceable public buildings from major damage or collapse in a future earthquake.

In order to keep property taxes from rising more than 2-3¢ per $100 of assessed value, Proposition A will not allow more than $65 million in bonds to be sold in any one year. It further requires that any Federal or State earthquake relief money we receive to repair these buildings reduce the amount of bonds sold. This assures that local taxpayers will not be required to pay for repairs that can be made using Federal/State emergency relief assistance.

Vote Yes on Proposition A to protect city buildings and increase public safety in a next major earthquake.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Chief Administrative Officer.

---

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition A
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition A

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

When future earthquakes strike, our libraries need to be safe. Proposition A will provide funds to help earthquake proof our library system.

Vote YES on A.

Michael Mellor, President
Friends of the San Francisco Public Library

This bond issue will help to ensure the seismic safety of the Palace of Fine Arts, home of the Exploratorium which is visited by over 600,000 people a year. Prop A represents a prudent investment to improve public safety and protect irreplaceable public buildings. We urge all citizens to vote “Yes” on Proposition A.

Exploratorium
F. Van Kasper, Chairman
William K. Coblentz, Vice Chairman
C. Richard Kramlich, Vice Chairman
G. Steven Burrill, Treasurer

Replacement of the earthquake-damaged, underground, 50-year-old water, gas and sewer lines at the San Francisco Zoo is critically needed for the safety and well-being of the animals. It will significantly improve public services to the 1.2 million children and adults who visit annually. The Zoological Society will endeavor to raise funds to renovate and build new above-ground facilities to supplement the $26 million included in the bond issue for the Zoo. Help make the Zoo a true sanctuary.

David E. Anderson
Zoo Director
Phil Arnold
Assistant General Manager
Recreation & Park
William Brewster Ely IV
Headmaster, Town School
Mary Burns
General Manager
Recreation & Park
Margaret K. Burks
Executive Director, Zoological Society
Jack W. Castor
Animal Keeper Shop Steward, Local 858
Todd Cecil
Children’s Zoo Keeper
Sherri Chiesa
President, Local 2
Robert Todd Cockburn
Executive Director, Clean Water Program
Rosemary Davidson
Urban School
Dolores A. Donovan
Animal Control & Welfare Commission

Keith G. Eickman
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Roy Eisenhardt
Director, California Academy of Sciences
Becky Evans
Conservation Activist
Norman Gershenz
Director, Ecosystem Survival Plan
Arthur J. Goedewaagen
Board Member, SPEAK
John E. Hafernik Jr.
Professor Biology, SFSU
Roger Hoppes
Director, Children’s Zoo
Michael Housh
Assistant to the Mayor
David J. Howe
Animal Keeper
Mark Hurley
Animal Control & Welfare Commission
Norma J. Kristovich
Zoo Docent Council
Connie Lurie
Vice Chairman, Zoological Society Board

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Zoological Society Board
Frances May McCartney
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Amy Meyer
People for GGNRA
Andrew Nash
President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Trent W. Orr
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Elizabeth D. Rieger
Zoo Volunteer
Fred A. Rodriguez
School Board Member
Carroll Soo-Hoo
Zoo Benefactor
Stephen V. R. Spaulding
Zoological Society Treasurer
James J. Walsh Jr.
Citizens Advisory Committee on Wastewater Management
Connie O’Connor
President, Recreation & Park Commission

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We must rebuild and repair our infrastructure. The October 17 quake was a warning. More resources going to earthquake preparedness programs today will save lives in the future.

VOTE YES on A.

Joel Ventresca
Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods Candidate for Supervisor

We urge everyone to vote Yes on Proposition A. The people of San Francisco have a $3.5 billion investment in public buildings. This bond issue will be used to fund repairs to many of our facilities damaged in last October’s earthquake, including City Hall, General Hospital, neighborhood libraries, police stations and cultural buildings. It will also provide monies necessary to make life-safety improvements to other city buildings.

Your Yes Vote on Proposition A will protect lives and property in the event of another major earthquake at a very small cost to businesses and homeowners. Because bonds to finance repairs will be sold over 6 - 10 years, replacing older bond issues as they are paid-off, the result will be an almost unchanged tax rate. In fact, the City’s independent budget analyst found that the tax bill for an average homeowner will increase by less than $5.00 a month.

Proposition A is a small price to pay to preserve our investment in the city’s valuable public facilities.

VOTE YES on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

We ask that you join with us in Voting YES ON PROP. “A”.

Your “Yes on A” vote will provide funds to protect the two remaining Police Stations which are not yet earthquake safe or provided for in previous bond issues.

In an emergency we can do our jobs only if our own police facilities are earthquake resistant and if we can get to those places in the City which most need our services. That is why it is important to us that as many City buildings as possible are made earthquake resistant. The less damage and street obstruction that results from a future earthquake, the better we can get to these parts of the City where we are most needed. The safer the public buildings in the City are made, the better we will be able to serve the rest of the City if we ever have to face a major earthquake emergency.

For security vote “Yes on A”.

Michael Keys President San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

The damage done by the October 17th earthquake to San Francisco’s most important public buildings is considerable. To correct that damage and prepare for the future vitality of our City demands the kind of response represented by Proposition A. This proposition carefully earmarks funds to upgrade buildings such as City Hall, the War Memorial Opera House, and the Department of Public Health offices which are treasures that can never be replaced or reproduced. They not only need to be repaired, but strengthened structurally and improved, to meet today’s building codes. The

Federal Government will pick up some of the damage, but much more will be needed if these vital components of our City’s daily life are to be improved and made ready for the next major quake.

Proposition A requests a large sum, but this is a time when we as a City have to agree to such a request. We strongly urge your support of Proposition A.

American Institute of Architects/San Francisco Chapter

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

We ask you to join us in voting “Yes on A”.
The primary purpose of Prop “A” is to protect lives and public buildings from the effects of the next earthquake. As San Franciscans, we all share the responsibility of having to do all we can to avoid the loss of life, the suffering and the huge costs which another, perhaps stronger or longer quake would bring. Thus we see Proposition “A” as a necessary, prudent investment in all our future.

We have a special reason to support “Prop A” and to ask you to vote YES ON “A” as well. That special reason is the fact that 20 of the buildings which will be repaired or strengthened against future earthquakes if Prop “A” passes will also be made fully accessible to the disabled. We want our City’s buildings to be repaired, to be made safe and to be made accessible to all San Franciscans.

Vote “Yes on A”.

Kathy Uhl, Executive Director,
Independent Living Resource Center
Michael L. Comini, Executive Director,
Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition “A”.
Many city buildings were damaged in the October 17 earthquake. If these buildings are repaired and strengthened, the Fire Department will be much safer when responding to future emergencies. Please help the Fire Department do its job safely and effectively by voting “Yes” on Proposition “A”.

James D. Jefferson, President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn, Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bres, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Soulis, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Frederick F. Postel, Chief of Department

We urgently request that you vote “Yes on A”.
The War Memorial complex of buildings, dedicated to San Francisco’s veterans, are one of our city’s treasures, irreplaceable architecturally and economically. They are central to our history and we owe it to ourselves to make sure they are made as fully earthquake-resistant as possible.
The October 17 earthquake was a warning which we must heed. Proposition “A” is a prudent and necessary response. It will protect our treasured buildings and, even more importantly, it will protect the lives of those who use them and the memories of those whose lives they commemorate.

Harold F. Jackson, Chairman, American Legion War Memorial Commission
Claude M. Jarmen, Jr., Vice-President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Mark Ryser, Executive Director, Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage

Save lives.
Support earthquake safety.
Vote YES on Propositions A and B.
Also vote YES on Proposition N. Limit San Francisco Supervisors to two four-year terms.

Terence Faulkner
Republican State Assembly Candidate
San Francisco Republican Party Chairman (1987-89)

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Candidate
Past San Francisco Democratic Party Secretary

Max Woods
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Alex Smith
Democratic County Central Committee woman

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for your safety. Let us learn from the October 17th earthquake. 15 seconds of moderate shaking resulted in the need for $32 million in repairs to city buildings in the Civic Center alone. We need to be better prepared. We need to reduce known safety hazards.

Please, vote YES on Proposition A.

Help the City of San Francisco and the Zoo rebuild. The animals will benefit, too! Vote YES on A.

Susanne Bartheil,
Zoo Advisory Committee member,
Zoo Volunteer
Sophie Papageorge,
Zoologist
Jorge L. Garcia, D.V.M.
Zoo Medicine Specialist
John J. Alcaraz,
Retired Zookeeper
Roni Joan Howard,
Educator

Ken Dowlin, City Librarian
Steve Coulter, Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson, Library Commissioner
Lonni Chin, Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil, Library Commissioner
Dennis Normandy, Library Commissioner
Roselyne Swig, Library Commissioner

David J. Howe
Animalkeeper
Terrence J. Moiles
Linda Caralli
Animalkeeper
Anthony Sharp
Animalkeeper
Martin E. Dias
A.K.A. Big Bison, Animalkeeper
Jack W. Castor
Lion House, Animalkeeper
Sandra Keller
Director, Citizens for a Better Zoo

Proposition A will help restore structural safety to the San Francisco County Jails in San Bruno, which were built in 1934 and are badly in need of repair. This is the oldest operating jail in California and sits near the San Andreas fault.

For the safety of City employees and county jail inmates, please vote YES on Proposition A.

Michael Hennesssey
San Francisco County Sheriff
Deputy Albert Waters, President
San Francisco Deputy Sheriff’s Association

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION A
This bond issue is iffy.
It should have been presented to the voters as two separate bond issues.
One for $75 million — earthquake repairs to be partly refunded by F.E.M.A. for our present estimated damages. Another for $257.4 million to take care of our needed capital improvements so neglected by this and past administrations.
Vote NO and get one issue back on the November ballot.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1990, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INURE THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, TO PAY FOR THE COST OF PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION, ASBESTOS ABATEMENT, PROVIDING ACCESS TO AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE DISABLED, AND ALL RELATED TO PUBLIC SAFETY TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING RELATED ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT FOR THE FOREGOING PURPOSE; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT NO MORE THAN $65,000,000 OF SAID BONDED INDEBTEDNESS SHALL BE INCURRED IN ANY SINGLE FISCAL YEAR AND PROVIDED, FURTHER, THAT THE AUTHORIZATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $332,400,000 WILL BE REDUCED BY THE AMOUNT OF THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEMA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND THE CONTROLLER TO MONITOR THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEMA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION AND TO TAKE ANY APPROPRIATE ACTION SO THAT THE BONDS ISSUED WILL NOT DUPLICATE FEMA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; FINDING THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF THE ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 5th day of June, 1990, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county a proposition to incur a bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the herein-after described municipal improvements in the amount and for the purposes stated:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, to pay for the cost of public safety improvements to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled, all related to public safety to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including related acquisition, construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purpose; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, Resolution No. 88-90, $332,400,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

 Said estimate of cost as set forth in said resolution are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. Authorizing and directing the Chief Administrative Officer and the Controller to monitor the issuance of the bonds and the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction and to take any appropriate action so that the bonds issued will not duplicate FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 4. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 5. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 5, 1990, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth said voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 31, 1990.

Section 6. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided,

(Continued on next page)
however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special election, each voter to vote for any said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word “YES” to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word “NO” to the right of said proposition.

Section 7. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 12% per annum, payable semiannually, provided, that interest for the first year after the date of any of said bonds may be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on said proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 8. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 9. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 10. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.
PROPOSITION B

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $33.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particular relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-81 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269
NO 272

Analysis
by City Attorney

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Some School District buildings were damaged by the earthquake. Some District buildings do not meet present earthquake and fire standards.

The State Mello-Roos law allows the Board of Education to submit to the voters a measure authorizing a special property tax to pay for repairs and other improvements to school buildings.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize a special property tax to pay for costs of repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety. Some of the money would also be used for deferred capital maintenance. The repairs and maintenance would be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis. Since no money would be borrowed, there would be no interest costs to pay.

The tax would last for 20 years. The tax on single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels could be no more than $46 for each of the first six years and no more than $32.20 for each of the last 14 years. The tax on other types of parcels could be no more than $23 for each dwelling unit for each of the first six years and $16.10 for each dwelling unit for each of the last 14 years. Dwelling units occupied by persons 65 years of age or older would be eligible for an exemption from this tax. The measure would also set an annual appropriations limit of $12 million.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to authorize this property tax to pay for repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety and you want to authorize this annual appropriations limit.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to authorize this tax.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed special tax levy be approved, in my opinion, it would increase revenues for the San Francisco Unified School District, net of estimated senior citizen exemptions, by approximately $8 million per year for the first 6 years and $5.6 million per year for the next 14 years, based on the current assessment roll of the City and County. The approximately $127.2 million generated over a 20 year period by this special tax levy would be restricted for use by the District for the repair, restoration, replacement, seismic upgrading and capital maintenance of School District facilities."

How "B" Got on the Ballot

On February 13, the Board of Education voted 5-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Board members voted as follows:

NO: Leland Yee.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When the earthquake struck last fall, our school buildings suffered. Sustaining major damage and at special risk in the future are our buildings that were not earthquake proofed in the 1970’s. In that category are our child care centers serving our youngest students. Also, in the fall of 1988 the City Fire Marshall inspected our schools and reported that the majority of our school buildings do not meet fire safety standards. Our 63,000 students and the community groups that meet at our schools in the evenings and on weekends must have buildings that can withstand earthquakes, and meet fire safety standards.

Proposition B will authorize a tax to provide for: repairing earthquake damage at 131 sites including the reconstruction of John O’Connell High School, seismic improvement of nine Children’s Centers, correction of fire code and safety violations at 97 sites and seismic improvement of John Swett, Jean Parker and Bessie Carmichael Elementary Schools and Parkside Curriculum Center. In addition, there will be funds for deferred capital maintenance.

Two years ago the citizens of this City voted to support major repairs for our school buildings. Now we must protect that investment by repairing the present earthquake damage and seeing that all our schools can withstand future earthquakes, be as safe as possible in case of fire and be well maintained into the next century.

Civic organizations who have joined in supporting Proposition B include: San Francisco League of Women Voters, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SF/PTA, Parents’ Lobby, San Francisco Labor Council, United Educators of San Francisco, and Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth.

Submitted by Superintendent Ramon C. Cortines, San Francisco Unified School District, and Fred Rodriguez, President, Board of Education.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition B
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

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

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California
February 13, 1990

For Board Meeting February 13, 1990


REQUESTED ACTION:

WHEREAS, the Board of Education (the "Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "District"), did, on January 9, 1990, adopt its Resolution of Intention (the "Resolution") to form Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "Community Facilities District"), and levy a special tax therein, pursuant to Chapter 2.5 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 53311) of the California Government Code, commonly known as the "Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982," as amended, (the "Act"); and

WHEREAS, a copy of the Resolution (which sets forth a description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, the name of the Community Facilities District and the types of facilities proposed to be financed by the District (the "Facilities")), providing that, except where funds are otherwise available, a special tax sufficient to pay for all Facilities and the financing thereof (to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District) is proposed to be levied within the proposed Community Facilities District specifying the rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the proposed Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, and setting a hearing thereon, is on file with the Clerk of this Board and is incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, notice of said hearing was duly published as required by law, as evidenced by the affidavit of publication on file with the Clerk of this Board; and

WHEREAS, on February 13, 1990 this Board held the noticed public hearing as required by law relative to the proposed formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, prior to the noticed public hearing a report (the "Report") containing a descrip-
To the tax. The District shall establish the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.

1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which, supported publicly-owned non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that leasehold/possessory interests shall be taxed.

2. From the parcels remaining identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor's data, and the District's review of building permits issued, and other changes in development status:

a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on that parcel will be classified based on the uses that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $32.20 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CFD 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CFD 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.

1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which, supported publicly-owned non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that leasehold/possessory interests shall be taxed.

2. From the parcels remaining identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor's data, and the District's review of building permits issued, and other changes in development status:

a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on that parcel will be classified based on the uses that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $32.20 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CFD 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CFD 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.

1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which, supported publicly-owned non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that leasehold/possessory interests shall be taxed.

2. From the parcels remaining identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor's data, and the District's review of building permits issued, and other changes in development status:

a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on that parcel will be classified based on the uses that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $32.20 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CFD 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CFD 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.

1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which, supported publicly-owned non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that leasehold/possessory interests shall be taxed.

2. From the parcels remaining identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor's data, and the District's review of building permits issued, and other changes in development status:

a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on that parcel will be classified based on the uses that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $32.20 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CFD 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CFD 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B (Continued)

Section 90-1 — Description of Facilities to be financed:
(i) Repair, restoration, and/or replacement of Community Facilities District for any such advances.
(ii) Seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other District facilities.
(iii) Correction of fire safety violations of District facilities.
(iv) Deferred capital maintenance of District facilities. Incidental expenses, including the cost of planning and designing the Facilities and the cost of environmental evaluations thereof; all costs associated with the creation of the proposed Community Facilities District, the determination of the amount of and collection of taxes, the payment of taxes, and costs otherwise incurred in order to carry out the authorized purposes of the Community Facilities District; and any other expenses incidental to the construction, completion, and inspection of the Facilities and permitted under the Act.

EXHIBIT B
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO.

A property owner may apply for a Senior Citizen Exemption which would provide an exemption from the special tax for the applicable tax year on dwelling units occupied by senior citizens, if the following conditions are met:
1. The applicant must show evidence that the dwelling unit is owned or rented by a citizen who is at least 65 years of age.
2. The applicant must show evidence of ownership of the property subject to the Exemption.
3. The Senior Citizen Exemption must be applied for annually.
4. If the applicant is a landlord, then he or she must certify that the entire tax exemption will be reflected only in the rent for the exempted dwelling unit(s).

Community Facilities District
BOUNDARIES OF SPECIAL TAX DISTRICT

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THIS ___________ DAY OF ___________, 19_________

RAMON C. CORTINES, CLERK
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE WITHIN MAP SHOWING PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, WAS APPROVED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AT A REGULAR MEETING THEREOF, HELD ON THE 7TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1990, BY ITS RESOLUTION NO. 90-01-01.

RAMON C. CORTINES, CLERK
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

FILED THIS ___________ Day of ___________, 1990, AT THE HOUR OF ___________ O’CLOCK ___________ M. IN BOOK ___________ OF MAPS OF ASSESSMENT AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICTS AT PAGE ___________ IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER IN THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

BRUCE JAMISON
COUNTY RECORDER
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

California government code: TITLE 3 DIVISION 1 CHAPTER 2 ARTICLE 2, 23138 — SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY LIMITS

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER, BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN MATEO, IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN, ON THE EXTENSION OF NORTHERN LINE OF TSS OF MOUNT DIABLO BASE; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG THE PACIFIC COAST, TO ITS POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE WESTERLY EXTENSION OF THE LOW-WATER LINE ON THE NORTHERN SIDE OF THE ENTRANCE TO SAN FRANCISCO BAY, BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MARIN AND NORTH-WEST CORNER OF SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE, EASTERLY, THROUGH POINT BONITA AND POINT CAVALLIO, TO THE MOST SOUTHEASTERN POINT OF ANGELO ISLAND, AND, ALL ON THE LINES OF MARIN, THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG THE EASTERN LINES OF MARIN, TO THE NORTHWEST POINT OF GOLDEN ROCK (ALSO KNOWN AS RED ROCK), BEING A COMMON CORNER OF MARIN, CONTRA COSTA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE SOUTH-EASTERLY, ON THE WESTERN LINE OF ALAMEDA COUNTY TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF TSS, BAY, M.D.B. & M., THENCE WESTERLY ON THE TOWNSHIP LINES AND AN EXTENSION THEREOF TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING. THE ISLANDS KNOWN AS THE PARRALONES (PARRALLONA) ARE A PART OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY.

PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1
OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

KCA ENGINEERS, INC.
CONSULTING CIVIL ENGINEERS

JANUARY 1990
Equipment Lease Financing

PROPOSITION C
Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277
NO 278

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City obtains computers, telephone systems and other equipment by paying for it all at once or by leasing it until it is paid for, which is called "lease financing." The City may not enter into long-term leases for financing equipment unless (1) the voters approve it, or (2) the lease requires the Board of Supervisors to approve the payments each year. When the Board of Supervisors must approve the lease payments each year, interest rates are higher than when the lease payments are not subject to annual approval. Also, interest rates charged by for-profit companies are generally higher than interest rates charged by non-profit corporations.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment. Under Proposition C, the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval, could authorize the lease financing of equipment without the lease payments being subject to annual approval. A non-profit corporation would be created to buy the equipment and would issue tax-exempt debt to pay for it. The City would lease the equipment from the non-profit until it was paid for. The total principal of the debt issued by the non-profit corporation could not be more than $20 million in the first year. This limit on the outstanding principal would increase five percent each year. The Board could approve this type of lease financing only if the Controller certified that the interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

Controller’s Statement on “C”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application, costs could be increased or decreased in presently indeterminate but probably not substantial amounts."

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would allow the City to lease finance needed equipment at the lowest possible interest rates. The City would establish a non-profit corporation, which would buy equipment approved by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors and lease it to City departments.

The charter currently requires the voters to approve lease financing if done through non-profit corporations. Financing through a non-profit is the less expensive method because interest rates are tax-exempt. The City has had to occasionally use the more expensive method because it is not always possible to delay purchasing critical equipment until an election is held.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Saves the City money by allowing current and future leases for equipment to be financed at lower interest rates (currently 6% to 7%) than must now be used with private corporations (ranging 9% to 16%). By simply refinancing existing leases, the City could save over $500,000.

Additional money could be saved on any future leases. Gives the City the option to pay cash for equipment or to finance it expeditiously at a low cost to the City. Allows quicker replacement of inefficient and outdated equipment, which will reduce maintenance costs, decrease downtime, and increase productivity for equipment which has outlived its economic useful life.

Provides restrictions to ensure prudent use of this financing mechanism.

Requires the Controller to certify that the lease is the least costly financing method.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition C
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition C
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

7.309 Voter Approval of Lease Financing

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purposes of this section, "lease financing" occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

1. to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

2. to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

3. to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.

Remember to VOTE on Election Day, Tuesday June 5, 1990.
Your polling place is open from 7:00 in the morning to 8:00 in the evening.
Recycling is not only easier than you might think, it’s a simple way you can do your part for environmental conservation—and feel good about it, too.

All you need is an ordinary brown paper bag.

Each time you set up your kitchen garbage, place an extra brown bag or two out for recycling. Then every day just drop your newspaper into a recycling bag—a week’s worth of papers fits perfectly (and your newspapers will stop piling up on the floor!).

When you’re finished with an aluminum soda or beer can simply pop it in a separate bag. The same goes for bottles; just put them in a bag, labels and all. Then when you’re on the way to the supermarket or heading out for the day, drop off the bags at a Recycling Center near you. Or, you can tie your newspaper with string and the garbage company will collect it free of charge.

That’s it. When you think about it, isn’t recycling almost as easy as not recycling?

And it really is the right thing to do.

For a free Recycling Guide and a list of Recycling Centers near you, call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL
554-6193
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no special City fund to pay for neighborhood beautification projects or graffiti clean-up. Money can be spent for this purpose only when the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors approve it in the City’s budget.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is an ordinance that would create a “Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund” (“the Fund”) to pay for cleaning up graffiti on public buildings and beautifying the neighborhood.

The Chief Administrative Officer would manage the Fund. Businesses could pay up to one percent of their payroll or business taxes into the Fund. Grants or money donated for graffiti clean-up would be deposited in the Fund. The goal of the ordinance is to produce for the Fund $1,000,000 each year, adjusted annually for inflation. The Controller would change the percentage of taxes businesses could pay into the Fund to produce $1,000,000 in the fund each fiscal year.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this fund.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

“Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, General Fund revenues could decrease by as much as $1.4 million in fiscal 1990 and as much as $1 million per year, adjusted for inflation, thereafter.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D asks the voters to make the revitalization of our neighborhoods and the wiping out of graffiti a top city priority without raising taxes.

Proposition D will permit those employers currently eligible in San Francisco to earmark up to 1% of their payroll or gross receipts tax bill to establish The Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

The fund will be used to award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city. The Budget Analyst has estimated that approximately one million dollars would be available every year.

Proposition D creates a unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers to keep our city attractive. It will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting and graffiti clean-up.

Also, Proposition D will fund public information and education campaigns to combat litter, and instill in our youth the old-fashioned virtue of respect for public and private property.

The fund created by Proposition D will be administered by the Chief Administrative Officer with public input from environmental organizations and neighborhood committees.

Proposition D was authored by Supervisor Jim Gonzales and has been submitted to the voters with the support of the Sierra Club, San Francisco Beautiful, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

According to their ballot argument, the Board of Supervisors wants to create a “unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers” to reduce graffiti. What’s stopping them from doing that now?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

The supervisors also say they want to provide “seed money” for planting trees and improving street lighting. Well, why haven’t they placed items in the city budget to do so?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

In their rebuttal argument, the supervisors claim that “many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle.” Whose fault is that, if not their own?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

Finally, the supervisors have the temerity to state: “With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark” funds for graffiti. What would be “fair” is if San Francisco businesses paid lower taxes. But no one should be “earmarking” tax dollars except elected representatives of the people!

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

There’s no question that graffiti is a serious problem demanding serious solutions. But what good is it to divert $1,000,000 a year from other city programs? That’s robbing Peter to pay Paul! It’s bad government!

Why do we need Proposition D? We don’t.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

I know something about graffiti. I wrote the city ordinances prohibiting the sale of spray paint and large, felt-tip pens to minors. I also authored the state law to allow police officers greater latitude in arresting juveniles who deface public transit vehicles. This year, I’m pursuing a bill to revoke for one year the driver’s license of any person convicted of graffiti vandalism.

Proposition D is not about graffiti or “neighborhood beautification”. It’s about diverting millions from the city’s General Fund. It’s about depriving existing city programs of critically needed revenue. Proposition D is a financial shell game.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Proposition D would allow any city business to designate up to 1% of its payroll tax check for deposit in a special fund. According to the supervisors’ Budget Analyst, Proposition D could divert up to $1,440,260 from the General Fund in the program’s first year.

Thereafter, annual diversions would approximate $1,000,000, plus inflation.

That’s over $1,000,000 per year which cannot be spent on police services, fire protection, libraries, and public health.

As you can plainly see from my legislative record, I’m no soft touch when it comes to graffiti prevention and clean-up. But Proposition D is the wrong approach. “Special funds” and “segregated accounts” have no place in our city budget.

Graffiti programs deserve adequate city funding, and the Board of Supervisors and Mayor should move promptly to appropriate such funds in the next regular budgetary cycle.

The voters, meanwhile, should move promptly to reject Proposition D on June 5th!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

---

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We need a city plan that invests in the quality of our neighborhoods . . . Now. It’s obvious laws banning the sale of spray paint and felt pens have done nothing to stop the sprawl of graffiti or create a climate of cooperation between city officials and neighborhood groups to find real solutions.

Proposition D is about beautifying our neighborhoods consistently. Proposition D is about wiping out graffiti permanently. With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark a mere one-hundredth to be poured back into the neighborhoods.

Out of a greater than two billion dollar annual budget, the city can afford a guaranteed million dollars to help keep our city beautiful, clean, and graffiti-free. Year in and year out, many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle. Proposition D will provide a solid foundation for the revitalization of our neighborhoods, which no one can tamper with and that requires no new taxes.

Over the last few years, individual Supervisors have spent many weekends planting trees and removing graffiti with neighborhood groups. Working with groups such as SF ALIVE, San Francisco Conservation Corps, 24th Street Revitalization Committee and the West Portal Merchants Association to make our neighborhoods shine has taught us one thing . . . neighborhood environmentalists and city departments working together as partners will be a winning combination for San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

There is a reason that the San Francisco Beautiful, the Sierra Club and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, along with dozens of neighborhood groups support placing PROPOSITION D on the ballot.

San Franciscans are united in wanting to preserve and enhance our city's attractiveness and keep San Francisco one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

Our Supervisors put PROPOSITION D on the ballot for your approval because they realize that a more attractive city starts with people like you and me and our neighbors who truly care about San Francisco.

YES ON PROPOSITION D creates a working partnership between our neighborhoods and city government;

YES ON PROPOSITION D means a more beautiful city and enhancement of your neighborhood and mine;

YES ON PROPOSITION D accomplishes this with NO NEW TAXES, allowing large employers to earmark up to 1% of their current payroll tax for beautification and graffiti cleanup;

YES ON PROPOSITION D pays for neighborhood-generated projects, giving residents a say in how these reserved funds are spent;

YES ON PROPOSITION D is the first step to guaranteeing more beautiful and attractive neighborhoods.

Join your neighbors, business owners and environmentalists by voting YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Al Pross, Chair
COMMITTEE FOR BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBORHOODS

The quality of life in our neighborhoods will truly become a top city priority with the passage of Proposition D.

- Proposition D will provide over a million dollars a year from the business community to stop neighborhood decay (through a voluntary checkoff on their payroll or gross receipts tax bill).
- Proposition D will award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city.
- Proposition D will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting, and graffiti clean-up.

Let's protect our city's special livability. Let's foster civic pride. Let's invest in the long term health of San Francisco's residential neighborhoods. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Supervisor Jim Gonzales

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

Graffiti is a blight on the beauty of San Francisco. We strongly encourage the continued generosity of grants and donations to eradicate this problem. However, during the current deficit-ridden period, it is irresponsible for the City to direct at least $1,000,000 a year from the General Fund for this purpose.

The San Francisco Republican Party urges you to vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley
William E. Grayson

Anna M. Guth
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"
Why add more government to your taxes.
$1 million per year to be funded from Payroll taxes which has a sunset clause to expire in 1990.
Then who pays the tab? You do.
If the police would assert their powers and nab the violators, instead of the City offering to pay to clean up their "works of art"
this ordinance would not be necessary.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
[Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund]

AN ORDINANCE, ADDING SECTIONS 10.98 AND 10.98-1 TO THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO ESTABLISH A NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND AND SPECIFYING THE PURPOSES THEREFOR AND AMENDING PART III, SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, BY ADDING ARTICLE 12B-1 THERETO, TO PROVIDE THAT ANY BUSINESS WHICH OWES A PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX OR BUSINESS TAX MAY ELECT TO DESIGNATE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE TAX FOR DEPOSIT IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND.

NOTE: All sections are new.

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Sections 10.98 and 10.98-1 thereto, to read as follows: SEC. 10.98. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: FINDINGS AND INTENT.

(a) Findings.

The proliferation of graffiti on public buildings and other public property has created a blight which offends both citizens of and visitors to San Francisco. The removal of such graffiti will enhance the beauty of the city in which we live and will encourage others to visit and to relocate here. Removal will thus both reflect and renew our civic pride and contribute to our economic viability. Providing a source of funds for the promotion of neighborhood beautification projects will support the efforts of local residents and businesses to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and the local economy, and assist in reducing the amount of graffiti in San Francisco.

(b) Statement of Intent.

The Board of Supervisors wishes to address the above concerns by establishing a neighborhood beautification and graffiti clean-up fund which will promote neighborhood beautification projects, including projects designed to improve the environmental quality of neighborhoods, and finance the clean-up of graffiti on public property.

SEC. 10.98-1. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: ESTABLISHMENT, ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS; DUTIES.

(a) Establishment of Fund. There is hereby established a special fund for the purpose of receiving all donations of money which may be collected by the City and County of San Francisco for the purposes enumerated in Section 10.98(b). Monies deposited in the fund shall only be expended for the purposes enumerated therein. The proceeds of such expenditures shall include reimbursement to City and County departments for expenses incurred in the administration of the fund. The special fund shall be known and designated as the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

(b) Acceptance of Gifts. All donations of money which may be offered to the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund are hereby accepted for such purposes. Any grants, gifts and bequests from private sources for this purpose shall be deposited into said special fund.

(c) Duties of the Chief Administrative Officer.

1. The Chief Administrative Officer, or his or her designee, shall be responsible for the administration of the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund, and shall have all such authority as may be reasonably necessary to carry out those responsibilities.

2. The Chief Administrative Officer shall promulgate such rules and regulations as he or she may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Section and Section 10.98. Before issuing or amending any rules and regulations, the Chief Administrative Officer shall provide a thirty (30) day public comment period by providing published notice in an official newspaper of general circulation in the City of the intent to issue or amend the rules and regulations. The rules and regulations shall be approved by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. Such rules and regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the qualifications of applicants and factors to be considered in the award of grants to fund programs to help remove graffiti and promote neighborhood beautification projects, including preference for the following projects: youth programs and innovation, projects that are neighborhood generated, and projects designed to benefit areas of San Francisco that are economically disadvantaged.

3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall submit a semi-annual report to the Board of Supervisors setting forth an accounting of the amounts disbursed and the uses for which said funds were made.

(d) Budgetary and Fiscal Provisions of the Charter. The monies in this fund are subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter and may be expended only when authorized by appropriation ordinance of the Board of Supervisors.

(e) Interest. Interest earned from the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund shall become part of the principal thereof, and shall not be expended for any purpose other than that for which said fund is established.

(f) Accumulation of Monies in Fund. The balance remaining in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Charter Section 6.306 and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said fund for the purposes recited hereinafter.

Section 2. Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code is hereby amended by adding Article 12B-1 thereto, to read as follows:

ART. 12B-1

NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND TAX

OPTION.

SEC. 1030. Initial Option. Commencing in tax year 1990, any business, as defined in Section 1002.1 of this Code, that is subject to the Payroll Expense Tax or the Business Tax may elect to designate up to one per cent (1%) of its tax liability for deposit in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

SEC. 1031. Amount of Fund Annually. It is the intent of the voters of the City and County of San Francisco that one million dollars ($1,000,000.00), derived from tax proceeds designated by the taxpayers pursuant to Section 1031, shall be deposited annually into the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund. The Controller shall annually adjust this figure for inflation to reflect changes in the most recently available U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose Metropolitan Area, or its successor index.

SEC. 1032. Subsequent Option. For each tax year after 1990, the Controller shall determine the amount of fund revenues actually generated in the prior year, including the interest thereon and the balance, if any, remaining at the close of the tax year. On the basis of the prior year's experience of taxpayer contributions and total revenues generated by the payroll expense and business taxes, the Controller shall calculate a percentage ceiling of total tax liability which taxpayers may designate for deposit in the fund the following tax year. The Controller shall set the percentage ceiling so that the revenues produced thereby are most likely to generate a total of one million dollars (adjusted for inflation) in the fund for the forthcoming tax year. The Controller shall transmit his or her calculation to the Board of Supervisors, which shall adopt a new tax designation ceiling, if necessary, in advance of the tax year to enable the Tax Collector to perform his or her collection duties.

SEC. 1033. Severability. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective. In addition, the voters declare their intention that should any portion of this initiative ordinance or all of it be declared invalid in whole or in part, such invalidity shall have no effect upon the continued validity of the Payroll Expense Tax and Business Tax.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PROPOSITION F
Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 284
NO 285

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Fire Commission has the authority to decide the number and staffing of fire companies and the number and location of fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors may change the number of firefighters. The Fire Commission may close or move fire stations or reduce the number of fire companies if it decides they are no longer needed. A fire company typically consists of a fire engine or other emergency vehicle and the firefighters needed to operate it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would specify a minimum number of fire stations and fire companies and minimum levels of staffing for those fire companies. Proposition F would increase the number of firefighters assigned to some types of fire companies. This means that the number of firefighters on duty at all times would increase from 297 to 322. Where necessary, Proposition F’s minimum level of staffing would be met by firefighters working overtime. Overtime pay for firefighters is one and one-half times their normal salary.

Proposition F would limit the power of the Fire Commission, Mayor and Board of Supervisors to set the number of fire stations and staffing levels.

Before closing any fire station or reducing the number of fire companies or units required by Proposition F, the measure would require (1) a recommendation by the Fire Chief; (2) approval by the Fire Commission, after public hearings; (3) approval by the Board of Supervisors; and (4) approval by the voters.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current salary rates and staffing levels of the Fire Department, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $4.9 million per year.”

How “F” Got on the Ballot
On March 2, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition F to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,485* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 21 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 56,364 of the signatures submitted were valid, 15,879 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WHAT IS PROP F?

PROPOSITION F IS A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WILL ESTABLISH A MINIMUM LEVEL OF FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS FOR SAN FRANCISCO. IT GIVES THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE FIRE CHIEF THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MANAGE THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITIZENS.

SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT BECAUSE IT WILL:

1. GUARANTEE THAT THE PRESENT 41 FIRE STATIONS STAY OPEN
2. GUARANTEE FULLY-STAFFED FIRE TRUCKS AT ALL TIMES
3. GUARANTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BEFORE ANY FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED
4. GUARANTEE THAT YOUR FIREBOAT WILL BE STAFFED WITH A FIREFIGHTING CREW OF TWO

THE 7.1 QUAKE OF OCTOBER 17 WARNED US AGAIN — WE MUST BE PREPARED!

ITEM A — MAYOR AGNOS CUT THE FIRE DEPART-

MENT ON-DUTY STAFFING BY 19 PERSONS A DAY IN 1989.

PROP F RESTORES THOSE CUTS.


ITEM C — PROP F DOES NOT REQUIRE "GUARANTEED OVERTIME" AND, IN FACT, BY JULY 1992 NO OVERTIME WILL BE NEEDED FOR THE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS OF PROP F.

Overtime is now caused by large numbers of vacant positions, new hiring will eliminate all vacancies and overtime by July 1992. Prop F will safeguard this full-staffing.

PROP F IS A COMMON SENSE MEASURE TO GIVE ADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION TO ALL CITIZENS.

VOTE YES ON F!

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F;
COMMITTEE FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

It is clear that Proposition F is not a Fire Safety Issue.

It is clearly an issue to guarantee overtime.

1. This Mayor and Board of Supervisors have never closed a single fire station and have no intention to close firehouses.

2. Most major cities in America considers five firefighters per truck to be fully-staffed. More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire.

3. Proposition F will not restore cuts in firefighters. We are mandated by law to provide 90 new firefighters this year. Proposition F only guarantees overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day, $3.5 million per year.

Our firefighters do a tough job! But we compensate them well! We need new equipment — not more overtime. Following the earthquake, a fire truck had to be taken from the fire museum to fight fires. Let's not waste money which could be used for new firefighting equipment.

San Francisco voters rejected a similar proposal in 1987 and it should be rejected again in 1990.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will waste millions of your tax dollars. Just look at the facts.
Fact: Proposition F does not hire new firefighters. The Federal Consent Decree already sets hiring standards — 90 new firefighters will be hired this year without Prop. F.
Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that Assistant Chiefs and Battalion Chiefs will continue to have chauffeurs.
Fact: Proposition F is not needed to save fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors have no intention of closing any fire stations.
Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that 18 current firefighters will get daily time-and-a-half overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day . . . or more than $3.5 million extra per year.
Fact: Proposition F is not a fire safety issue. Virtually every major American city deploys five or fewer firefighters on fire trucks. A sixth firefighter is featherbedding, not firefighting.
More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire. That’s enough people to raise ladders, ventilate rooftops and carry out lifesaving tasks.
FACT: Our firefighters do a tough job. But they are well compensated already and do not need additional guaranteed overtime . . . especially when there are so many other pressing needs in San Francisco.
FACT: Firefighters in San Francisco are currently paid $300 more per month than the average salaries of firefighters in the four largest California cities. But the other firefighters work 15 percent more hours than San Francisco.
FACT: San Francisco firefighters already receive 23 percent more vacation, sick and holiday leave than other city workers. A recent study by the Controller shows that increased overtime results in increased sick leave and disability.
Study the facts and you’ll agree. Proposition F is nothing more than $7 million per year in unnecessary guaranteed overtime.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

FACT: PROP F does:
• Guarantee that the 90 new firefighters cannot later be eliminated by politicians.
• Require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people before cutbacks can be made to the minimum staffing.
FACT: The Mayor DID cut back Fire Department staffing in August 1989 from 315 to 296.
FACT: Assistant and Battalion Chiefs DO NOT have “chauffeurs.” They DO have an operations and communications assistant.
FACT: Prop F IS needed to guarantee public review and input before any fire station can be closed.
FACT: SIX fire stations have been closed by the Mayor’s office since 1972 without any public review.
FACT: Prop F DOES guarantee that the 19 on-duty firefighters cut by the Mayor in 1989 will be restored. When sufficient new firefighters are hired, NO OVERTIME will be required.
FACT: PROP F IS A FIRE SAFETY ISSUE!
FACT: San Francisco firefighters ARE REQUIRED to work overtime because previous policies of politicians allowed large numbers of vacant positions to occur.
FACT: San Francisco firefighters DO NOT get a paid health plan for dependents, nor do they get longevity pay or other benefits enjoyed by firefighters in the four largest California cities.
FACT: ALL city employees, including firefighters, receive EXACTLY THE SAME vacation, sick and holiday leave. This is a city Charter requirement.

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON
PROPOSITION F
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

I STRONGLY SUPPORT PROP F!

Prop F will benefit all the people of San Francisco. Over 71,000 voters from every part of the City signed the petition to put Prop F on the ballot. They expressed enthusiastic support for a stronger Fire Department.

The City is becoming increasingly built-up, causing greater congestion. This means that fire hazards are increasing and adequate fire protection will be even more important to us than ever.

The October 17th earthquake was an urgent reminder of how fragile our city is and how important our Fire Department is to all of us.

When you, the people, call for help, whether it is for a medical emergency, a rescue, or fire, the firefighters come.

PROF F MAKES SENSE FOR ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

It allows you to participate in fire safety decisions that affect your neighborhood.

Our neighborhoods are the “heart” of San Francisco. OUR FAMILIES, HOMES, CHURCHES, FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS NEED SATISFACTORY FIRE PROTECTION.

PROP F WILL MAKE SAN FRANCISCO A SAFER PLACE TO LIVE IN.

VOTE YES ON F!

Bill Maher, Member
Board of Supervisors

---

I STRONGLY SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!

They provide vital services to our citizens. Last year, our firefighters answered a record-breaking 58,000 alarms and saved thousands of lives. The greatest number of calls came from the Tenderloin, the Inner Mission, the Fillmore, Civic Center/Hayes Valley, Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley. I WANT TO BE SURE YOU GET THE HELP YOU NEED — WHEN YOU NEED IT!

Over the past 20 years, unlike other city departments, Fire Department staffing has been slashed by 40%! THREE FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT AGREE THAT THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY ARE TOO FEW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS! THEY AGREE THAT NO MORE FIREFHOUSES SHOULD BE CLOSED.

We NEED Proposition F. It will:
• Put firefighters back on the ladder trucks
• Put firefighters back on our fireboat
• Bring daily staffing up to an adequate level
• Guarantee that any proposed closings of fire companies will be subject to a public review and vote by the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people
• Guarantee the SFFD the funding it needs

THE COST OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT IS ONLY 2 CENTS A DAY FOR EACH OF US! That 2 cents could easily save a life — maybe yours, or that of a loved one. PROP. F WILL BENEFIT ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

---

I STRONGLY SUPPORT IMPROVED FIRE PROTECTION IN SAN FRANCISCO!

I SHARE THE CONCERNS OF THE 71,000 VOTERS WHO PUT THIS PROPOSITION ON THE BALLOT. Fire Department daily staffing has been forced so low that our safety is threatened. WE MUST KEEP OUR FIREFHOUSES OPEN AND FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED.

In addition to fighting fires, our firefighters perform many services for our elderly, disabled and low income families that no one else does. FIREFIGHTERS RESPONDED TO OVER 58,000 EMERGENCIES LAST YEAR, INCLUDING 26,000 MEDICAL CALLS.

We depend on our firefighters to protect our families, homes, and businesses. Our narrow streets, steep hills and rows of wood frame buildings make firefighting very difficult. SAN FRANCISCO HAS SPECIAL FIREFIGHTING AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL NEEDS! We are different from other California cities with their wide streets, flat terrain and detached buildings!

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING FOR PROPOSITION F. THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL BENEFIT ALL OUR CITIZENS.

WENDY NELDER, Member
Board of Supervisors

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

STOP REDUCTIONS IN CITY FIRE PROTECTION! VOTE YES ON F!

Over 71,000 San Francisco voters from every neighborhood, ethnic group and economic level joined to put PROPOSITION F on the ballot. They are concerned because politicians have reduced daily staffing to a dangerous all-time low while emergency calls reached an all-time high of 58,000 last year. People want their neighborhood firehouses to stay open and their fire engines, aerial ladder trucks and fireboat fully staffed to meet their emergency needs. They want a Charter amendment to take politics out of fire safety decisions.

Remember October 17? We learned that we need a strong Fire Department to fight fires, perform rescues and coordinate civilian volunteers. When both bridges are down, we need a strong SFFD!

THIS IS A COMMON SENSE PROPOSITION — IT IS SUPPORTED BY 3 FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT!

Join your friends and neighbors! VOTE YES ON F!

John L. Molinari
Former member of the Board of Supervisors

ONLY YOU CAN STOP FURTHER DANGEROUS CUTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

Over the years, the San Francisco Fire Department has assisted hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans in time of great personal need. The people understand how important the SFFD is in their lives, and OVER 71,000 OF THEM SIGNED THE PETITION TO PLACE PROPOSITION F ON THE BALLOT. The citizens want to be heard!

SFFD EMERGENCY RESPONSES ARE INCREASING DRAMATICALLY EVERY YEAR! Fiscal year totals have gone from 28,000 in 1970 to over 58,000 in 1989, while politicians have slashed daily on-duty staffing from 482, when I was Fire Chief, to today's all-time low of 296. Department resources are being stretched thinner and thinner despite greater and greater needs. THIS DANGEROUS TREND MUST BE STOPPED!

The Department must be able to meet the complex and highly varied needs of today's San Francisco. These include fighting structural fires, providing medical assistance, performing cliff and water rescues, responding to BART and MUNI fires and accidents, controlling hazardous materials emergencies, assisting victims of industrial accidents, and responding to many other emergency needs.

Many seniors, low income families and handicapped people rely on the SFFD to help them. THE PERSONAL ATTENTION THAT THE SFFD PROVIDES CAN NEVER BE CONVERTED TO SELF-SERVICE OR AUTOMATED! Firefighters, now machines, put out fires, perform rescues and meet all the other emergency needs of our city. You need these firefighters! THE NEXT CALL HELP MAY BE YOURS!

The need for Fire Department services crosses all social, ethnic and economic strata. We can all get behind this quality of life issue. Proposition F will strengthen your Fire Department and take politics out of fire safety.

William F. Murray
Chief of Department, SFFD, Retired

VOTE YES ON PROP F!

It takes teamwork to put out a fire. Without it, lives and property can be lost. Without it, firefighters can pay a hard price, for their lives, when in danger, may depend on having a buddy to lend a hand or go for help. As much a part of their job as hose, ladders, and water is that firefighters work in pairs when possible. It can be critical where dense smoke obscures vision or — as so many San Francisco neighborhoods well know — when trying to maneuver on a steeply pitched roof.

Current staffing of aerial ladder trucks leaves one firefighter without a buddy, the team short one vital hand. Proposition F will restore the balance that a fire — and time-tested system needs.

It also will mean two firefighters ready to move out with the fireboat when it has a job to do. Because they weren’t readily available, the fireboat was delayed in pumping bay water to put out the disastrous Marina fire after last October’s earthquake.

That’s why I’m voting “Yes” on Prop F and am urging all San Franciscans to do the same.

Edward J. Phipps
Chief of Department, SFFD (Retired)

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

I STRONGLY SUPPORT PROP F!

Prop F will benefit all the people of San Francisco. Over 71,000 voters from every part of the City signed the petition to put Prop F on the ballot. They expressed enthusiastic support for a stronger Fire Department.

The City is becoming increasingly built-up, causing greater congestion. This means that fire hazards are increasing and adequate fire protection will be even more important to us than ever.

The October 17th earthquake was an urgent reminder of how fragile our city is and how important our Fire Department is to all of us.

When you, the people, call for help, whether it is for a medical emergency, a rescue, or fire, the firefighters come.

PROP F MAKES SENSE FOR ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

It allows you to participate in fire safety decisions that affect your neighborhood.

Our neighborhoods are the “heart” of San Francisco. OUR FAMILIES, HOMES, CHURCHES, FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS NEED Satisfactory Fire Protection.

PROP F WILL MAKE SAN FRANCISCO A SAFER PLACE TO LIVE IN.

VOTE YES ON F!

Bill Maher, Member
Board of Supervisors

I STRONGLY SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!

They provide vital services to our citizens. Last year, our firefighters answered a record-breaking 58,000 alarms and saved thousands of lives. The greatest number of calls came from the Tenderloin, the Inner Mission, the Fillmore, Civic Center/Hayes Valley, Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley. I WANT TO BE SURE YOU GET THE HELP YOU NEED — WHEN YOU NEED IT!

Over the past 20 years, unlike other city departments, Fire Department staffing has been slashed by 40%! THREE FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT AGREE THAT THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY ARE TOO FEW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS! THEY AGREE THAT NO MORE FIREHOUSES SHOULD BE CLOSED.

We NEED Proposition F. It will:
• Put firefighters back on the ladder trucks
• Put firefighters back on our fireboat
• Bring daily staffing up to an adequate level
• Guarantee that any proposed closings of fire companies will be subject to a public review and vote by the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people
• Guarantee the SFFD the funding it needs

THE COST OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT IS ONLY 2 CENTS A DAY FOR EACH OF US! That 2 cents could easily save a life — maybe yours, or that of a loved one. PROP. F WILL BENEFIT ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

I STRONGLY SUPPORT IMPROVED FIRE PROTECTION IN SAN FRANCISCO!

I SHARE THE CONCERNS OF THE 71,000 VOTERS WHO PUT THIS PROPOSITION ON THE BALLOT. Fire Department daily staffing has been forced so low that our safety is threatened. WE MUST KEEP OUR FIREHOUSES OPEN AND FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED.

In addition to fighting fires, our firefighters perform many services for our elderly, disabled and low income families that no one else does. FIREFIGHTERS RESPONDED TO OVER 58,000 EMERGENCIES LAST YEAR, INCLUDING 26,000 MEDICAL CALLS.

We depend on our firefighters to protect our families, homes, and businesses. Our narrow streets, steep hills and rows of wood frame buildings make firefighting very difficult. SAN FRANCISCO HAS SPECIAL FIREFIGHTING AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL NEEDS! We are different from other California cities with their wide streets, flat terrain and detached buildings.

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING FOR PROPOSITION F. THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL BENEFIT ALL OUR CITIZENS.

WENDY NELDER, Member
Board of Supervisors

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

STOP REDUCTIONS IN CITY FIRE PROTECTION! VOTE YES ON F!

Over 71,000 San Francisco voters from every neighborhood, ethnic group and economic level joined to put PROPOSITION F on this ballot. They are concerned because politicians have reduced daily staffing to a dangerous all-time low while emergency calls reached an all-time high of 58,000 last year. People want their neighborhood firehouses to stay open and their fire engines, aerial ladder trucks and fireboats fully staffed to meet their emergency needs. They want a Charter amendment to take politics out of fire safety decisions.

Remember October 17? We learned that we need a strong Fire Department to fight fires, perform rescues and coordinate civilian volunteers. When both bridges are down, we need a strong SFFD!

THIS IS A COMMON SENSE PROPOSITION — IT IS SUPPORTED BY 3 FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT!

Join your friends and neighbors! VOTE YES ON F!

John L. Molinari
Former member of the Board of Supervisors

ONLY YOU CAN STOP FURTHER DANGEROUS CUTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

Over the years, the San Francisco Fire Department has assisted hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans in time of great personal need. The people understand how important the SFFD is in their lives, and OVER 71,000 OF THEM SIGNED THE PETITION TO PLACE PROPOSITION F ON THE BALLOT. The citizens want to be heard!

SFFD EMERGENCY RESPONSES ARE INCREASING DRAMATICALLY EVERY YEAR! Fiscal year totals have gone from 28,000 in 1970 to over 58,000 in 1989, while politicians have slashed daily on-duty staffing from 482, when I was Fire Chief, to today's all-time low of 296. Department resources are being stretched thinner and thinner despite greater and greater needs. THIS DANGEROUS TREND MUST BE STOPPED!

The Department must be able to meet the complex and highly varied needs of today's San Francisco. Those include fighting structural fires, providing medical assistance, performing cliff and water rescues, responding to BART and MUNI fires and accidents, controlling hazardous materials emergencies, assisting victims of industrial accidents, and responding to many other emergency needs.

Many seniors, low income families and handicapped people rely on the SFFD to help them. THE PERSONAL ATTENTION THAT THE SFFD PROVIDES CAN NEVER BE CONVERTED TO SELF-SERVICE OR AUTOMATED! Firefighters, not machines, put out fires, perform rescues and meet all the other emergency needs of our city. You need these firefighters! THE NEXT CALL HELP MAY BE YOURS!

The need for Fire Department services crosses all social, ethnic and economic strata. We can all get behind this quality of life issue. Proposition F will strengthen your Fire Department and take politics out of fire safety.

William F. Murray
Chief of Department, SFFD, Retired

VOTE YES ON PROP F!

It takes teamwork to put out a fire. Without it, lives and property can be lost. Without it, firefighters can pay a hard price, for their lives, when in danger, may depend on having a buddy to lend a hand or go for help. As much a part of their job as hose, ladders, and water is that firefighters work in pairs when possible. It can be critical where dense smoke obscures vision or — as so many San Francisco neighborhoods well know — when trying to maneuver on a steeply pitched roof.

Current staffing of aerial ladder trucks leaves one firefighter without a buddy, the team short one vital hand. Proposition F will restore the balance that a fire — and time-tested system needs.

It also will mean two firefighters ready to move out with the fireboat when it has a job to do. Because they weren't readily available, the fireboat was delayed in pumping bay water to put out the disastrous Marina fire after last October's earthquake.

That's why I'm voting "Yes" on Prop F and am urging all San Franciscans to do the same.

Edward J. Phipps
Chief of Department, SFFD (Retired)

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

I OWE MY LIFE TO THE QUICK AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS STATIONED AT MY LOCAL FIREHOUSE
Over 26,000 San Franciscans received emergency medical assistance last year by the SFFD. Many lives were saved because firefighters were on the scene in 3 minutes or less. The neighborhood firehouse is an essential part of San Francisco’s complex fire protection system.
The October 17th earthquake and the great Marina fire showed us how vital it is to have our Fire Department maintained at an adequate level. There were no firefighters on board the Fireboat Phoenix when it arrived in the Marina, and for over 1 1/2 hours firefighting and search and rescue operations were hindered by a lack of firefighters, as well as by a lack of water. UNDERSTAFFING CAN CAUSE FIRE DEATHS.
Proposition F will answer these critical needs by restoring funds for adequate staffing of fire companies, including the fireboat, and it will require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission and Board of Supervisors before any further cutbacks in fire protection can be made.
PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING YES ON F!
John Barbagelata

PENNY-POWER! LOOK — HOW CAN YOU BUY SOMETHING PRICELESS FOR ONLY PENNIES A DAY?
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F!
FOR ONLY 2 CENTS PER DAY, YOU WILL:
• KEEP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIREHOUSE OPEN
• KEEP FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED
• KEEP YOUR FIREBOAT IN SERVICE AND STAFFED WITH FIREFIGHTERS
• GUARANTEE THAT NO FIREHOUSES OR FIRE COMPANIES WILL BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT
• REMOVE POLITICS FROM FIRE SAFETY
THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL COST EACH OF SAN FRANCISCO’S 732,000 RESIDENTS JUST PENNIES A DAY:
YEAR 1 — COST $5.3 MILLION = 2 CENTS PER DAY!
YEAR 2 — COST $2.8 MILLION = 1 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 3 — COST $0.8 MILLION = 1/2 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 4 — NO ADDITIONAL COST!
THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE POLICY YOU WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON’T MISS THE CHANCE!
VOTE YES ON F!
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

WE STRONGLY SUPPORT PROPOSITION F!
No one worries more about costs than working people. For their hard-earned dollars, breadwinners demand value in return.
Value is what Proposition F is all about. It restores adequate staffing of engine and ladder truck companies, staffs the fireboat, and assures that you and I will have a voice in any proposed closing of a fire company or firehouse.
Proposition F is an insurance policy that is clearly a benefit to all San Franciscans. And, there is no question that the benefits greatly exceed the cost — to each of us, just 2 cents a day for the first year, 1 cent a day for the second year, and no cost thereafter.
Without adequate fire protection, San Francisco has too much to lose.
VOTE YES ON F!
Walter L. Johnson
San Francisco Labor Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
THEY PROVIDE ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL SERVICES FOR OUR CITIZENS, AND NO ONE ELSE CAN DO THEIR JOB! We have 500 high rise buildings, BART and MUNI tunnels, and large business, school and hospital complexes where firefighting requires many firefighters.

On October 17, we were lucky! It was just a warning.
THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY IS TOO LOW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS!
Let's all get behind Proposition F! It will assure stability in Department funding, guarantee adequate staffing for our houses and apparatus, and permit long-range planning and improvements. Our firefighters need your vote!

James A. Hood
Chairman
San Franciscans for Fire Safety

VOTE YES ON F!
SAN FRANCISCO IS A FRAGILE CITY. OVER 90% OF ALL STRUCTURES ARE OF WOOD FRAME CONSTRUCTION. YOUR HOMES ARE BUILT IN SOLID BLOCKS OF WOODEN BUILDINGS. THIS SITUATION PRESENTS THE POSSIBILITY OF A DISASTEROUS FIRE OR CONFLAGRATION OCCURRING, ESPECIALLY FOLLOWING AN EARTHQUAKE.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS THE LIFELINE FOR ALL OF US WHO LIVE IN THIS CITY. THE EARTHQUAKE ON OCTOBER 17TH AND THE GREAT FIRE IN THE MARINA SHOW HOW IMPORTANT THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS TO SAN FRANCISCO.

POLITICIANS ARE USING SHRILL RHETORIC AND OTHER OFFENSIVE TACTICS IN AN ATTEMPT TO MISLEAD THE PUBLIC AS TO WHAT THE REAL MEANING OF PROP F IS. DO NOT BE MISLED! PROP F PROVIDES THREE MAIN POINTS:

VOTE YES ON F:
Fire protection is vital for our families and businesses.
Prop F will stabilize protection and prevent further cuts in the Fire Department.
Protect our city. Vote Yes on F.

- ESTABLISHES THE PRESENT 41 NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS AS A MINIMUM STANDARD
- PUTS A FIREFIGHTING CREW ON THE FIREBOAT
- REQUIRES PUBLIC HEARINGS AND APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE CITIZENS BEFORE A FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED.

THESE ARE COMMON SENSE MEASURES THAT PROVIDE A MINIMUM LEVEL OF PUBLIC SAFETY FOR OUR FAMILIES AND CITY.

PLEASE JOIN ME, AND THE 70,000 OTHER SAN FRANCISCANS WHO SIGNED THE PETITIONS TO PUT PROP F ON THE BALLOT, AND VOTE YES ON "F!"

FRANK T. BLACKBURN
ASSISTANT FIRE CHIEF

Robt. E. Donohue
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
Charles D. Cresci
Deputy Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Charles H. Lee
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)

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

DON'T TAKE YOUR FIREFIGHTERS FOR GRANTED!
San Francisco firefighters answered a record 58,000 calls for help last year. Of those, 26,000 were for medical emergencies. Heart attacks, auto accidents, building collapses, childbirths were just a few. BUT EVERY YEAR THERE ARE FEWER AND FEWER FIREFIGHTERS TO HELP YOU! In 1970 there were 482 firefighters on duty each day — in 1990 there are only 296! Six firehouses and 12 fire companies have been closed.

FIRE SAFETY DECISIONS MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE HANDS OF POLITICIANS! Only a Charter amendment will assure that your Fire Department is adequately staffed to meet San Francisco's special needs — now and in the future. FOR JUST 2 CENTS A DAY, WE CAN KEEP OUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS OPEN AND OUR FIRE APPARATUS ADE-QUATELY STAFFED.

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE WE WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON'T MISS THE CHANCE! VOTE YES ON F!

Walter G. Jabe
John J. Figone
Caesar A. Churchwell
Alessandro Baccari
Virgil Caselli
Marsha Garland
Tom Creedon
Ed Farrah
Michael Salarno

NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS

Pride, trust, reliance. They're all wrapped up in a San Francisco institution. The neighborhood fire station turns out to be more — it's a rock, an anchor, a point of reference in people's lives.

City residents have said so loud and clear in endorsing Proposition F. Besides setting a minimum number of firefighters to be on duty each day, the June ballot measure guarantees a public hearing in the area concerned and a vote of the people, if needed, before any fire station may be closed.

Seventy thousand people petitioned to put F on the ballot. Their reasons all had a common core. It's not THE fire station but OUR fire station, they said — a place to expect and get help in a fire or medical emergency, a place the local community can turn to and rely on if the earth shakes, buildings fall, and other resources break down.

Neighborhoods and fire stations. The one requires the other, San Franciscans say.

John W. Flaherty
Mark L. Kaplan
Robert L. Barisone
Elvera Jane Barisone
William A. Roberts Jr.
Maureen Porter
William Porter Jr.
Homer G. Miles
Dorothy L. Miles
Peter C. Gardner
Joan M. Gardner
John Daly
Lucia R. Flaherty
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T BE MISLED BY MAYOR AGNOS!
PROP F IS A LIFE AND DEATH ISSUE!
FIRE, INSURANCE AND EARTHQUAKE EXPERTS AGREE: SAN FRANCISCO FACES THE HIGHEST RISK OF CONFLAGRATION OF ANY CITY IN THE UNITED STATES! FIRE RISK IS HIGHER THAN IN 1906!
SAN FRANCISCO'S FIRE PROTECTION NEEDS ARE DICTATED BY THE NATURE OF OUR CITY, with its:
• Blocks and blocks of adjoining wood frame buildings
• Steep hills
• Narrow streets
• Traffic congestion
• Network of overhead electrical, trolley and telephone lines
• Prevailing winds
• 500 high rise buildings
• High density residential areas
• Large population of seniors and low-income families
• High vulnerability to severe earthquake damage
• Isolation from outside help in time of disaster
SAN FRANCISCO IS IN TROUBLE BECAUSE THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY. Former SF Fire Chief Emmet Condon in his book "Denial of Disaster": "THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT IS BELOW THE DAILY MANNING LEVEL THAT ANY EXPERIENCED CHIEF OFFICER KNOWS IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SERVICE TO THE CITY." Condon continues:
"I WOULD AGREE THAT THE HAZARD OF FIRE TO THE CITY AFTER A SIMILAR DISASTER TODAY IS MUCH GREATER THAN IN 1906." And,
"SYNTHETIC MATERIALS HAVE GREATLY INCREASED THE FIRE RISK IN MODERN BUILDINGS AND WILL MAGNIFY THE FIRE PROBLEM IN THE MULTIPLE FIRES THAT WILL BREAK OUT AFTER A SERIOUS EARTHQUAKE."
At least 400 of the city's 500 high rise buildings do not have modern life-safety systems! HIGH RISE FIRES CAUSE A HUGE DRAIN ON FIRE DEPARTMENT RESOURCES.
PROP F IS STRONGLY SUPPORTED BY INDIVIDUALS, CITIZEN, BUSINESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS, FIRE SAFETY EXPERTS, AND A BROAD SPECTRUM OF KNOWLEDGEABLE CIVIC LEADERS.
There is no significant opposition to Prop F. PROTECT YOURSELF, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR FRIENDS — YOU HAVE A LOT TO LOSE! VOTE YES ON F!

GERRY LONG
Concerned Citizen

WHY VOTE YES ON F? WHY A CHARTER AMENDMENT?
City politicians have been consistently unresponsive to your fire safety concerns. It is the duty of the City to provide its citizens with adequate fire protection and earthquake preparedness. Instead, Fire Department staffing has been cut to a dangerous level.
The politicians say, "TRUST US!"
We can see that this has not worked, and a Charter provision is necessary. YOUR EMERGENCY NEEDS ARE TOO VITAL TO BE LEFT VULNERABLE TO POLITICAL GAMES.
You hear the sirens every day — BUT HAVE YOU COUNTED

THE FIREFIGHTERS? Fewer firefighters means greatly reduced firefighting capacity. FIRE DEPARTMENT STAFFING IS NOW AT AN ALL-TIME LOW AND CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO FALL FURTHER!
WE NEED A STRONG FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

John Flaherty
Battalion Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Past President, S.F. Fire Chiefs Assn.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

HIGH RISE BUILDINGS AND BART AND MUNI UNDERGROUND FACILITIES MAKE SPECIAL FIRE PROTECTION DEMANDS

Today, San Francisco has over 500 high rise buildings. Fires in these buildings require many firefighters because equipment must be carried by hand to the fire — often up many flights of stairs.

In 1988 in Los Angeles, a fire on three floors of a high rise building required 383 firefighters to bring it under control. In San Francisco, our entire on-duty force would be required, leaving the rest of the city completely unprotected. Mutual aid from neighboring communities would be totally inadequate to cover our needs.

BART and MUNI underground facilities present special fire and rescue problems. Large numbers of firefighters are required to fight these fires and perform rescue and evacuation operations.

In July 1989, Mayor Agnos forced reductions in truck company staffing — the key players in rescue and ventilation operations. Now these aerial ladder teams can no longer function properly.

Building ventilation is delayed, greatly increasing the risk of deadly backdrafts.

The Department's daily staffing has fallen to 296 firefighters, the lowest in history, while fire, medical and other emergencies are higher than ever. Proposition F will bring SFFD staffing up to 320. This is critically needed to meet these ever-increasing demands.

In the past, some Fire Chiefs have thought that you could safely relocate or close a firehouse, but I now recognize that this is dangerous. The SFFD can now get to most emergencies within 3 minutes, but if we close a firehouse we lose that prompt response. With our rows of wood buildings, our large population of elderly citizens, we must get there quickly.

The SFFD is your lifeline. Protect it! I strongly urge all citizens to vote YES on F!

James P. Olson, President
San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

Any firefighter responsible for any racist act or statement on duty, after due process, should be disciplined. Repeat occurrences must result in severe penalties.

Expensive overtime can be largely eliminated by adding more firefighters.

Differences between the union and the mayor should be resolved through good faith negotiations, not through the election process. Maintaining high morale is the only way to insure efficiency.

The neighborhood service cuts need to be restored.
Vote YES on F.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Becoming a victim in another major earthquake or runaway fire in one of San Francisco's densely populated neighborhoods continues to be a hazard for all of us.

Nonetheless, because the Firefighters Union did not endorse him, Mayor Agnos has seen fit to reduce the staffing levels of the Fire Department in any twenty-four hour period from 315 to 296. The San Francisco Republican Party believes these cuts are penny-wise, pound-foolish, and politically motivated.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. DO NOT let the Mayor's political vendetta jeopardize public safety.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkeley

William E. Grayson
Anna M. Gauth
Tina H. Frank
Christopher L. Bowman
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition F. This proposition, if passed, will require twenty-five extra firefighters to be hired each day — five of these firefighters will have no specific functions — their daily assignment will be at the discretion of the Chief of Department. It will also require that daily truck staffing be increased from five to six persons and the fireboat staffing be increased by another two firefighters daily. These increases are unnecessary and are not required — fire suppression units are now staffed to provide effective and efficient fire service for San Francisco.

Proposition F will take management control and responsibility away from the Chief of Department by requiring organizational changes to be approved by the voters at a regular election. This would not allow the Chief, through the Fire Commission, to respond to the changing demands placed on the Fire Department. Fire protection decisions can’t wait until an election. To provide for and maintain the most cost effective and efficient fire department, I urge you to vote NO on Proposition F.

Frederick F. Postel  
Chief of Department

Overtime pay is bleeding the Fire Department’s budget dry! Over 92 percent of the budget goes for personnel costs. In 1988-89 uniformed personnel were paid salaries totaling $53,567,000 plus mandatory fringe benefits of $53,543,000 and still another $11,893,000 for overtime!

Proposition F would increase that bleeding by creating new positions not necessary for the safety of San Franciscans despite the scare statements made by the firefighters’ union.

Proposition F would cost $4,900,000 in overtime thereby siphoning away money needed to make major improvements.

We already have excellent protection but we want to upgrade it by developing a comprehensive earthquake program, by improving our response to emergency medical calls (over 4 1/2 times the number of fires) and by purchasing more modern fire equipment.

During the October quake 522 off-duty firefighters reported back immediately yet there were not enough engines and trucks for them; in fact, one old piece had to be taken out of the Fire Museum to help fight the Marina District fire.

Our firefighters work nine days out of 31 in shifts of approximately 24 hours on and 48 off. Many are “double-dippers” holding down well paid outside jobs such as contractors, lawyers, plumbers and electricians. They still put in overtime because the Charter provides for such generous pay.

Overtime pay for a firefighter is $585 per shift, for a Captain $776 and for an Assistant Chief $1077! Last year the average firefighter’s cost to the City was $90,000, including salary, fringe benefits and overtime.

Do not pay out more money just for overtime. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

James Jefferson  
President, Fire Commission

Frank Quinn  
Vice-President, Fire Commission

Henry Berman  
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Sharon Brets  
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Ted Soulis  
Commissioner, Fire Commission

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

San Francisco has the finest fire protection in California. Now is not the time to jeopardize it with Proposition F. **Proposition F is an ill-advised and wasteful measure.** First, it would wrest management of the Fire Department away from the Fire Commission and the Chief, where management properly and historically belongs.

Management of the Fire Department should remain accountable to the citizens of San Francisco, through its appointed Fire Commission. This principle is violated when rigid language is placed in the Charter.

Second, Proposition F would unnecessarily increase the Fire Department’s budget by approximately $4.9 million a year.

The San Francisco Fire Department already has staffing levels on its fire engines and aerial ladder trucks that are equal to the best in California.

To overstaff the engines and trucks would be counterproductive as well as wasteful, especially in a time of limited resources and ever-increasing demands for City services.

Let life and death decisions of fire protection in San Francisco remain in the control of the Fire Commission and the Chief.

Let the buck stop where it has always stopped — with the Fire Commission and the Chief. And let San Francisco’s first-rate fire protection continue.

We can’t afford to play around with fire, or with Proposition F. A similar Proposition was defeated in November, 1987.

Vote NO on this Proposition in 1990.

Vote NO on Proposition F.

James D. Jefferson
President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Souls
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Vote No on Proposition F.

Proposition F has little to do with fire protection and earthquake preparedness and a lot to do with unnecessary Fire Department staffing.

Vote No on Proposition F. Don’t tie the hands of the Chief and Fire Commission, preventing them from managing the department and our tax dollars. Proposition F will take $6 million a year from health services, libraries, homeless programs and other vital city services. Why? Because Proposition F will require the city to pay more overtime to firefighters who already receive higher salaries than those in Los Angeles, San Jose, Long Beach or San Diego.

Employment of unnecessary personnel is called “featherbedding.” Proposition F is just that — at a cost of $6 million.

San Francisco has the best fire protection services in the country. We already pay more per person for that service than any other city in California.

Stop a $6 million raid on the City Treasury. Vote No on Proposition F.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Like all San Franciscans, we want a safe and healthy city. But Proposition F could jeopardize our safety and health.

By spending more than $7 million on unnecessary overtime, Proposition F will take money away from other vital services like fire equipment, police protection, health care and children’s programs.

The annual fire department budget is already $150 million. Firefighters are already getting a pay raise of almost 10%. That’s more than most city workers — and most of us.

San Francisco already has more firefighters per thousand residents than any other major Western city.

Yet San Francisco has fewer fire and emergency alarms than other cities. In 1986, San Francisco had 78,000 emergency calls.

Oakland had 95,000.

We appreciate the job that our firefighters do. But we cannot support this multi-million dollar attempt to win back overtime for just 18 firefighters per day.

Susan J. Bierman
Agar Jaicks
Mauri Schwartz
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Sunset Democratic Club
Margaret Brodkin, Director Coleman Advocates for Children
Carole Migden, chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

I respect and admire the work done by San Francisco’s firefighters.

It’s a dangerous job.

That’s why they’re paid more than firefighters in any other large city in California, even though our firefighters work 15 percent fewer hours.

But today our average cost per firefighter has hit $96,000 per year.

We have been reducing this amount — and improving fire service at the same time — by hiring more new firefighters and reducing costly overtime payments.

That overtime runs as much as $585 per day for a fourth-year firefighter, and up to $1077 per day at the higher ranks.

When they argue for Proposition F, the union avoids mentioning this fact. They raise a false alarm about closing down firehouses, when in reality we are adding new firefighters as quickly as we can train them.

Ninety new firefighters are being hired this year alone. We have full classes in the Fire Academy for the first time in years.

Prop F asks you, the voters, to put an unnecessary sixth firefighter back on every fire truck, in order to give current firefighters millions in guaranteed overtime.

There’s no need for it. Even a one-alarm fire in San Francisco draws 30 firefighters in response.

It’s easy, when you think about the heroic work firefighters do, to justify giving them whatever they ask for.

I made the same mistake myself three years ago, before I was mayor. As a State Assemblyman and a strong union supporter, I lent my name to a measure that was similar to Proposition F.

But no group, however much we appreciate their work, is entitled to millions of taxpayer dollars a year in guaranteed, unnecessary overtime — especially when they are trying to feather their own nests by keeping out women and minorities.

With all the pressing needs facing our city, we can’t afford to give away $7 million and get nothing in return. Please vote No on Proposition F.

Mayor Art Agnos

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTES: This entire section is new.

The Proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

NEW CHARTER SECTION: 3.548:
MINIMUM LEVELS OF FIRE PROTECTION FOR THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Notwithstanding any other section of this Charter, the minimum levels of fire protection for the City and County of San Francisco shall be specified as follows:

A. The MINIMUM level of Fire Protection for the City and County of San Francisco, in fire suppression, effective July 1, 1990, except as specified in Section C shall be as follows:

1. Engine Companies 41
   Truck Companies 18
   Rescue Companies 2
   Fireboat Companies 1
   Battalion Districts 10
   Divisions 3
   Service Units 1
   Bureau of Equipment 2
   High Pressure System Tank (staffed) 1
   (Jones St. Tank) 1
   Assigned Firefighters 5
   (At Chief’s Discretion)

2. Fire station: The minimum number of stations shall be 41, at locations listed on the SFFD Station Directory for July 1, 1987.

B. MINIMUM daily staffing of Fire Companies and other Units:

1. Engine Companies:
   1 Officer and 3 Firefighters
2. Truck Companies:
   1 Officer and 5 Firefighters
3. Rescue Company:
   1 Officer and 3 Firefighters
4. Fireboat Company:
   1 Officer, 1 Pilot, 1 Marine Engineer and 2 Firefighters
5. Service Units:
   1 Firefighter
6. Bureau of Equipment:
   2 Firefighters

7. Battalion District:
   1 Battalion Chief, 1 Chief’s Aide
   1 Assistant Chief, 1 Chief’s Aide
   1 qualified person to operate gates, valves and communications equipment of the High Pressure System.

Required minimum staffing shall be maintained on a constant basis, 24 hours per day. Sufficient personnel and positions shall be authorized and funded to maintain MINIMUM required staffing levels established in this section. When assigned personnel are not available, then staffing shall be maintained by working of overtime.

C. CLOSURE AND RELOCATION OF FIRE STATIONS, DEACTIVATION OF FIRE COMPANIES OR OF UNITS REQUIRED BY THIS SECTION:

1. Fire Stations, Fire Companies or other Units required by this section may be closed or deactivated only when each of the following procedures is completed:

a. It is recommended by the Chief of Department and approved for consideration by the Fire Commission.

b. The Fire Commission shall hold at least two public hearings on the matter so that affected citizens may appear to express their views.

c. At least one of the public hearings shall be held in the neighborhood of the Station, Company, or Unit to be closed or deactivated. Such meeting to be held at a time and place most suitable for maximum public attendance.

d. Except as provided by this section, other facilities or units may be closed or deactivated by majority of the five members of the Fire Commission upon recommendation by the Chief of Department.

e. Upon conclusion of public hearings and approval by a majority of the five members of the Fire Commission for the closure or deactivation of a Company or Unit, the Fire Commission shall forward its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors within 30 calendar days.

f. Upon receipt of the Fire Commission recommendation, the Board of Supervisors may hold public hearings on the matter and they may approve or disapprove the recommendation of the Fire Commission for closure or deactivation of a Station, Company or Unit. Such approval or disapproval shall be by majority vote of the Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors approves of the Fire Commission recommendation, then they shall direct the Clerk of the Board to have the matter put on the ballot of the next regular election for final determination by the voters of the City and County.

D. DEFINITIONS — EQUIPMENT

1. ENGINE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying hose and a pump to pump water of at least 1,500 gallons per minute.

2. TRUCK COMPANY: A tractor-trailer vehicle carrying ladders and rescue equipment with a 100-foot aerial ladder or equivalent device to reach upper floors of buildings.

3. RESCUE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying rescue equipment capable of heavy rescue and diving equipment for underwater rescue.

4. FIRE BOAT COMPANY: A boat equipped with pumps, hose, monitor nozzles and able to navigate San Francisco Bay for firefighting and rescue duty along the shorelines of the City and County.

5. SERVICE UNIT: A vehicle carrying spare supply of air and equipment for self-contained breathing apparatus and resuscitators.

6. HIGH PRESSURE SYSTEM PUMP STATION: A facility capable of pumping at least 10,000 gallons per minute from San Francisco Bay or other water source into the mains of the high pressure water system.

7. BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT: A vehicle capable of carrying equipment for emergency repairs or towing of fire apparatus under emergency conditions.
PROPOSITION G

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Health Service System provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Supervisors may not continue to receive health insurance from the Health Service System after they leave the Board of Supervisors.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Board of Supervisors could allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G will allow former Supervisors to buy health insurance coverage from the City’s Health Service system, when they leave office. THERE WILL BE NO COST TO THE CITY.

The Health Service System now provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Proposition G simply allows former Supervisors to BUY continued health coverage in the City’s Health Plan, at their own expense.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition G
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "G"
Former supervisors are either those who have decided not to run; or those the electorate voted out of office.
Even as it claims they will pay their own health plan benefits, why continue to have them in the system.

Cut bait.
Vote NO.

Marguerite Warren
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold** face type; deletions are indicated by *strike-out* type.

8.425 Persons Covered

Each plan may make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system by the dependents of members, retired city and county employees, temporary city and county employees, such other dependents of deceased and retired city and county employees as the board of supervisors may authorize by ordinance, teachers and other employees of the San Francisco Unified School District retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees of the city and county and resigned teachers and employees of the school district whose resignations occur after June 15, 1955, and within 30 days immediately prior to the date on which, but for their resignations, they would have become retired members of the said retirement system, on whose relinquishment of retirement allowances as permitted by the charter occurs after such date and resigned employees of the San Francisco Unified School District not otherwise included. A resigned employee or teacher is one whose employment has terminated other than by retirement, discharge or death or who has relinquished retirement allowances. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system to the aforementioned resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District is to enable them, subject to the health service board's exercise of its power, to participate in the benefits of the system after transferring to the State Teachers' Retirement System from the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for participation in the benefits of the system by the aforementioned resigned employees of the city and county and other resigned employees of San Francisco Unified School District is to permit the health service board to have power to treat them the same as it treats resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District.

As used in this section, and for the purpose of this section, the terms "city and county employees" and "employees of the city and county" shall include officers and employees of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco.

The board of supervisors may also provide by ordinance for the continuation in any plan by former supervisors who agree to and do pay the full cost of such benefit.

---

**Moved since you last voted? Then you must re-register. Phone 554-4375.**

---
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PROPOSITION H

Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?

YES 290
NO 292

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers belong to the City’s Retirement System. Under the charter, the Board of Supervisors may contract with the State’s Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) to allow certain safety employees to be members of PERS instead of the City’s Retirement System, if there is no additional cost to the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City’s Retirement System, if there would be no additional cost to the City.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City’s Retirement System.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want these employees to continue to be covered by the City’s Retirement System.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This Charter Amendment would provide for safety retirement for eighteen civilian Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers employed by the San Francisco Fire Department, at no additional cost to the City.

Fire Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers are classified by the State of California as safety personnel and properly belong in a safety retirement program that is not offered by the City’s Retirement System for non-uniformed employees. Instead, the City contracts with the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) for its public safety officers who are not police officers or firefighters.

Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers, along with their counterparts in the uniformed firefighter ranks, provide the professional expertise necessary for the City’s fire prevention program. Proposition H provides a retirement plan for this small group of civilians equivalent to the retirement plan for their uniformed firefighter counterparts, at no additional cost to the City.

Voters approved similar measures in recent years that provided for safety requirement for probation officers, investigator groups and various other safety personnel.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition H
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by **strike-out type**.

8.506-2 Miscellaneous Safety Employees

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the board of supervisors or the community college board shall have the power to contract with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System of the State of California to provide that the probation officers, airport police officers, district attorney and public defender investigators, coroner investigators, juvenile court counselors, and institutional police, fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers who are not members of the Section 8.588 plans, shall be members of the public employees' retirement system, and the board of supervisors, the community college board and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such contract.

The power to contract created herein shall be limited to a contract with no net increase in cost to the city and county or the community college district.

Any person who shall become a member of the public employees' retirement system pursuant to such contract shall have the right to be a member of the health service system and the health board shall make provision for the participation in the benefits of the health service system by such persons.
THANKS, SAN FRANCISCO
Residents are recycling in record numbers!

Nearly 70,000 homes in the southern and eastern parts of the City have curbside recycling. By 1991, every resident will have curbside collection service.

Until curbside reaches your neighborhood, you can recycle at our many community recycling centers.

For a free Recycling Starter Kit and information on where to recycle call:

San Francisco Recycling Program
CITY HALL
554-6193
PROPOSITION I
Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?

YES 293  NO 295

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the State Retirement System are allowed to work for the San Francisco Unified School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. Retired San Francisco teachers in the City Retirement system are not allowed to do so.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow retired teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. While they are consultants they would not make retirement contributions or earn additional retirement credits.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on “I”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, costs could increase, the amount of which, being dependent upon the dollar amount and the number of personal service contracts executed, cannot be determined, but should not be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on “I”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Jim Gonzalez and Richard Hongisto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is necessary to correct an inequity that exists between teachers in the State Teachers’ Retirement System and those in the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System. Teachers in the state system can retire up to three years early and supplement their reduced retirement income by serving as consultants to the school district developing curriculum, orienting new teachers, substituting for absent teachers, tutoring students, etc. The Charter denies the right to the four hundred teachers in the city retirement system to continue serving students and schools in these ways. Proposition I would correct this inequity by extending the same right to teachers in the city retirement system.

Proposition I will save taxpayers’ money by encouraging teachers at the top of the salary scale to retire early. New hires at the low end of the salary scale will earn little more than half as much as those at the top.

Proposition I will also improve education in San Francisco schools by continuing to take advantage of the experience and expertise of retired teachers. It will also help to solve the shortage of qualified substitute teacher.

Vote YES on Proposition I for equity, economy, and educational excellence.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition I
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition I
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will bring equity and fairness to retired teachers, save the taxpayers money and improve the educational system in San Francisco.

Assemblyman Willie Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John Burton
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Jim Gonzalez
San Francisco Democratic Party
Fred Rodriguez, President of the Board of Education

United Educators of San Francisco, Joan-Marie Shelley
Judy Dellamonica
Joanne Miller, vice-president of the San Francisco Board of Education
Thomas Ammiano
Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council
Larry Martin, Transport Workers of America
Robert Barnes
Jim Wachob
Joe Medina
Harry G. Britt, President of the Board of Supervisors

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the charter on February 1, 1969, and persons who become miscellaneous officers and employees after February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote, of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under Section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under Section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(a) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

"Retirement allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payments is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workers' compensation laws of the State of California, shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation variable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the retirement board, which would have been earned by the member had he worked, throughout the period under consideration, the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police department as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under Section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in Section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in Section 3.670 of the charter.

"Charter" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural; and the plural the singular.

"Fifinest" shall mean at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(b) Any member who completes at least 20 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 50 years, or at least 10 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 60 years, said service to be computed under Subsection (g) hereof, may retire from service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after reaching the age of 60 years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of two percent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of 65 years, if the allowance available to such member, pursuant to the provisions of Subsection (f) of this section, shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this Subsection (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this Subsection (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said Subsection (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of 60 years, after rendering 20 years or more of such service and having attained the age of 50 years, computed under Subsection (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under Subsection (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/4</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/2</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-3/4</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-1/4</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member’s retirement allowance exceed 75 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or Subsection (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of 65 years may elect, without right of revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system, and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of Sec.

(Continued on next page)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued)

Section 8.514 of this charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $100 per month upon retirement after 30 years of service and after attaining the age of 60 years, and provided further that as to any member within 15 years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of 65, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $100 per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied on full-time service and compensation in the calculations of retirement allowances.

(c) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least 10 years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in Subsection (a) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in Subsection (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds 40 percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age 60, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed 60 percent of such average final compensation.

In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation payable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one year immediately preceding his retirement. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied as full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

(d) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

(e) If a member shall die, before retirement, (1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of 12 months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(2) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired from service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under Subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) shall be paid in lump sum as follows:

(A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election, but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 years, may make the election herein provided before benefit has been paid under this Subsection (e), for and on behalf of such children if, in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this Subsection (e), any allowance payable under this Subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

(f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least 10 years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed $1,000, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service.
TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued)

retirement, but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1-2/3 percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

(g) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

(1) Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.

(2) Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitling him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contributions standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member, to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of Section 8.520 of the charter for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under Section 8.507.

(5) The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and service rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions thereof shall be required of the city and county.

(h) All payments provided under this section shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation paid to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to 7-1/2 percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system.

(2) Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of Subsection (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members, and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this Subsection (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), Subsection (h), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement, and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year, and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this Subdivision (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition hereof submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience of the pension, investment, and other agencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(i) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said Subsection (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(j) Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsections (b), (c), (f), and (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and

(Continued on page 92)
PROPOSITION J
Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?  
YES 296  NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Human Rights Commission was created by an ordinance. Under that ordinance, the Human Rights Commission has 15 members.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment that would make the existing Human Rights Commission a charter commission; it would reduce the number of members from 15 to 11.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you want to reduce its size to 11 members.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you do not want to reduce its size to 11 members.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government in an amount not to exceed $4,200.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisor Thomas Hsieh.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Let us make human rights a fundamental part of the fabric of San Francisco.

San Francisco is the birthplace of the United Nations and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, our Human Rights Commission is not even a part of our constitution — the Charter.

Proposition J will make the Human Rights Commission a charter commission. Proposition J will take the position of the Human Rights Commission out of politics and ensures its place in the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Please vote in favor of Proposition J to recognize the importance of human rights to San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition J
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition J
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department and a candidate for Municipal Court Judge I urge you to vote for Ballot Measure J.

The Human Rights Commission has been a positive voice for 25 years. Thousands of San Franciscans have directly benefited from the Commission's efforts. Its mandate will be greatly strengthened by extending Charter status through this measure.

Please join me and vote yes on J!

James Harrigan
For Municipal Court

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "J"

We have a Human Rights Commission NOW, appointed by the Mayor. A new one in the charter would have the same appointing officer.

We don't need a confirmation of said committee. It will not take it out of politics. No reason for this.

Just another layer of government — for what.

Vote no on "J".

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: This entire section is new.
PART TWENTY-FOUR: HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
3.699-5 Commission; Composition
A human rights commission is hereby established. The human rights commission shall consist of eleven members broadly representative of the general public to be appointed by the mayor. Three of the members who are first appointed shall be designated to serve for terms of one year, three for two years, three for three years and two for four years from the date of their appointments. Thereafter, members shall be appointed as aforesaid for a term of office of four years, except that all of the vacancies occurring during a term shall be filled for the unexpired term. Members of said commission shall be compensated for each commission or committee meeting actually attended by said members in an amount as may be established and amended, from time to time, by ordinance of the board of supervisors, but not less than $50 per meeting provided, however, that no member shall be paid for attending more than two commission or committee meetings in any one calendar month.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION J (Continued from page 88)

County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system, an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) A retired person, who is a certified employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certified employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
8.584-10 Limitation on Employment During Retirement
(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.584 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.
(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.
(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.
(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.584, he shall re-enter membership under Section 8.584 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.584. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.
(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for service or disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 60 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he held the position which he held at the time of his retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he held the position from which he was retired immediately prior to its abolition.
Seven Member Commissions

PROPOSITION K
Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?

YES 298
NO 299

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department, Fire Department, Social Services Department, Port of San Francisco, Public Utilities Commission, Board of Permit Appeals, Civil Service Commission, Airports Commission and Parking and Traffic Department are managed by a board or commission. Each of these boards and commissions has five members appointed by the Mayor.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K is a charter amendment that would increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the size of these boards and commissions to stay the same.

Controller’s Statement on “K”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $18,800 annually beginning January, 1991."

How Supervisors Voted on “K”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh, Bill Maher, and Wendy Nelder.
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K expands the opportunity for San Francisco's varied communities to participate in City government. Proposition K increases, from five to seven, the membership of the Board of Permit Appeals and seven City commissions: Police, Fire, Social Services, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports, and Parking and Traffic. It also includes the Port Commission, subject to amendment of state law to authorize such an increase.

Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities. Only five members of these crucial commissions is insufficient to address the diversity of concerns in our City; seven members will provide greater representation and greater leadership from a variety of communities. The expansion of the size of these commissions enhances the possibility for all San Franciscans to be part of decision-making and policy-making processes at every level.

The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions. Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor, but instead of the many underrepresented voices in San Francisco.

Proposition K would make these commissions representative of the interests of more San Franciscans, while maintaining the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants. San Franciscans want accessible, responsive, and active commissioners. We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns, and Proposition K is a method for achieving these goals.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

You need a decoder ring to read the Supervisors' argument in favor of creating 18 new commissioner slots. Here's what the Board says, and here's what they really mean.

The Board means: "Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities."

The Board means: All you interest groups out there, it's time to get yours.

The Board says: "The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions."

The Board means: With 18 more political appointments, a mayor won't offend as many supporters by passing them over for city jobs.

The Board says: "Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor."

The Board means: Adding 18 new city commissioners isn't really a boon to the incumbent mayor — unless he's re-elected.

The Board says: "Proposition K would... maintain the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants."

The Board means: Increasing commission memberships by 40% isn't that big a deal.

The Board says: "We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns."

The Board means: A fair hearing before city commissions isn't enough; we want guaranteed results!

Let's stop speaking in code and talk plainly. Proposition K is based on the notion that people should be treated as groups — not individuals — in the political process. That's offensive, and so is Proposition K.

Please vote NO on K!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is a textbook example of what's wrong with contemporary San Francisco politics.
Proposition K demeans us because it lumps city residents into groups, rather than respecting their rights as individuals.
Proposition K divides us because it stresses what such interest groups (the polite euphemism is "communities") disagree about, rather than what all San Franciscans share in common.
Proposition K debases us because it is premised on a "quota system" for city boards and commissions. There shouldn't be "white seats" or "black seats", "gay seats" or "straight seats" on city commissions. There should be but two qualifications for service as a city commissioner: San Francisco residency and individual ability!
Vote NO on Proposition K!
San Francisco is indeed a polyglot and richly diverse community. City residents come from all corners of the country and the globe. Their political opinions range from radical to reactionary and all points in between.

It's impossible for each point of view, each ethnic group, each political persuasion, each neighborhood to be represented on city commissions. Increasing the membership on those bodies from five to seven persons is like buying a bigger umbrella in a hurricane. It won't make a bit of difference.

It is possible, however, for city commissioners from all walks of life to represent views and interests other than their own. It happens all the time in countless actions by city boards and agencies. And if we want to encourage consensus and better understanding among San Francisco's many "communities", we must resist attempts — such as Proposition K — to make the labels we all wear easier to read.

Three years ago, Mayor Agnos campaigned on the slogan, "One City, One Future". The supporters of Proposition K have failed to heed those words.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The opponents of Proposition K are clearly on the wrong page of the textbook of contemporary San Francisco politics.
Proposition K values us because it gives city residents greater ability to be heard, individually and as a community.
Proposition K unites us because it reinforces what we all share in common: respect for democracy. If, as the opposition claims, the ability to have more representation to representation to be diverse, democratic ideals such as checks and balances must therefore also be diverse and undesirable.
Proposition K elevates us because it originates from that respect for democracy. This does not limit or allocate, but reasonably expands available seats on the commissions. Proposition K effectively dilutes the influence of special interests in favor of more broad-based views.
San Francisco is an extremely diverse city and that diversity should be reasonably represented. Democracy requires the opportunity for representation of all points of view. Good government demands that the number of appointed officials be limited so that debate can be functional. Proposition K addresses these two needs: increased citizen participation, and reasonable size to facilitate getting work done.

If you take the opposition’s argument — that it is not meaningful to have representatives from different neighborhoods, ethnicities, political persuasions — to its logical extreme, you could have one member commissions achieving a consensus at the price of democracy.
Proposition K is good government, since it integrates the multiplicity of voices into a united future for the residents of San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition K!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

We need to create an open, democratic, and participatory local government.
This measure will encourage more participation.
Vote YES on K.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Individuals and community groups strongly support K. Increasing the membership on these bodies expands the opportunity to participate for all San Franciscans.
Vote YES on K!

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Robert McCarthy
Ruth Picon
President, Latino Democratic Club
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead, Pres.
Bernal Heights Community Foundation
Jake McGoldrick
Arnie Scher
Natalie Berg
Sodonia Wilson, San Francisco Board of Education
Alma Jackson
Margaret Brady
Reverend Amos Brown
Yori Wada

Mayor Art Agnos
Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John L. Burton
State Senator Milton Marks
Fr. James Goode
Carole Migden
Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes
Political Action Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Catherine Baccarri
Bob Dockendorff
Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

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

Vote No on Proposition K.
Proposition K unnecessarily tinkers with our commission system for managing city departments.

Many of the most important city functions — police and fire services, libraries and health care — are governed by five-member city commissions. Proposition K would increase the size of these commissions to seven members. The Planning Commission would be expanded to nine members.

For what reason? The supporters say that the commissions cannot reflect our diverse community unless we allow the mayor to appoint more commissioners. They miss the point of the commission system.

Commissioners are not advisors or members of a community-wide study panel. They are managers. They set city policy, recommend hundreds of millions of dollars in spending, and hire and fire key departmental personnel.

Preserve our system of citizen management. Don’t make city commissions debating societies.
Vote No on Proposition K.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Are not seven Deputy Mayors at the rate of $94,000 a year a sufficient number of political plums for the Mayor? Does he really need eighteen more commissioners to achieve good government in San Francisco?

Do not give the Mayor additional tools to promote his re-election efforts. The San Francisco Republican Party urges voters to Vote No on Proposition K.

San Francisco Republican Party
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Anna M. Guth

William E. Grayson
Honor H. Bulkley
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Brian Mavrogeorge
Ronald G. Kershaw
Sam T. Harper
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

No sound arguments have been presented which support the need for Proposition K. Enlarging Boards and Commissions would increase city costs without improving productivity. Indeed, extra members may impede efficiency and result in protracted proceedings.

Don’t give the Mayor additional opportunities for patronage. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw

Brian Mavrogeorge
Paul Kavouksian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Munaney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence
Martin Keller

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K
PROPOSITION K WILL ADD TO BUREAUCRACY
Proposition K will hinder quick and fair response to citizen concerns. Larger commissions do not mean better commissions; on the contrary, they mean a less efficient, more cumbersome process.
PROPOSITION K WILL NOT MAKE COMMISSIONS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INTERESTS OF SAN FRANCISCO
Present commissions serve a diverse San Francisco by appointment of individuals who reflect and possess sensitivity, respect for different backgrounds and points of views.

Sharon Bretz
Susann L. Danielson
Jean Kalil
Victor Makras
Esther Marks
Beverly Prior

Larger commissions and larger support bureaucracy are not the answer to better representation. The answer is less political patronage and more appointments based on experience and knowledge. This proposal only makes government more cumbersome and less effective.

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

... Vote NO on Proposition K!

Proposition K is not about democracy. It is about patronage. It is about creating many new commission positions to hand out as political plums. To whom? For what? And why should the taxpayers be forced to pay for it?
No one, not even the author, Supervisor Ward, claims that it will improve the efficiency of the government, yet it will certainly add to the costs. The true costs will include trips, staff time, expenses, etc., with no discernable benefit to the public.

Bill Maher

This measure will lead to longer meetings, more arguments, divisiveness and politics while providing less management oversight.
Proposition K is an insider’s game. They gain and the voters pay. It is a costly bad idea and should be soundly rejected by the voters.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”
If qualified commissioners were appointed who understood they represented ALL of San Francisco this charter amendment would not be necessary.
There are nine commissions listed for additional members — 18 more appointments. Just another avenue for political appointments.

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

PART FOUR: POLICE DEPARTMENT

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, police force, an office of citizen complaints and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of five seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year of 1993. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission to seven members, shall continue to hold their respective positions, subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the police department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the police commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the chief of police, shall create such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to exceed the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-2 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation for said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The police commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

PART FIVE: FIRE DEPARTMENT

The fire department shall be under the management of a fire commission, consisting of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor; and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years of 1948, 1949, and 1950, respectively, two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1993. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The chief of department shall have power to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for fire-fighting purposes.

The commissioners shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the fire department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the fire commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to exceed the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-2 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation for said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The fire commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

PART SIX: SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

There is hereby established a social services department. This department shall consist of a social services commission of five seven members, a director of social services, and such employees and assistants as may be necessary to carry out the work and functions of said department. The members of the social services commission shall be appointed thereto by the mayor and shall be selected for their respective positions on the basis of their interest in and understanding of the problems of public welfare. The members of said commission shall serve without compensation and no person shall be eligible to serve on said commission while holding a salaried public office, position or employment. The term of office of the members of the said commission, subject to the provisions hereof relative to removal and the terms of the first mem-

(Continued on next page)
The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3.590 Commission; Composition

A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o’clock on the 8th day of January, 1932, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of the two other commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936. The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS

3.650 Board Composition

The mayor shall appoint five seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $5,000, $7,000 per year. One such term shall expire at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934 and 1935, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936, and two terms at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1996, and upon these and successive expirations the mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART NINE: PORT COMMISSION

3.580 Commission; Composition

The San Francisco Port Commission shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, their appointment being subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors. Each of said members shall serve for a term of four years. Vacancies on the commission shall be filled by the mayor for the unexpired portion of the term. Initial appointive members of the commission shall consist of the incumbent members of the San Francisco Port Authority, who shall serve as commissioners for a term corresponding to the unexpired portion of their tenure as members of the port authority. Subject to amendment of state law to authorize an increase in membership, the port commission shall consist of seven members. The two additional members shall be appointed by the mayor after the eighth day of January, 1992. The initial term of office not to exceed four years shall be fixed by the mayor to insure that the term of office for a majority of the commission shall not expire in the same year. In addition, the director of finance and secretary of agriculture and services, or their designated representatives, shall be ex-officio members of the commission. Persons appointed to the port commission shall be subject to recall, suspension and removal in the same manner as an elected official.

The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3.590 Commission; Composition

A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o’clock on the 8th day of January, 1932, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of the two other commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936. The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS

3.650 Board Composition

The mayor shall appoint five seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $5,000, $7,000 per year. One such term shall expire at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934 and 1935, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936, and two terms at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1996, and upon these and successive expirations the mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART NINE: PORT COMMISSION

3.580 Commission; Composition

The San Francisco Port Commission shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, their appointment being subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors. Each of said members shall serve for a term of four years. Vacancies on the commission shall be filled by the mayor for the unexpired portion of the term. Initial appointive members of the commission shall consist of the incumbent members of the San Francisco Port Authority, who shall serve as commissioners for a term corresponding to the unexpired portion of their tenure as members of the port authority. Subject to amendment of state law to authorize an increase in membership, the port commission shall consist of seven members. The two additional members shall be appointed by the mayor after the eighth day of January, 1992. The initial term of office not to exceed four years shall be fixed by the mayor to insure that the term of office for a majority of the commission shall not expire in the same year. In addition, the director of finance and secretary of agriculture and services, or their designated representatives, shall be ex-officio members of the commission. Persons appointed to the port commission shall be subject to recall, suspension and removal in the same manner as an elected official.

The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3.590 Commission; Composition

A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o’clock on the 8th day of January, 1932, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of the two other commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936. The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS

3.650 Board Composition

The mayor shall appoint five seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $5,000, $7,000 per year. One such term shall expire at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934 and 1935, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936, and two terms at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1996, and upon these and successive expirations the mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

3.651 Functions, Powers and Duties

Any applicant for a permit or license who is denied such permit or license by the department authorized to issue same, or whose license or permit is ordered revoked by any department, or any person who deems that his interests or property or that the general public interest will be adversely affected as the result of operations authorized by or under any permit or license granted or issued by any department, may appeal to the board of permit appeals. Such board shall hear the applicant, the permit-holders, or other interested parties, as well as the head or representative of the department issuing or refusing to issue such license or permit, or ordering the revocation of same. After such hearing and such further investigation as the board may deem necessary, it may concur in the action of the department authorized to issue such license or permit, or, by the vote of a majority of the members, may reverse the action of such department and order that the permit or license be granted, restored or refused.

The board of permit appeals shall have and exercise the following powers:

(a) To hear and determine appeals where it is alleged there is error or abuse of discretion in any order, requirement, decision or determination made by the zoning administrator in the enforcement of the provisions of any ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors creating zoning districts or regulating the use of property in the city and county.

(b) To hear and determine appeals from the rulings, decisions and determinations of the zoning administrator granting or denying applications for variances from any rule, regulation, restriction or requirement of the zoning or setback ordinances, or any section thereof. Upon the hearing of such appeals, said board may affirm, change, or modify the ruling, decision or determination appealed from, or, in lieu thereof, make such other additional determination as it shall deem proper in the premises, subject to the same limitations as are placed upon the zoning administrator by this charter or by ordinance.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SEVENTEEN: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county.

The civil service commission shall consist of five seven members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the 1st day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and, provided further, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall be as follows: one shall expire on June 30, 1996 and one on June 30, 1998, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. No less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this

(Continued on page 128)
PROPOSITION L

Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Candidates for elective office and members of charter boards and commissions must be San Francisco residents and electors. For other boards, commissions and advisory bodies, the law creating them may set residency requirements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L is a charter amendment that would require the members of all boards, commissions and advisory bodies to be San Francisco residents and electors.

This rule would not apply where a non-charter board, commission or advisory body requires a person with specific qualifications, and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found. Also, this rule would not apply to the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Fine Arts Museums, the Asian Arts Commission, the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission and the elected members of the San Francisco Retirement Board and Health Service Board.

Proposition L would delete the current requirement that candidates and members of charter boards and commissions be residents and electors for a certain length of time before assuming office, which courts have found unconstitutional.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

Controller’s Statement on “L”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “L”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh and Bill Maher.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

This charter amendment provides that all individuals serving on city boards and commissions and committees with few exceptions, must be citizens of voting age of San Francisco.

Members of boards and commissions and committees often have policy making and regulatory responsibilities. Clearly, San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco. With a population of 750,000 residents, surely we have enough qualified and talented San Franciscans who can get the job done.

This charter amendment offers the appointing officer with some flexibility. If a qualified candidate for a public post requiring specialized skills cannot be found in our city, then, following such a declaration, the appointing officer may search elsewhere.

Let's open up more opportunities for our residents to serve San Francisco. VOTE YES FOR THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERSHIP ON CITYBoARDS AND COMmissions AND COMMITTEES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I was mistaken in one of my objections to Proposition L. Some years ago, a court decision invalidated the voter-adopted Charter requirement that a person be a San Francisco resident for five years before appointment to a city commission. I disagree strongly with that decision, for the reasons cited in my ballot argument appearing on the opposite page. The inoperative language remained in our Charter, however, and Proposition L disingenuously removes it — like pruning a dead branch from a tree.

But, there are still plenty of reasons to vote against Proposition L.

(1) Proposition L eliminates the requirement that a commissioner be an “elector” of San Francisco (a voter, meaning also a U.S. citizen) for at least one year. This Charter provision has not been altered by a court, but Proposition L would strike it from the books.

A person could move into town, register to vote, and be appointed that day to a city post.

(2) Proposition L exempts three city commissions — Health System, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board — from any residency requirement whatsoever.

(3) Proposition L would allow non-residents to serve on any board or commission created by the Board of Supervisors. In fact, Proposition L could even be interpreted to allow the appointment of non-citizens to such posts!

Don’t be misled or confused. If you want San Franciscans to make decisions about San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition L!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

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

If you want San Francisco residents to serve on all city commissions established by the charter, vote NO on Proposition L. If you think San Franciscans should serve on boards and committees created by the Board of Supervisors, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you favor city residents serving on the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees, vote NO on Proposition L.

The Board of Supervisors says "San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco." I agree completely. Trouble is, Proposition L weakens the existing residency requirement in our City Charter.

Charter Section 8.100 states that no person "shall be appointed as a member of any board or commission unless he shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years." Proposition L eliminates the five-year residency requirement! Proposition L also exempts from any residency requirement whatsoever members of the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees.

The idea behind the five-year residency rule is that city commissioners should have first-hand knowledge and personal experience of San Francisco's people and neighborhoods, its problems and possibilities. City commissioners should not just rely on staff reports and statistical abstracts. Proposition L would destroy this sensible safeguard. Instead, a person could move into town and be appointed, that day, to a city post!

Finally, Proposition L purports to extend the Charter's residency rules to advisory boards and committees established by the Board of Supervisors. But the residency requirement can be waived for a person "with specific experience, skills, or qualifications." That's a loophole big enough to drive a truck through!

San Franciscans should make decisions about San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition L.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for most advisory panels of the City.

Under Proposition L, panel members MUST be residents of San Francisco.

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for membership on the Health System Board, Retirement Board and War Memorial Board.

Under Proposition L, there is no change. Membership on the Health System Board and Retirement Board is by DIRECT ELECTION of city employees. The Health Fund and Retirement Fund are operated by and for city workers. Because employees are not required to live in the city, there are serious constitutional problems with denying a worker the right to be a candidate for trustee of a fund controlled by employees.

The way things are now, the courts have thrown out San Francisco's five-year residency requirement. Reports the City Attorney:

"In the years since Charter Section 8.100 (residency rule) was originally adopted, the California courts have struck down all durational residency requirements applicable to candidates for elective or appointive office."

Most Supervisors like the durational requirement. But even Supervisors cannot overrule the Supreme Court.

The bottom line: Proposition L does not cover everything. Just most things. It's time San Franciscans were making the decisions about San Francisco. Proposition L is a major start in the right direction.

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S FUTURE, YES ON PROPOSITION L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

San Franciscans deserve to be represented by commissioners who live within San Francisco, not by employees filling in for their ex-officio bosses. Vote for San Francisco commissions made of San Francisco voters.

... Vote Yes on Proposition L!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Don’t clutter the Charter with unnecessary provisions. Vote No on Proposition L.

Proposition L would require almost all commissions and advisory board members to be city residents. That makes sense — so much sense that, for most commissions, it is already the law.

This is one more example of a needless Charter amendment. If the Board of Supervisors wants to require members of any advisory body to be city residents, they can pass an ordinance to accomplish it. Adding an unnecessary provision to a Charter that is already too long and complicated is not the answer.

Vote No on Proposition L.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.100 Qualifications

(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she is shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for at least one year immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retirement system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.680, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.

Notwithstanding this requirement, in the case of boards, commissions or advisory bodies established by legislative act, the residency requirement may be waived by the appointing officer, or entity upon a finding that the board, commission or body requires the appointment of a person with specific experience, skills or qualifications and after exercising due diligence, an eligible and willing appointee residing within the city and county could not be located.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 7 through Tuesday, June 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease. Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals. It's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be TOXIC FREE 554-4333

San Francisco Household Hazardous Waste Program

HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR YOUR HOME'S TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday 8am to 4 pm. 554-4333 San Francisco Household Hazardous Waste Program
PROPOSITION M

Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by the Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?

YES 302
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter requires some City boards and commissions, such as the Police and Fire Commissions, to have at least one woman member. However, the charter does not have a general policy on balancing the number of men and women on City boards and commissions.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a charter amendment that would create a City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex. This charter amendment does not apply to the Commission on the Status of Women.

A "YÈS" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex.

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

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "M"

On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Bill Maher and Wendy Nelder.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The 1990s are here — but you would never know it by the few women serving on City boards and commissions. In fact, of ten major commissions — Police, Fire, Airports, Ports, Public Utilities, Parking Authority, Social Services, City Planning, Elections, Housing Authority — women hold just 18 percent of the seats. And only one woman serves as a president of these commissions.

Women do not fare much better on other key commissions. For instance, women hold just two seats on the seven-member Recreation and Park Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission. Three women serve on the eleven-member Small Business Advisory Commission.

Despite the enormous influence and regulatory controls most commissions have over the lives of all citizens, women’s voices and leadership on city panels do not equal their numbers in society. These gloomy statistics aside, women have begun to make gains during the past two years. Women are now being regularly considered and appointed to boards and commissions. But, clearly, much more needs to be done.

Proposition M will emblazon into the Charter a policy goal of gender equality on all boards and commissions. This amendment, authored by Supervisor Richard Hongisto, is a simple measure of justice.

Only the Commission on the Status of Women is excluded from the provisions of this charter amendment, since its sole purpose is to serve as an advocacy forum for women.

Increasingly, communities and groups are instituting gender parity provisions in their constitutions with much success. For instance, the Democratic Party has dramatically brought about near gender equality of delegates to its national and state conventions. Let’s start the 1990s off with a renewed commitment to fairness and equality.

VOTE YES ON THE GENDER PARITY AMENDMENT.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition M
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition M

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

Proposition M moves San Francisco into the 1990s. It is stunning to review the composition of our city boards and commissions and see just how few women are serving. Women comprise 18 percent of the seats on ten major commissions. This is an untold tragedy. Women have been making gains in recent time. We can do even better.

Proposition M is about fairness and equality. Iowa enacted a law in 1987 to require greater gender balance on all boards, commissions, committees, and councils.

Vote Yes for Gender Justice. Yes on Proposition M.

SF Chapter, National Organization for Women
Legal Advocates for Women
San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Creating political leadership opportunities for women will strengthen the public policy decision-making process. Vote YES on M.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

As a predominately lesbian and gay Republican volunteer organization we believe it is a travesty that after fifteen years of three liberal Democrat mayors only 38% of the city’s Commissioners are women. This negligence has prompted the need to enact gender-parity. We support Proposition M.

In the future, the provisions of Proposition M should be amended to apply to the Commission on the Status of Women. Women and men must actively dialogue so that our city begins to address the concerns of all.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw
Paul Kavouksian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence

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

Requirement that any commission be comprised of a certain number of persons of any gender is as inappropriate as requiring a certain number of persons who have red hair or blue eyes. Please vote to maintain the mayoral prerogative to appoint the best San Franciscans for the job.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Like Proposition L, but only more so, Proposition M does not belong in the City Charter.

The power to make appointments to boards and commissions rests with the Mayor. Proposition M would write into the Charter a non-binding policy statement urging the Mayor to fill not more than 50% plus one of any commission with members of the same sex.

The City Attorney advised the Board of Supervisors that the Constitution prohibits the city from adopting a quota for male and female appointments. Instead, the Board of Supervisors proposes
to clutter up the Charter with a non-binding, legally unenforceable policy statement.

If the Board of Supervisors wants to send a message to the Mayor it should be done by resolution, not costly and unnecessary Charter amendments.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "M"

There is nothing in the charter NOW that prevents the Mayor or Board of Supervisors to appoint more women to achieve gender parity now.

Why now does it have to be written in concrete.

Vote NO on "M".

Marguerie Warren
NOTE: Entire section is new.
3.503 Composition of Boards and Commissions.

It is the policy of the city and county, which shall be considered a goal when filling vacancies on boards or commissions appointed by the mayor, or otherwise provided by this charter, except for the Commission on the Status of Women, to achieve gender parity on these boards and commissions by limiting to a simple majority of board and commission membership the number of members who are of the same sex.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 24.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
MISSING SOMETHING IN YOUR LIFE?

If your life seems to be missing that special warmth that comes from having a pet, come and see us at the new San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department. We have a wide variety of dogs, cats and other animals available for adoption.

A waggly tail, a sweet meow or a gentle squeak - it'll make you glad to come home at night.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PROPOSITION N

Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?

YES 305
NO 307

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter does not limit the number of consecutive terms a person may serve on the Board of Supervisors. A full term on the Board of Supervisors is four years.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a charter amendment. Under Proposition N, no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors. After two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, a person must wait four years before serving again. Any person appointed to the Board of Supervisors to complete more than half a four-year term would be considered to have served one full term. A member of the Board of Supervisors who resigned with less than half a four-year term remaining would be considered to have served a full term. This charter amendment would go into effect July 1, 1990. Each Supervisor holding office on that date would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when his or her current term ends.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the charter so that no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors and you want to prohibit persons who served two consecutive four-year terms from serving on the Board of Supervisors again until four years after their second consecutive term in office.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to limit Supervisors to serving two consecutive terms.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On January 25, 1990, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition N to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,151* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 45,408 of the signatures submitted were valid, 5,257 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is a non-partisan, reasonable, fair and democratic measure to reform our government and improve the present city-wide system for electing supervisors. Neighborhood, civic leaders, current and former elected officials, community activists, business owners, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, unionists, and minorities all support Proposition N.

Limiting politicians' consecutive terms is not radical or extreme. In fact, it helps to prevent political corruption and power grabbing. More than 150 cities, towns and counties in the United States have laws limiting politicians terms. Governors in 30 states can only serve two terms. San Mateo county limits supervisors terms and for more than 30 years San Francisco’s mayors have been limited to two consecutive terms.

Proposition N is a very modest and reasonable proposal.

Proposition N does not recall or force any current member of the board from office. Proposition N allows supervisors whose terms expire in 1991 to serve until January 1995 if they are reelected. Supervisors whose terms end in 1993 may serve until 1997 if reelected. Former supervisors may run for office again after 4 years.

The current system favors incumbent politicians and denies experienced newcomers a fair chance to serve. Since 1973, only 3 newcomers have been elected to the city-wide board. 5 supervisors have already served 10 years. By 1995 most board members will have been in office 14 years or more.

We know that a lake or pond will stagnate unless its waters are replenished from time to time. So too will an elected body grow stale without a regular infusion of fresh faces and new ideas.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Richard Bodisco
Chairman, San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
Steve Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu
Harold Hoogasian
Joseph L. Powell
Raymond Chalker
Robert A. Reveles
Robert C. Sanchez
Joel Ventresca
Barry Lastra
Daniel Willson

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N backers have misrepresented the facts to get you to vote for N. Since just 1982 three non-incumbent supervisors have been independently elected to the Board. Proposition N is not true reform — it only tinkers with the citywide election process. It is not democratic — it takes power away from the people. It is not a solution — it’s an additional problem.

Supervisors are elected to carry out the will of the people. When they fail to serve, they are unelected — by vote of the people. Appointed department heads, who are not supposed to have their own political agendas, are balanced only by the Mayor’s and the Board’s overseeing eyes.

With the Mayor already limited to two terms, the Board must not consist only of rookies and lame ducks, or department heads can consolidate their power and bide their time, waiting until watchdog Supervisors are automatically thrown from office. Proposition N threatens accountability and increases the chances for bureaucratic corruption.

Uninformed actions are foolish actions — closely examine the facts, and you’ll agree that blindly forcing change is a bad plan. If Proposition N passes, nothing can stop department heads from installing power bases immune to voter inspection. Voters have the right to choose — this measure permanently limits that right.

PROTECT YOUR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Two years ago, San Francisco voted on Proposition O, a recall of the Board of Supervisors thinly disguised as a "good government" initiative. San Franciscans saw through this scheme, and sent the measure down to defeat.

Last year, the same group attempted to offer a similar proposal to the voters, but failed to collect enough signatures to qualify it for the ballot.

Now they're at it again.

They say that Supervisors have lost touch with the people of San Francisco, and should automatically be thrown from office after they've served two terms — but by bringing up this rejected issue again and again, they're proving that THEY are the ones who are out of touch.

San Francisco doesn't need a two-term limit. When supervisors stop working for the people, they stop getting elected. If Board members are prematurely removed, more power falls into the hands of civil servants and department heads, who are unaccountable to the voters. These unelected officials who already hold great power must be balanced by supervisors free to do their jobs, or citizens lose their representation.

The diversity of our City is one of our greatest strengths. San Franciscans have always individually evaluated our city's varied issues, judging each on its specific merits. The Board of Supervisors is similarly diverse, and should also be evaluated selectively. Citizens should use the election process to tell their representatives when they're not doing their jobs — not by acting blindly and installing an arbitrary time limit. San Franciscans are smart enough to tell the difference between voting an incompetent out of office and firing a valuable employee without cause.

Proposition N denies San Franciscans the right to vote for legislators of their choice, and that's not fair.

Vote NO on Proposition N.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Let's talk about what WE want City Hall to do for US, not the politicians.

Politicians will tell you anything to advance their political careers.

They won't tell you the TRUTH about the Two Term Limit.

The politicians say we failed to collect enough signatures last year to qualify for the ballot.

But here's what their appointee, the city's Chief Administrative Officer says:

"Last year's Proposition removal was forced by an error, one which we admitted, apologized for and tried to repair . . ."

(Letter to Two Term Limit — Chairman — Richard Bodisco, dated February 7, 1990.)

We need new leadership in City Hall.

We have some hard and serious problems to solve in San Francisco and we can't solve them with political rhetoric and name calling.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N removes experienced supervisors from the Board.

FACT:

Proposition N insures that San Francisco will always have 5 or 6 supervisors with seniority and experience on the Board.

Proposition N also gives experienced and concerned citizens an opportunity to serve without needing to become professional, career politicians.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N will take away your right to vote for a legislator of your choice.

FACT:

Proposition N gives you more choices because it removes the current system which favors incumbent politicians.

The politicians have spoken too long for themselves.

It is time City Hall spoke for us.

Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Submitted by San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Richard Bodisco

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

This citizen’s initiative is a good government reform measure which will guarantee change, encourage competition, improve the chances of electing new political leadership, and curtail the influence of special interests.

Vote YES on N.

SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

Change is the driving force in our economy, our lives . . . and our government! Eight years on the Board of Supervisors is enough time to initiate changes espoused in any candidacy. Our City government is in desperate need of change. Vote for new life in San Francisco government.

. . . Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

The longer supervisors remain in office the more likely they become captives of special interests who bankroll their costly campaigns.

Entrenched incumbent politicians often end up working against the public interest, rather than for it.

Only two supervisors have been defeated at the polls since the end of 1980.

New faces, new ideas, new leaders, and new directions are needed at City Hall.

Vote YES on N.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

The Two-Term Limit is an idea whose time has come!
The United States Constitution limits the President to two terms in office. Similarly, the San Francisco Charter limits our Mayor to two terms.

Incumbent San Francisco Supervisors, however, continue to win re-elections year after year. This has made many of them less accountable to the voters.

Eight years is enough! Let’s bring new people, new ideas, and new energy to our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Citizens for a Better San Francisco

It works for executive offices, let’s put a limit on the terms of service for our supervisors. As Thomas Jefferson called it, “rotation in office”. Let’s have some healthy competition for these positions, let’s take advantage of the many experienced people around who are willing to serve. Let’s vote YES on Proposition N for reasonable reform.

John and Carol Maerzke
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will ensure that we have a Board of Supervisors of concerned citizens, not career politicians.

For almost forty years, San Francisco has limited its Mayor to eight years in office. Many cities around the Bay Area, such as San Jose, Richmond, Mountain View and Redwood City, limit terms in office for their city councils. Yet we have had supervisors serve up to 16 years in office. Why? Because by raising large sums of money and using the power of incumbency, supervisors face little chance of defeat when running for re-election.

Proposition N will not remove any member of the Board of Supervisors from office. It is a fair proposal that allows each current supervisor to run for one more four year term. But in the future, each supervisor will be limited to eight years in office.

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will give the city fresh leadership on the Board of Supervisors. It will open up the city’s political processes, reversing the trend in recent years towards full-time professional politicians. Most importantly, it will mean that our elected representatives put the city’s needs and interests ahead of their desire for re-election.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

I’m supporting Proposition N because of my concern about the status of women and children in San Francisco.

As a long time supporter and treasurer of a shelter for battered women in the City, I have had the opportunity to closely observe how our City government works. I think there are more important things than politics.

San Francisco needs leaders in government who will show more compassion and concern about peoples’ lives as opposed to their reelection campaigns.

I don’t feel that every member of the Board of Supervisors is bad, but the two term limit will improve the current system and help our Supervisors do a better job for us.

That is why I am voting YES on Proposition N.

Millie Favetti

Over the past 20 years women have made enormous gains in electoral politics. The situation is far, far from ideal but some positive changes have taken place. Therefore, we think it is important to encourage and support the entry of women into elective politics.

We’re supporting Proposition N because it ensures that more women will have the opportunity to assume leadership roles in City government. The two year experiment with district elections produced more women supervisors than at any other time in San Francisco’s history.

The gains women have made could be easily lost under the current city-wide system. Proposition N will prevent the clock from being turned back because it allows newcomers a fair chance to compete without always having to run against entrenched incumbents.

Proposition N is equitable and fair to everyone. Join us and vote YES on Proposition N.

Helen Dawson
Miriam Smith

As a small business owner and long time resident of San Francisco, I’m supporting Proposition N because it makes good sense for our City.

Limiting Supervisors’ terms will create a Board of Supervisors more accountable to the needs of San Franciscans. Under the current city-wide system, to many Supervisors see service on the Board as a career.

They worry more about keeping their seats than about doing the job they were elected to do. As a result, politics is all to often put ahead of the City welfare.

Let’s get politics out of City Hall.
Vote YES on Proposition N.

Zdenka Bodisco
Mike Salarno
Harold Hoogasian
Small Business Owners
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Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

We're supporting the Two Term Limit because San Francisco needs new political leadership. The Two Term Limit will open the "Door of Opportunity" for new candidates to serve on the Board of Supervisors.

The Two Term Limit will allow a new generation of civic leaders to represent our City. It is a fair and democratic way to reform the current system and to restore citizens' confidence in City Hall.

San Francisco's government should reflect the diversity of the people who live here. This is the meaning of a Democratic and free system. The Two Term Limit insures that new people with new ideas will have a fair chance to serve the City.

Don't be fooled by arguments of professional, career politicians. The Two Term Limit is good for our community and it is good for San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Steve M. Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu

WHY DIDN'T WE GET TO VOTE ON THE TWO-TERM LIMIT LAST YEAR?

Because Louise Renne found a legal loophole to get the measure thrown off the ballot after the Registrar of Voters had certified that it qualified for submission to the electorate.

Never mind that when Renne violated a number of election laws several years ago she got everyone to overlook the "technicality."

But what do you expect?

This is the same Louise Renne who sued the Olympic Club because it had no female members conveniently "overlooking" the fact that her husband Paul belongs to the all-white, all-male San Francisco Golf Club.

Say "No" to Renne's legal machinations!

Vote "Yes" on "N."

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

WHAT ARE THEY AFRAID OF?

Why are the Supervisors and their contributors fighting the two-term limit so hard?

Why did City officials use a legal loophole to get this same measure thrown off the ballot last fall?

Are they afraid they won't be able to give away another city street worth $9 million to the Rockefellers for free like they did in 1987?

Are they afraid that the people might vote to turn them out?

Clean up City Hall! Yes on N!

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic Senate Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman
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Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The Two-Term Limit is a reform whose time has come! At the Federal, State, and Local levels, political reformers agree that the powers of incumbency virtually preclude incumbents from being defeated at the polls, and that term limitation is the only way to ensure turnover in legislative bodies. Even Attorney General John Van de Kamp has proposed a twelve-year limit for State legislators.

Since the return to City-wide elections in 1980, only two incumbent Supervisors have been defeated at the polls. They were replaced by Wendy Nelder and Angela Alioto — the daughters of a former Police Chief and Mayor, respectively. Because of this trend, Supervisors have become burned-out, complacent, less accountable to the voters, and more beholden to the special interests who contributed to their re-election campaigns.

Proposition N would limit San Francisco supervisors to two consecutive terms of office, just like the mayor. It’s a modest reform that deserves your vote.

Proposition N would not force any incumbent out of office. All current supervisors could run for one more term after their present term expires. And after four years, they could run again and hold office for two more terms.

The President of the United States has been limited to two consecutive terms of office since 1951. The Mayor of San Francisco has been limited to two consecutive terms since 1953. San Mateo County

has a term limit for its board of supervisors. Proposition N is not a new or radical idea; it’s an overdue reform for a stagnant system.

The founders of our city charter envisioned supervisors as part-time citizen legislators, not full-time professional politicians. Proposition N respects and revives that tradition.

A bit of fresh air never hurt anybody — even two-term supervisors!

Please vote YES on Proposition N.

Harold M. Hoogasian
Christopher L. Bowman

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

The current system of electing supervisors in San Francisco badly needs reform. But Proposition N is not the answer. The Board of Supervisors is not accountable to the people, largely because of the pernicious influence of large monetary contributions. A two-term limit would only exacerbate the problem. All supervisors would either be rookies or lame ducks, resulting in a tremendous shift of power to the bureaucracy, without lessening the powerful influence of money in campaigns.

Dennis Anenore
Robert Barnes
Ron Braithwaite
Supervisor Harry Brit
Gordon Chin
Brother Kelly Cullen
Catherine Dodd R.N.
Noah Griffin

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Geraldine M. Johnson
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leslie Katz
Tony Kilroy

Myra G. Kopf
Steven M. Krefting
William J. Brandy Moore
Jim Morales
Connie O’Connor
Ruth Picon
Mauri Schwartz
Yori Wada

What San Francisco needs is real campaign reform — limiting the ability of supervisors to vote on the pet projects of their major contributors, and district election of supervisors. Both would greatly reduce the enormous sums of money needed to run for office citywide.

Proposition N is a false promise of reform. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N!

Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead
Harold T. Yee
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943 and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and a public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, 11 members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected to a term of four years, from the commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms.

Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the eighth day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the eighth day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor, or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

The effective date of this section as amended is July 1, 1990. All supervisors holding office on that date shall be deemed to have served one full four year term upon the expiration of their then current terms of office.
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PROPOSITION O
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?

YES 309
NO 310

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law regulates the sale, distribution and use of hypodermic syringes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

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

Controller's Statement on "O"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

"Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted it would not affect the cost of government."

How "O" Got on the Ballot
On September 15, 1989 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,173 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,774 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.
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OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

The connection between AIDS and unclean needles is unchallenged. Virtually every authority on the subject agrees that sharing needles increases the chances of contracting AIDS. San Francisco has an estimated 13,000 IV drug users, each of whom is at risk of contracting AIDS and spreading it to their sexual partners or their unborn children. Tens of thousands of people are being directly threatened with contracting AIDS because it is illegal to obtain clean, safe needles.

Some groups are trading clean needles with addicts for their dirty ones. This removes contaminated needles from circulation and can dramatically cut the infection rate among drug users and their partners. But these groups face up to a six months in jail and a $1,000 fine. One member of this group, who lost her mother to AIDS, contracted through a dirty needle, said, “I lost a parent to this because this bureaucracy sits around and talks while lots of people are dying.” Dr. John Newmeyer of the Haight Ashbury Free Medical Clinics said, “People are dying because of our institution’s resistance to AIDS risk reduction methods.”

In an attempt to stop this disease from being spread to drug users and their partners AIDS prevention workers are risking legal persecution. Jerry DeJong, who works with substance abusers and is a member of the Mayor’s Narcotic’s Task Force, said “... with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives.” But in a sane, free society it shouldn’t be necessary to break the law to save lives.

The only way this deadly policy can be changed is for the state legislature to change the law. These State laws should be repealed.

Pamela Willard Pickens
Secretary San Francisco Libertarian Party

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition O
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition O

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

Dr. John Watters of the Urban Health Study says that, "The middle class have access to clean needles." Poor people can't get clean needles, because they are illegal. Black and Latino IV drug users have a more difficult time finding clean needles and are thus more likely to be infected with AIDS. Because minorities are more likely to be infected with AIDS a higher proportion of their sexual partners or unborn children are being infected. AIDS is likely to become the leading cause of death in young Blacks and Latinos if things continue as they have. Legal clean needles will help save their lives.

Christina Groth

The San Francisco Department of Health estimates that there are 13,000 IV drug users in the city. If clean needles remain unavailable to them the AIDS infection rate can easily reach over 60%. If these 60% infect just two other people either through shared needles or sex, the total number of infected people can reach 23,400. San Francisco can't afford the financial burden it is under today from AIDS cases. Prevention through clean and legal needles can save us millions of tax dollars without costing us a cent. Legal needles make financial sense.

Isaac Klein

The San Francisco Chronicle has reported on the use of needles for IV drug use in Scotland. The newspaper said that in Edinburgh police launched a crackdown on the availability of clean needles. Within 18 months of the crackdown 50% of all IV drug users were infected with AIDS. Soon their sexual partners and unborn babies were infected with the disease. But 30 miles away in Glasgow the police took no action against the availability of clean needles and only 4 to 7 percent of needle users were infected. Dr. Roy Robertson, Edinburgh's leading authority on AIDS said, "Making needles available to addicts is not the only answer to the problem of AIDS among drug users but certainly, it has to be part of the solution." VOTE YES!

George Meyer

WHAT IS CANADA DOING RIGHT?

In Canada, fewer than 1% of AIDS cases are from needles!

In the United States, about 50% of new cases now involve needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners and babies, (up from about 20-30% in the beginning of the epidemic).

What is Canada doing right?

The AIDS epidemic has hit here many times worse than there. Why?

In Canada, drug-users can buy sterile needles in drugstores.

GRASSROOTS

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

SURGEON GENERAL KOOP ON CLEAN NEEDLES
"One of the strongest advocates of making needles legal is Surgeon General Koop who addressed that issue last November (1987):
"I'm asked about clean needles everyplace I go. I've always said the same thing. If clean needles will do anything to contain a part of the epidemic, we should not have any foolish inhibitions about so doing."
(S.F. Sentinel 1/22/88)

Wm. Schwartzman, M.D.

Clean needles cause no diseases.
Legal needles are clean needles.
Vote Yes.

William Schwartzman, MD

Does this initiative "condone drugs"?
If you vote Yes, that could be interpreted as condoning drugs.
But if you vote No, that could equally well be interpreted as condoning the spread of AIDS (and hepatitis, and many other diseases).

The present state law is like the "death penalty" — not just for drug abusers, but also their spouses, their babies, transfusion recipients and others. Who can "condone that"?

GRASSROOTS

The AIDS epidemic was caused by a combination of germs, working together to collapse the immune system.
N.Y.'s health department has concluded that the HIV epidemic already existed among New York addicts in the 1970's.
That epidemic existed only because New York has laws against addicts buying clean needles.

If we keep these deadly laws, no one can predict what future epidemics might result.

GRASSROOTS

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES ENCOURAGES STERILE NEEDLES
The National Academy of Sciences the country's most prestigious scientific organization in 1986, issued a major study titled "Confronting AIDS". Many lives could have been saved if California had promptly implemented the conclusion drawn by America's leading scientists:
"IT IS TIME TO BEGIN EXPERIMENTING WITH PUBLIC POLICIES TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF STERILE NEEDLES AND SYRINGES BY REMOVING LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS TO THEIR POSSESSION AND USE."

Wm. Schwartzman, MD
Wm. Steinsmith, MD

The issue is not "free needles".
Some of us believe that mass giveaways of clean needles is best. Others of us believe it would be enough if doctors and pharmacies were allowed to sell needles, as with diabetes.
Legal needles are as cheap as ballpoint pens, so cheap that price would be no barrier.
This initiative takes no position on "free needles" programs, only for legalization — a prerequisite for either approach.

GRASSROOTS

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

Under present California law, even doctors aren’t allowed to provide needles except for approved purposes. So far “stopping AIDS” is not an approved purpose.

Under “legalization”, needles are a medical question, not a police question. A doctor’s prescription could still be required, as with diabetes, Whatever controls are adopted, needles will be better controlled under legalization than they are now. 

*William Steinsmith, M.D.*

---

Dr. Don Francis, an epidemiologist with the Centers for Disease Control said, “We can’t overstater the threat of AIDS among addicts in the minority population in the inner city.” Dr. Francis says that there is no evidence that legal, clean needles increase the use of drugs. The only thing stopping clean needles is the law. It’s time for Sacramento to repeal the law and save lives.

*Will Wohler*

---

According to the *New York Times* a new, rare virus known as HTLV-II is spreading through the IV drug community because of needle sharing. Spread in the same manner as AIDS, this virus “could cause leukemia or other serious diseases and may exact a rising toll in future years.” Surveys have found that 20% of addicts in New Orleans were infected and in San Francisco a preliminary survey of blood donors showed this new disease has a higher rate of incidence than the AIDS virus. Because it can take as long as 20 years to develop no one can know for sure how many people have been infected. Clean, legal needles will stop the transmission of this disease. VOTE YES!

*John Whisman*

---

Clean needles save the lives of innocent victims of AIDS. Not everyone who gets AIDS because people share needles is an addict. Some are small babies. The Centers for Disease Control says 314 babies were born in 1988 with AIDS because their mothers used infected needles. Dr. James Buchler of the CDC said “We need to do what we can to prevent the sharing of dirty needles. Sharing dirty equipment is the worst problem.” In California it is illegal to obtain clean needles so addicts share. Because they share, babies are born with AIDS. Save lives. Legalize needles. VOTE YES!

*Mark Pickens*

---

Illegal needles, which force IV drug users to share unclean needles, is now the cause of over one-third of all AIDS cases in the United States according to the federal government’s Centers for Disease Control. In 1988, 10,747 people contracted AIDS because of sharing unclean needles. Some of these people never used needles themselves. 226 were men who had sex with women who used needles, 623 were women who had sex with men who used unclean needles and 314 were unborn babies. Over 1,000 people who don’t use drugs were infected because clean needles are illegal. VOTE YES FOR LEGAL, CLEAN NEEDLES!

*Pamela Williard Pickens*

---

Proposition O was endorsed by the Central Committee of the Democratic Party of San Francisco on March 21, 1990. VOTE YES!

*John Whisman*

---

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

Clean, legal needles will save lives. Jerry DeJong of the Mayor’s Narcotics Task Force said, “The bottom line is that this is not a moral or legal issue. Unfortunately with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives.” Something is very wrong when it illegal to save lives; and that wrong must be corrected. Tell Sacramento that we want to legalize saving lives. We need clean, legal needles now!

Ron Dorsey

Illegal needles are the primary means of spreading AIDS to minority communities. Most of the IV drug users and their partners who have been infected with AIDS are Black or Latino. Most of the babies born with AIDS because of needle sharing by their mothers are also Black and Latino. Blacks and Latinos are now more likely than ever before to become infected with AIDS because clean needles are illegal. Legal, clean needles will slow down the infection rate and decrease the number of deaths in minority communities. Illegal needles hurt Blacks and Latinos more than they hurt others. Support legal needles.

Jim Peron

Prof. Ethan Nadelman, in the Washington Post, reported that “The governments of England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, the Netherlands and several other countries have actively attempted to limit the spread of AIDS by removing restrictions on the sale of syringes . . . .” Dr. Nadelman notes that there is growing evidence that legal needles do not increase the use of drugs but they do save lives.

George O’Brien

A former prosecutor of high-level drug dealers, Ben Clark, said in The Daily Recorder, a law newspaper, that legal restrictions on clean needles “have had the disastrous effect of forcing drug users to share syringes. Over half the addicts in New York State are infected with AIDS, and the rate of infection among intravenous drug users in Illinois is growing dramatically.”

While some people may say addicts deserve to die, Clark notes, “. . . the issue is not simply whether society should sit back and watch addicts kill themselves off: AIDS transmitted by needles does not stay within the druggie population. Unborn children of AIDS-infected female users may become infected. The sex partners of persons with AIDS are exposed to the disease. Needle-sharing prostitutes interact with the drug-free heterosexual community on a daily basis.” Clark says that clean, legal needles have never been proven to increase drug use but they do save lives. VOTE YES!

Sam Grove

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

There is no scientific evidence that unlimited and uncontrolled availability of hypodermic syringes/needles will stop the spread of AIDS. Proposition "O" would open the floodgates to the purchase and distribution of hypodermic syringes, without prescription, in drug stores, supermarkets and in the streets without medical supervision under the guise of stopping the spread of AIDS. Addicts will continue to commit crimes to pay for the dope since possession and sale of drugs, such as crack cocaine and heroin, will still be illegal.

Latest statistics show that over 80 percent of inmates in our already overcrowded jails are there for illegal drug offenses.

Who will protect the public against the careless disposition of these used needles by addicts?

Black communities in San Francisco are under siege from the sale of illegal drugs and the crime this produces. Approval of Proposition "O" by the voters permitting use of unprescribed legal needles and illegal drugs could leave the City open to millions of dollars in lawsuits for unsupervised use of a medical procedure by intravenous drug addicts from death and other causes.

WE URGE A "NO" VOTE ON PROPOSITION "O". It should not be City policy to support the removal of all restrictions in the distribution, sale and use of hypodermic syringes.

Rev. Amos Brown
Hon. Naomi Gray
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Senator Quentin Kopp
Dr. Raye Richardson
Lulann McGriff
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Melvin Miles
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Clean, legal needles will save lives. Jerry DeJong of the Mayor's Narcotics Task Force said, "The bottom line is that this is not a moral or legal issue. Unfortunately with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what's sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives." Something is very wrong when its illegal to save lives; and that wrong must be corrected. Tell Sacramento that we want to legalize saving lives. We need clean, legal needles now!
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Illegal needles are the primary means of spreading AIDS to minority communities. Most of the IV drug users and their partners who have been infected with AIDS are Black or Latino. Most of the babies born with AIDS because of needle sharing by their mothers are also Black and Latino. Blacks and Latinos are now more likely than ever before to become infected with AIDS because clean needles are illegal. Legal, clean needles will slow down the infection rate and decrease the number of deaths in minority communities. Illegal needles hurt Blacks and Latinos more than they hurt others. Support legal needles.
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Prof. Ethan Nadelman, in the Washington Post, reported that "The governments of England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, the Netherlands and several other countries have actively attempted to limit the spread of AIDS by removing restrictions on the sale of syringes...." Dr. Nadelman notes that there is growing evidence that legal needles do not increase the use of drugs but they do save lives.
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A former prosecutor of high-level drug dealers, Ben Clark, said in The Daily Recorder, a law newspaper, that legal restrictions on clean needles "have had the disastrous effect of forcing drug users to share syringes. Over half the addicts in New York State are infected with AIDS, and the rate of infection among intravenous drug users in Illinois is growing dramatically."

While some people may say addicts deserve to die, Clark notes, "... the issue is not simply whether society should sit back and watch addicts kill themselves off: AIDS transmitted by needles does not stay within the druggie population. Unborn children of AIDS-infected female users may become infected. The sex partners of persons with AIDS are exposed to the disease. Needle-sharing prostitutes interact with the drug-free heterosexual community on a daily basis." Clark says that clean, legal needles have never been proven to increase drug use but they do save lives. VOTE YES!

Sam Grove
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PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION O

There is no scientific evidence that unlimited and uncontrolled availability of hypodermic syringes/needles will stop the spread of AIDS. Proposition “O” would open the floodgates to the purchase and distribution of hypodermic syringes, without prescription, in drug stores, supermarkets and in the streets without medical supervision under the guise of stopping the spread of AIDS. Addicts will continue to commit crimes to pay for the dope since possession and sale of drugs, such as crack cocaine and heroin, will still be illegal.

Latest statistics show that over 80 percent of inmates in our already overcrowded jails are there for illegal drug offenses. Who will protect the public against the careless disposition of these used needles by addicts?

Black communities in San Francisco are under siege from the sale of illegal drugs and the crime this produces. Approval of Proposition “O” by the voters permitting use of unprescribed legal needles and illegal drugs could leave the City open to millions of dollars in lawsuits for unsupervised use of a medical procedure by intravenous drug addicts from death and other causes.

WE URGE A “NO” VOTE ON PROPOSITION “O”. It should not be City policy to support the removal of all restrictions in the distribution, sale and use of hypodermic syringes.
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TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION O

We, the people of the City and County of San Francisco, California, call upon the California State Legislature to eliminate all sanctions, criminal, regulatory, or civil, on the manufacture, use, sale or other distribution of hypodermic syringes. We do this to reduce the spread of AIDS and other diseases.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION K (Continued from page 100)

charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of $100.

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such a time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission after the regular daily working hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

This amendment shall become operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY: AIRPORTS COMMISSION
3.690 Commission; Composition

An airports commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on September 1, 1996.

On the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

All rights, claims, actions, orders, obligations, proceedings and contracts relating to the airport department under the public utilities commission existing prior to the effective date of these amendments shall not be affected by the adoption thereof, and shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the airports commission.

This amendment shall become operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY-TWO: PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION
3.698 Commission — Composition

A parking and traffic commission and the department of parking and traffic are hereby established. The parking and traffic commission shall consist of five seven members. If not in conflict with state law, members of the parking and traffic commission shall serve ex-officio as members of the parking authority.

The term of each member shall be for four years; provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section shall, by lot classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided further, that terms of the two commissioners created by the amendment of June, 1990 shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 5th day of December, 1992; and on the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month. Any person may serve concurrently as a member of the San Francisco parking authority and the parking and traffic commission.
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IS GOING TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON ELECTION DAY A PROBLEM?

If you are unable to go to your polling place to vote on Election Day (Tuesday, June 5, 1990), you may vote by absentee ballot in one of two ways:

1. **Vote at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.** Starting on May 7 through June 5, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., you can vote in Room 158 at City Hall.

2. **Vote by mail.** Complete the application for an absentee ballot on the back cover. Tear or cut off the back cover, fold it in half with the address of the Registrar of Voters on the outside, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated, and mail the form.

Voters who have specified disabilities may apply to be a **permanent absentee voter.** Please refer to page 24.
BALLOT TYPE
N6 52
90

NON-PARTISAN
17th Assembly District

PRECINCTS
APPLICABLE:
4200's, 4400's, 4500's, 4600's,
4700's, 4800's, 5400's, 5500's,
5600's, 5700's, 5800's, 5900's,
6100's

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION

Must be received by the Registrar of Voters
no later than May 29, 1990
June 5, 1990 Consolidated Primary Election

FIRST NAME               MIDDLE INITIAL               LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX OR MAIL DROP ADDRESS)

NUMBER AND STREET

CITY

ZIP CODE

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (if different from above)

P.O. BOX OR STREET

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

I HAVE NOT AND WILL NOT APPLY FOR AN ABSENTEE BALLOT BY ANY OTHER MEANS.

X

SIGNATURE (DO NOT PRINT)

DATE

DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER

EVENING PHONE NUMBER

I understand that voters with specified disabilities may qualify as Permanent Absent Voters. See page 24.

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
VOTE!

Polls are open from 7 am to 8 pm
See the label on the back cover for the location of your polling place.

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot
Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:30 a.m. to about 9:00 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL
I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name _____________________________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________ Apt. #_________

Telephone No. (required) _____________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) ________________________________________

Signature _________________________________________________________
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 5, 1990 election. The Pamphlet includes:
1. a Sample Ballot (i.e., a copy of the ballot you see at your polling place or the one you receive when you vote) .................................................. Page 5-21
2. the location of your polling place ........................................ (see label on the back cover)
3. application for absentee ballot ........................................ back cover
4. definitions of words you need to know .................................. 22
5. information for disabled voters; and application for permanent absentee voter status ........................................... 24
6. rights of voters .................................................................. 25
7. statements from the candidates who are running for office .......................................................... 26-34
8. information about each proposition, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the proposition, and the legal text .............................................. 37-128

3
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

A 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张票插入。

B 第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合于二红点之上。

C 第三步
请把带针之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

D 第四步
投票选举之后，把选票取出，放入空信袋内，票尾凸出在外。
在信袋上，有空白格预填为投票人应用。

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

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

STEP 2

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

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

STEP 3

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

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

STEP 4

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

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

STEP 4
This is a Non-Partisan Ballot. You may only vote for Non-Partisan local offices, and for State and local propositions.

Non-Partisan voters in the Primary election do not vote for:

- Governor
- Lieutenant Governor
- Secretary of State
- Controller
- Treasurer
- Attorney General
- Insurance Commissioner
- Member, State Board of Equalization
- United States Representative
- State Senator
- Member of the State Assembly
- Member, County Central Committee

You will be able to vote for those offices in the General Election in November.

To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
To begin voting for Non-Partisan offices and propositions, please turn to the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

107
HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

YES 185
NO 187

108
PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

YES 189
NO 190

109
GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 192
NO 193

110
PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

YES 195
NO 197

111
THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

YES 200
NO 203
| N 51, N 52 & N 53 | 13-1N |

**Balota Independiente**  
**Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, Elecciones Primarias Consolidadas, 5 de Junio de 1990**  
**Proposiciones a ser Sometidas al Voto de los Electores — Estatal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>PROPUESTA</th>
<th>RESUPONSA</th>
<th>VACANTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para Viviendas y para Personas sin Vivienda de 1990. Esta acta disfunda una emisión de bonos por cincocientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000) para propósitos de desarrollo de viviendas y para su adquisición. Se propondrá para votar el 5 de junio de 1990.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para la dependencia física de la ciudad de San Francisco. Esta acta disfunda una emisión de bonos por cincuenta millones de dólares ($50,000,000) para propósitos de desarrollo de viviendas y para su adquisición. Se propondrá para votar el 5 de junio de 1990.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para Viviendas y para Personas sin Vivienda de 1990. Esta acta disfunda una emisión de bonos por cincuenta millones de dólares ($50,000,000) para propósitos de desarrollo de viviendas y para su adquisición. Se propondrá para votar el 5 de junio de 1990.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para Viviendas y para Personas sin Vivienda de 1990. Esta acta disfunda una emisión de bonos por cincuenta millones de dólares ($50,000,000) para propósitos de desarrollo de viviendas y para su adquisición. Se propondrá para votar el 5 de junio de 1990.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para Viviendas y para Personas sin Vivienda de 1990. Esta acta disfunda una emisión de bonos por cincuenta millones de dólares ($50,000,000) para propósitos de desarrollo de viviendas y para su adquisición. Se propondrá para votar el 5 de junio de 1990.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aprobaciones**

1. **Acta de Bonos para Viviendas y para Personas sin Vivienda de 1990.**
   - Acta disfunda una emisión de bonos por cincocientos millones de dólares ($500,000,000) para propósitos de desarrollo de viviendas y para su adquisición. Se propondrá para votar el 5 de junio de 1990.

2. **Acta de Bonos para la dependencia física de la ciudad de San Francisco.**
   - Acta disfunda una emisión de bonos por cincuenta millones de dólares ($50,000,000) para propósitos de desarrollo de viviendas y para su adquisición. Se propondrá para votar el 5 de junio de 1990.

3. **Acta de Bonos para Viviendas y para Personas sin Vivienda de 1990.**
   - Acta disfunda una emisión de bonos por cincuenta millones de dólares ($50,000,000) para propósitos de desarrollo de viviendas y para su adquisición. Se propondrá para votar el 5 de junio de 1990.

4. **Acta de Bonos para Viviendas y para Personas sin Vivienda de 1990.**
   - Acta disfunda una emisión de bonos por cincuenta millones de dólares ($50,000,000) para propósitos de desarrollo de viviendas y para su adquisición. Se propondrá para votar el 5 de junio de 1990.

5. **Acta de Bonos para Viviendas y para Personas sin Vivienda de 1990.**
   - Acta disfunda una emisión de bonos por cincuenta millones de dólares ($50,000,000) para propósitos de desarrollo de viviendas y para su adquisición. Se propondrá para votar el 5 de junio de 1990.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES 211</td>
<td>NO 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226</td>
<td>NO 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230</td>
<td>NO 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL —

211 SI

FUNCIONARIOS ESTATUALES, ÉTICA. Establece leyes de órden estadual adicionales. Crear una Comisión para que determine la comprensión de los funcionarios estatales ejecutivos. Ordena que las secciones legislativas sean públicas, impacto fiscal. Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependen de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menos costos estatales por la manutención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

213 NO


215 SI

ASENATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y establece la definición de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Costos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se establece la definición legal para la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

217 NO

DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; establece cambios legislativos. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectúa cambios significativos en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondrán en ejecución y se interpretará la medida. Puede haber un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatales y locales o puede haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

218 SI

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,000,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de viaje. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requerida del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1,6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

220 NO

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir árboles. Prohibe vender el puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobrestimación al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, y menos que la Legislatura puede dar otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

223 SI

224 NO

230 SI

232 NO
### LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

236 SI 贊成
LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, EMHINDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Boja la redistribución de distritos de los 28 partidos de la legislatura y aprueba medidas para su votación. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impact Fiscal: Los ingresos de las lecciones en las gastos por redistrubución podrán ser compensados parcialmente a menos que la ley de revisión estatal ponga en efecto la nueva ley de la corte. Los costos de las disposiciones para dita son probablemente menores.

238 NO 反對

240 SI 贊成
REDISTRIBUCION FOR COMISION, EMHINDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistrubución de distritos de la comisión, los criterios de población y las elecciones en 1994 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impact Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reducirá los costos de la redistrubución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hecho, la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarán, disminuyendo los altos.

242 NO 反對

243 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de 450.000.000 de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

245 NO 反對

248 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de 450.000.000 de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, con las que incluyen los nuevos edificios de la Universidad de California, los 20 centros de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de la Universidad Estatal de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes "Hastings," la Academia Naval de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobados por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 15 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clases, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la estabilidad.

250 NO 反對

254 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de 450.000.000 de dólares ($350,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiciones a edificios existentes, reparación, remodelación y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros, principalmente en caso de los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

256 NO 反對

258 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de 450.000.000 de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolsos de capital para construcción o mejoras de escuelas públicas.

259 NO 反對

118
119
120
121
122
123
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Public Safety Improvement Bonds, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.</td>
<td>YES 263</td>
<td>NO 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?</td>
<td>YES 269</td>
<td>NO 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?</td>
<td>YES 277</td>
<td>NO 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund; this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?</td>
<td>YES 280</td>
<td>NO 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>WITHDRAWN</td>
<td>YES 284</td>
<td>NO 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?</td>
<td>YES 284</td>
<td>NO 285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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263 SI
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PUBLICA, 1990. Para construir una red de buses de $232,400,000 para la adquisición y rehabilitación de edificios que sean propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la autorización del aumento, el aumento de la deuda para el financiamiento de los proyectos, y cuando se suma el costo de $50,000,000 de dicho proyecto en un año (local) en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $232,400,000 se reduzca por la cantidad real recibida en comisiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

265 NO

269 SI
¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 00-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (a) la reparación, la restauración, y el remodelado de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 y (b) la mejora técnica de las instalacionesbles del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco. (c) la recodificación de las instalaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco y, (iv), la construcción de un nuevo laboratorio de ciencia en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco.

272 NO
¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 00-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y cierres de los años relacionados a los amenazados por medio de efectos de un proceso especial a ser reconstruido durante varios años (1) años con una casa unida (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias de dos a cinco unidades residenciales, de $45,00 por parcela durante los primeros años, (2) por parcelas de uso mixto (casa unida o uso mixto residencial hasta un uso un máximo de $45,000 por parcela), y (3) para parcelas de uso mixto (casa unida o uso mixto residencial hasta un uso un máximo de $45,000 por parcela) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias de $75,00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y $10,22 por unidad de vivienda durante los cuatro (4) años siguientes al sexto año, y (4) para parcelas de uso mixto (casa unida o uso mixto residencial hasta un uso un máximo de $45,000 por parcela) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $75,00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y $10,22 por unidad de vivienda durante los cuatro (4) años siguientes al sexto año.

277 SI
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Superintendentes, sin la aprobación de los electores, un límite de la deuda específica, autorizar el enriquecimiento de equipos de grupo para alguna empresa sin fines de lucro, si el Consejero certifica que el caso esté en interés de la ciudad en su beneficio, para los fines de enriquecimiento de equipos de grupo para alguna empresa sin fines de lucro?

278 NO

280 SI
¿Crees que la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Calles de $20,000 para pagar por atender a los vecindarios de la ciudad y limpiar las escuelas de los impuestos, permitiendo que las empresas dispagan hasta el 10% de su impuestos comerciales a dicha fundación, con un ajuste anual del 6% de este porcentaje y que tal fondo sea de $1 millón disponible en el año febrero de 1990, y deberá establecerse el límite de $250,000 millones de año Recal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

281 NO

284 SI
¿Se realizaría una consulta a la Constitución Federal para (1) cambiar la semana laboral de 48 horas (después de la cual un hombre gana horas extra) y permitir un cambio en que la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a la máxima estabilidad por medio de un rescate, establezca la duración y las horas de las sesiones de los hombres, en vez de requerirlas tomadas de 24 horas que comienzan a las 6 a.m.?

285 NO

ELIMINADA

E 撤消

F

市民投票提案第45城投票之前及在某些特定情况下，如市议会通过有利公司负担的措施，是否要增加市政府所付的利息比其他各种债务计划低？

C

市民应否设立美化街区及奖励有首都基金的金矿家三藩市街坊及清道夫的费用？请参考联邦及州的街头设备之一百美元基金，每年此基金会受政府以维持一百万元基金？

B

市民应否设立美化街区及奖励有首都基金的金矿家三藩市街坊及清道夫的费用？请参考联邦及州的街头设备之一百美元基金？
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

288 SI 采
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?

289 NO 反对

290 SI 采
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los inspectores de protección contra inundaciones de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?

292 NO 反对

293 SI 采
¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultoría con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?

295 NO 反对

296 SI 采
¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?

297 NO 反对

298 SI 采
¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a diez miembros?

299 NO 反对

300 SI 采
¿Será un requisito que los miembros de los mandos y los servidores de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que no sean empleados a los miembros de otras jurisdicciones, comisiones y partes superiores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a servidores menores, o a los miembros que se ocupan de áreas más agrupadas, capacidad o aplicaciones superiores a otras unidades residenciales de San Francisco que no sean con otras condicionales?

301 NO 反对

302 SI 采
¿Se emmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?

304 NO 反对

305 SI 采
¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un periodo completo de cuatro años cuando termine su periodo actual?

307 NO 反对

309 SI 采
¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles irrelevantes a la fabricación, el uso, o a la distribución de aguas hipodérmicas?

310 NO 反对

N 51, N 52 & N 53

21-IN
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — If you do not wish to go to your polling place to vote, you may vote by mail or by going to the Registrar’s Office in City Hall in person. This is called absentee voting.

BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest.


CHARTERBoARDS AND COMMISSIONS (PROPOSITION J, K, L) — Boards and commissions created by the Charter, either directly or indirectly.

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

DEFERRED CAPITAL MAINTENANCE (PROPOSITION B) — Major building repair projects that have been postponed.

ELECTOR (PROPOSITION L) — A person who is eligible to register to vote.

FINANCE (PROPOSITION C) — Various ways to pay for something over time. This may include raising money or offering something in trade.

FISCAL YEAR (PROPOSITION A, D) — The twelve months from July 1 to June 30 make up a fiscal year. The City budgets revenues and expenses on a fiscal year basis.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS (PROPOSITION B) — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INITIATIVE (PROPOSITION F, O) — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE (PROPOSITION B, J) — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters. For such a law to be passed by the Board of Supervisors, a majority, (or in some cases, three-fourths) of the Supervisors must vote to approve the law at two consecutive meetings.

OUTSTANDING PRINCIPAL (PROPOSITION A, C) — The actual amount of borrowed money, not yet paid back. Principal does not include interest charges.

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A person who has turned in the required papers and signatures with the Registrar of Voters to run for an office as a write-in candidate. The name of this person will not be on the ballot. Voters who want to vote for this person can do so by writing the name of the person on the inside of the grey envelope given with the ballot.

SPECIAL PROPERTY TAX [MELLO-ROOS DISTRICT] (PROPOSITION F) — A flat tax on a parcel of land, which is not based on the property’s value. The special tax would be in addition to current property taxes. This tax requires a two-thirds majority vote.

STAFFING LEVEL (PROPOSITION F) — The number of employees on duty at any one time.

TAX EXEMPT DEBT (PROPOSITION C) — Money borrowed by the City which is paid back with interest. The lenders are not taxed on the money earned from these loans.

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now," "The Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters’ rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.

BALLLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas de Luca, Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters
Vincent Chao
San Francisco Unified School District Reading Specialist
Beverly Ornstein
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, Northern California Chapter
S.M. Rilleau
The Newspaper Guild, Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney
### VOTER SELECTION COUPON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE - OFFICE 1</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE - OFFICE 1</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE - OFFICE 3</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE - OFFICE 3</th>
<th>ASSESSOR</th>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNOR</td>
<td>(Check Ballot for the number of candidates to vote for)</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>PROP YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT. GOVERNOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>A 263 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARY OF STATE</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>B 269 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROLLER</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>C 277 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURER</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>D 280 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E WITDRAWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE COMMISSIONER</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F 284 285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, BOARD OF EQUALIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G 288 289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>STATE SUPT. OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H 290 292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE - OFFICE 3</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I 293 295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE - OFFICE 3</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J 296 297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K 298 299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L 300 301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 302 304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N 305 307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O 309 310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, and Molly Wood

Board of Supervisors appointees: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gillham, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that absentee ballots be mailed to them or they may vote in person at City Hall from May 7 through June 5 during normal working hours (see “Your Rights as a Voter” section of this pamphlet). In addition, voters with specified disabilities enumerated below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library’s Branch for the Blind at 3150 Sacramento Street produces and distributes tape recorded copies of the State and Local Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually-impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voter’s office by calling 554-4386.

ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them. The persons providing assistance may be someone who came with the voter, or poll workers can be asked to provide needed assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the sidewalk in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If your polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided that this will not impede the flow of traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large print instructions on how to vote and magnifying sheets to enlarge the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows for seated voting.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip tool and pen to be used in punching the ballot and signing in.

APPLICATION TO BE A PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

The physically disabled may apply to be permanent absentee voters. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, you will automatically receive an absentee ballot every election until you move or re-register.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the form below and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158, City Hall, San Francisco, 94102. Each time you move or re-register to vote, you must apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases you do not need to re-apply.

I hereby apply for “Permanent Absentee Voter” status in San Francisco by reason of:

___ Lost use of one or more limbs. ___ Lost use of both hands.
___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g. cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair).
___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease.
___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities.
___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

PLEASE SEE EXPLANATORY LETTER ATTACHED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>LAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residence Address

Street Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>APT. #</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mailing Address

(if different than residence address given above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I declare under penalty of Perjury that the above is true and correct:

Date ____________________ Signature ____________________

(Return only this page; do not return the whole book)
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens over 18 years old who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 8, 1990.

Q — I moved before May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 8 and June 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — If you are registered as a member of a political party you may choose a candidate for:
Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Member-State Board of Equalization (District 2), Member-State Assembly, State Senator if you live in Senate District 8, United States Representative, and members of the County Central Committee.
Non-partisan offices are:
Superintendent of Public Instruction, Superior Court Judge, Municipal Court Judge, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 5, 1990. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar's Office at 554-4375 to let us know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help you.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don’t know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to my polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 5 by:
• going to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall from May 7 through June 5, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday; or
• mailing in a request for an absentee ballot. You may send in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. The application must be received by the Registrar of Voters before May 29, 1990.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include:
• your home address
• the address to which you want the ballot mailed
• your printed name and your signature.
Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSessor
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is paid $98,670 a year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is paid $102,882 a year.
The Public Defender represents the following persons unable to pay for their own lawyer: 1) persons accused of crimes, 2) juveniles in legal actions, and 3) persons in mental health hearings.
Candidates for Assessor

PAUL E. SCHWENGER

My address is 16 Ord Court, Apt. #4
My occupation is Deputy Assessor
My age is 53
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Francisco, Mission High School graduate, and San Francisco State University graduate. I have been a Deputy Assessor for San Francisco for the past 22 years. I have been awarded the SRPA, Senior Real Property Designation, which is one of the highest awards for professional appraisers. My 22 years of experience will enable me to effectively represent homeowners’ and renters’ concerns before State Legislative Committees. I will analyze property values to make sure business pays its fair share and I will oversee the operations of the Assessor’s office in an experienced and professional manner.

Paul E. Schwenger

The sponsors for Paul E. Schwenger are:

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: With 28 years of public service, I am the only candidate with real management experience.
As Sheriff of San Francisco, I managed 399 employees; as Police Chief, 2,500; as New York Prison Commissioner, 13,000.
While this would be the largest managerial responsibility faced by the other candidates, it would be my smallest.
I want to be your assessor so I can make it a model agency. I know government and real estate. I am dedicated to public service and to lower taxes for you.
Mayor Agnos agrees I am the rational choice.
I would appreciate your vote.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Assessor

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Attorney/Supervisor
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have absolutely no ownership or income interests in real property which create any conflict of interest as Assessor.

As attorney for 25 years, Supervisor for three terms, and past President of the Board, I have a proven record of unique, practical accomplishments.

Just as I've fought for reduced local government spending, I'll work for new statewide lower assessment formulas with the same energy that created the nationally copied No-Smoking Ordinance; the Police Fingerprint Computer which reduced our crime rate; laws allowing earthquake victims to quickly replace damaged buildings.

My goal is to achieve fair, reduced property assessments.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred S. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Chief of Police.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St. #20D, Attorney-Legislator.
Nancy Pelosi, 2640 Broadway, Member of Congress.
John Burton, 712 Vermont, Assemblyman.
Jim Gonzalez, 642 Edinburgh, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th Street, Community College Board.
Thomas C. Scallon, 631 Vicente St., Retired City Treasurer.
Sam Duca, 16 Wawona St., Assessor.
John J. Lo Schiavo, 650 Parker Avenue, President.
USF. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., University Professor, UCSF.
Sophie Hoffman, 2825 Lake St., Chairman, Salvation Army, Advisory Bd.
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave. #4, Teachers' Union President.
Collin P. Quock, 140 Casitas Avenue, Physician.
Richard Rodriguez, 37 Brentwood Ave., Vice President Teamsters.
Sam Jordan, 4006 3rd St., Caterer.
Alfred D. Trigueiro, 1956 Stockton St., Police Officers Association Official.
Lawrence B. Martin, 401 Garfield Street, International Representative, Transport Workers Union.
John Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist.
Louis G. Spadia, 1177 California St. #315, President, Bay Area Sports Hall of Fame.
Mary Frances Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Businesswoman.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Assistant to Speaker.
John J. Moylan, 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader.

RONALD G. KERSHAW

My address is 3533 21st Street
My occupation is Real Estate Portfolio Manager
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are: B.S. Accounting, Brigham Young University 1975

MBA Real Estate, Golden Gate University 1986
Eleven years experience in all aspects of property management, appraisals, renovation and property sales.
Currently responsible for supervising a real estate portfolio of $150,000,000

Past President SF Chapter, Institute of Internal Auditors
Currently, President, Log Cabin Club of San Francisco
San Francisco homeowner and resident since 1975.
San Francisco needs a fiscal conservative who is the only qualified candidate to become the City's new Assessor.

Ronald G. Kershaw

The sponsors for Ronald G. Kershaw are:

Christopher L. Bowman, 39 Fair Oaks #303, Political Consultant.
Nicole Brien, 147 10th Ave., Secretary.
Honor H. Bulkley, 3 Downey St., Property Manager.
Albert C. Chang, 1328 Wawona St., Realtor.
Rose Chung, 2161 Mason St., Radiologic Technologist.
Theresa L. Claassen, 1940 Broadway, Retired Social Worker.
James Fang, 170 Gellert Drive, Journalist.
Wade Francois, 2436 15th Ave., Lawyer.
William E. Grayson, 95 Sea Cliff, Attorney.
Jun Retu Hatoyama, 150 Glenbrook, Political Consultant.
James L. Howard, 839 41st Ave., Child Welfare Supervisor.
Ronald G. Kershaw, 3533 21st Street, Real Estate Portfolio Manager.
Leonard J. Lacayo, 925 Persia Ave., Consultant.
Tung K. Lee, 1312 California, President, Chinese Times Newspaper.
Christina I. Mack, 2963 23rd Ave., Accountant.
Nancy A. Nichols, 1032 Broadway, Archaeologist.
George H. Pfau, Jr., 2298 Vallejo St., Stockbroker.
Emily G. Pike, 1800 Broadway, Retired.
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Owner, Andre's TV. Helen Skripkin, 347 14th Avenue, Retired.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender represents people in trouble who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. The responsibility must be performed ethically, competently, and efficiently. During three terms in office, with the help of a superb staff of men and women, that duty has been fulfilled with compassion, dignity, and with the highest professional standards of the American legal system.

In the next term, I pledge to continue to carry out the special trust of this office: to guarantee that everyone in this City has the full benefit of our Constitution and is treated with fairness and with justice.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:


Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #3

ALEX SALDAMANDO

My address is 700 Arkansas Street
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: In my 11 years presiding as a Municipal Court Judge, I have worked to protect the citizens of San Francisco. I have delivered justice swiftly and firmly, in a fair and impartial manner. As a Superior Court Judge, I would bring the same approach to felony criminal cases and complex civil disputes. I am currently President of the California Judges Foundation. My background includes experience as a prosecutor and a public interest lawyer. A graduate of the University of California (Berkeley) and Hastings College of Law, I live with my wife and two children on Potrero Hill.

My sponsors include: Judge Ira Brown, Jr.; Judge John Dearman; Judge Isabella Grant; Judge Ed Stern; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Lillian Sing; Former Judge Charles Renfrew; Mayor Art Agnos; Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein; Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi; Assemblyman Willie Brown; Assemblyman John Burton; Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Harry Britt; Supervisor Jim Gonzalez; Supervisor Terence Hallinan; Supervisor Willie Kennedy; School Board Member Rosario Anaya; School Board Member Libby Denebeim; School Board Member Fred Rodriguez; Commissioner Paul Melbostad; Larry Mazzola, President, Local 38; Thelma Shelley, Director, Performing Arts Center; Benny Yee; Stan Smith, Building Trades Council; and Police Commissioner John Keker.

Alex Saldamando

J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY

My address is 340 Magellan
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a Municipal Court Judge since 1974, native Californian, resident San Francisco since 1937; attended local schools, N.D.V., St. Ignatius, USF and USF School of Law; married Patricia M. Berti, admitted State Bar 1960, devoted thirty years to public service; adjunct Professor of Law, USF; participant, member and/or lecturer for many organizations — Salesian Boys Club, 44 years — Municipal Court Speakers Bureau — California Judges Association — California Center for Judicial Education and Research — San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project; Supervising Judge, Preliminary Courts, Presiding Judge, Assistant Presiding Judge, Court Administrative Committee member eight years; honored by: San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Irish-Israeli-Italian Society, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, Lawyers Club, USF School of Law and USF Law Society for outstanding community service.


J. Dominique Olcomendy

* Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #5

KAY TSENIN

My address is 637 Steiner Street
My occupation is Attorney and Counselor at Law
My age is 43 years
My qualifications for office are: B.A., San Francisco State University (Dean's List), graduate, University of San Francisco School of Law. Attorney for sixteen years specializing in civil litigation. Pro-Tem Municipal Court Judge in San Francisco for five years.

Born in China, moved to San Francisco as a child, graduate of George Washington High School.

Broad Community service includes founding of environmental law societies while in law school, Vice President for Legal Affairs for California National Organization for Women (NOW), Board Member for the Russian American Credit Union and San Francisco Trial Lawyers and Board Advisor for the Legal Advocates for Women. Vice-President, Alamo Square Neighborhood Association.

Strong commitment to equal justice for all without prejudice or bias. The following San Franciscoans support me because they feel that the Superior Court needs a judge with my background, legal expertise and perspective on the law:

Sheriff Mike Hennessey, Supervisor Harry Britt, Dr. Leland Yee, Attorney Paul Melbostad, Jean Harris, Calvin Welch, Attorney Sue Hestor, Attorney Mary C. Dunlap, Roberto Esteves, Bob Ross, Matthew Rothschild, Pat Norman, Jonathan Bulkley, Susan P. Kennedy, Adrian Bermudez, Lawrence Brinkin, John H. Cushner, Attorney Anne Kiruksnik Facing, Eugene Kiruksnik, N. Arden Danekas, Laura E. McBride, Donna Yutzy, Gale Armstrong.

Kay Tsenin

CARLOS BEA

My address is 2727 Pierce Street
My occupation is Judge Superior Court #5
My qualifications for office are: I am a Superior Court Judge in San Francisco and author of articles in several professional journals, such as California Trial Lawyers and Defense Research Institute’s. Am recognized by the State Bar for pro bono work with members of the Hispanic Community. Have served two terms as a member of the Board of Visitors, Stanford Law School. Was a panelist and lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar. Was an adjunct professor, Hastings College of Law and Stanford Law School. I graduated from Stanford Law School and have been an attorney in San Francisco since 1959.

Sponsors include: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Ollie Marie-Victoire, all the judges of the Superior Court, Angela Alioto, Ernest Chuck Ayala, Willie Brown, Jr., John Burton, Jim Gonzalez, Quentin Kopp, H. Jesse Arnelle, James Herman, Mary Noel Pepys, Robert McDonnell, G. Joseph Bertain, Edward McFetridge, Zeppelin Wong, Paul Renne, Leo Murphy, Jr., Gina Moscone, James Brosnahan, Barbara Caulfield, Robert Morales, Paul Haerle, Michael Hardeman, Howard Nemerovski, Edwin Heafey, Jr., Larry Mazzola, Vincent Friia, Putnam Livermore, William Coblenz.

Carlos Bea
DONNA HITCHENS

My address is 468 30th Street
My occupation is attorney
My age is 42 years
My qualifications for office are: Over the past thirteen years, I have represented clients in San Francisco courts, taught law to San Francisco students and served on the Boards of Directors of private and public agencies designed to further the cause of justice in our city.

My experience as a mediator, counselor and advocate demonstrates my willingness to pursue alternative dispute resolutions. Judicial leadership and integrity are standards that the community should demand. My record attests to my ability to meet those standards.

• J.D. UC Berkeley 1977
• Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates, a public interest firm specializing in sex discrimination cases. 1978 – 1984
• Co-founder, Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom
• Staff Counsel, ACLU. 1984 – 85
• Partner, Hitchens & Brenner. Small Business, non-profit corporations, civil rights and family law. Presently
• Former chair, San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women.
• Member, Board of Directors, Pacific Primary PreSchool.

SUPPORT: Assembly member John Burton; Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisors Nancy Walker, Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, and Terence Hallinan; Judge Lillian Sing, Judge Mary Morgan, and Judge Herbert Donaldson; Commissioners Jim Jefferson, Adrian Bermudez, Jr., James Morales, Paul Melbostad, Richard Grosboll, and Leni Marin; Hon. Libby Denebeim; Hon. Leland Yee; Carol Migden; Will Leong; Catherine Dodd, R.N.; Jeff Mori, and Mauri Schwartz

Donna Hitchens

JEROME T. BENSON

My address is 187 Robinhood Drive
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the Superior Court
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are:
• 23 years public service in the courtroom protecting victims, litigants and the community.
• 7 years as Chief of the Criminal Division in the District Attorney’s Office including:
  • 65 felony jury trial prosecutions for murder, rape, child abuse, drugs, white-collar fraud.
• Stanford Law School graduate 1964.
• Chairman, State Bar of California Subcommittee on Jury Instructions (Criminal).
• Member, Project Safer California.
• Fair and equal application of the law without regard to race, sex, or economic status.
• I am a native San Franciscan and homeowner living with my wife and two daughters near Miraloma Park.
• My judicial office is dedicated to fair rulings, hard work, human sensitivity, and legal equality.

CITYWIDE SUPPORT:
State Senator Quentin Kopp; Justice Harry Low; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Public Defender Jeff Brown; Sheriff Michael Hennessey; Former Chief of Police Alfred Nelder.
SUPERVISORS:
Angela Alioto, Tom Hsieh, Wendy Nelder;
JUDGES:
John Ertola, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Ina Gyemant, Paul Alvarado, Isabella Grant;
LABOR:
Mike Hardeman, Stan Smith, Kevin Ryan;
ATTORNEYS AND COMMUNITY:
William Coblenz; Harold Dobbs; Charles Breyer; Airport Commission President Morris Bernstein; Wayne Friday; Benny Yee; Louis Giraud; Doris Thomas; Christopher Bowman; Haddie Redd; Elizabeth Aguilar-Tarchi; Ron Haberman;

Jerome T. Benson
JAMES HARRIGAN

My address is 494 Mangels St.
My occupation is Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department.
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I live in Glen Park with my wife, Serena Lee, and our three children.

I received my law degree with academic awards and Law Review distinction in 1975 from Golden Gate University, San Francisco.

I have completed more than 80 jury and court trials in Municipal and Superior Court, representing thousands of citizens and victims of crime in civil and criminal cases in private practice, as a public defender, and as Legal Counsel to the Sheriff.

My expertise includes: employment law, labor relations, criminal, landlord/tenant, and constitutional law. As Counsel to the Sheriff, I resolve the legal affairs of a major law enforcement agency. My work brings me before the civil and criminal justice system each day.

"James Harrigan is by far the best qualified candidate. No other candidate has his broad range of experience: public service and private practice; law enforcement and defense law; extensive courtroom experience and administrative expertise. I strongly urge your vote for James Harrigan."

— Sheriff Michael Hennessey

I have not listed my sponsors. I firmly believe the voter's decision should be based on one's qualifications and experience — not on political connections.

I pledge equal application of the law. I ask for your support. Thank you.

James Harrigan

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Ave.
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My qualifications for office are: What I am in life, I owe to my family and to an excellent education: M.A., counseling, Stanford University; B.A., psychology, University of San Francisco; Juris Doctorate, Hastings College of Law. I began practicing law in 1982 and have been an assistant district attorney since 1983: with experience in criminal prosecution and family law enforcing child support. I have served 10 years on the College Board; my colleagues elected me president three terms because of my firm but fair judgment. My duties include equitably settling conflicts, grievances and contracts. In my years of public service, compassion, integrity and common sense have always guided my decisions; and as a judge that will continue to be the case.

My supporters:
Justice Harry Low
Judges: Isabella Grant, Lenard Louie, David Garcia, Larry Kay, Mary Morgan, Bill Mallen, Herbert Donaldson.
District Attorney: Arlo Smith
Public Defender: Jeff Brown
Senators: Milton Marks, Quentin Kopp
Attorneys: Charlie Clifford, Harriet Ross, William Coblenz, Cedric Chao, Roberta Achtenberg
BART Director: Mike Bernick
Commissioners: Rosario Anaya, Tim Wolfred, Chuck Ayala, Naomi Gray.
Supervisors: Thomas Hsieh, Angela Alioto
Walter Johnson; Alex Esclamado; Reverend Amos Brown; Carole Migden;
UC Regent Yori Wada.

Julie Tang

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: I'm honored that MAYOR ART AGNOS and 8 PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION — who know my courtroom experience and qualifications in civil and criminal law — endorse me.

As a lawyer in private practice 18 years, mother of 2 children, married 19 years, I care about the strength and integrity of San Francisco's courts.

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred community trust — not a consolation prize for a restless politician. A lawyer lacking courtroom experience is unqualified to be judge.

In HUNDREDS of court appearances and trials, as chair of the Bar Association Criminal Justice Advisory Council, as a San Francisco Delinquency Prevention Commissioner, and as a Hastings Law School teacher, I have demonstrated a longstanding commitment to professional excellence.

Community and law enforcement leaders who acknowledge my legal service and endorse me:

SPEAKER Willie Brown
SUPERVISORS Nancy Walker, Bill Maher, Harry Britt, Terence Hallinan
JUDGES Dorothy vonBoroldingen, John Dearman, Edward Stern
COURT COMMISSIONER George Colbert
SENATOR Milton Marks
SCHOOL BOARD JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Libby Denebim, Myra Kopf
POLICE COMMISSIONER John Keker
FIRE COMMISSIONER Sharon Bretz
SHERIFF LIEUTENANT Connie O'Connor
POLICE OFFICERS VICE PRESIDENT Paul Chignell
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY Charles Wood
BUSINESSMAN Mel Swig
PUC COMMISSIONER Rodel Rodis

WILLIAM J. O'CONNOR

My address is 3615 Buchanan St. #206
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: I am the most qualified candidate for this office. I have had judicial experience, serving as Municipal Court judge pro tem for over five years, and have been commended by the Presiding Judge for the quality of my service. I have been a journeyman lawyer for 15 years, with both criminal and civil experience, and have done over 30 jury trials.

With Amnesty International and Church representatives, I have been an International Trial Observer.

I have been a Board Member of the Elizabeth Frye Center and the Irish Forum, and a volunteer on the Bar Association's free legal services panel.


William J. O'Connor

---

Ellen Chaitin
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #3

LILLIAN K. SING

My address is San Francisco Municipal Court,
400 Van Ness Ave.
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the San Francisco
Municipal Court
My age is 47

My qualifications for office are: I am an incumbent judge, and
have been a judge since 1981. I am the first Asian-American
woman judge in the history of Northern California. In 1988, I
was awarded Trial Judge of the Year by San Francisco Trial
Lawyers Association, one of the highest awards a Bar Associ-
ation can bestow. Last year, I was unanimously elected as Munici-
pal Court’s Presiding Judge. As Presiding Judge, I implemented
the Pro Tem Judge Program, drastically reduced backlog in
civil/criminal cases, brought Trial Court Funding to San Fran-
cisco, spearheaded San Francisco’s first judicial forum “Access
To Justice” attended by 680 people. I served as a faculty member
with the California Center for Judicial Education/Research
which trains all new judges in California and am a faculty judge
with the National Institute for Trial Advocacy which trains trial
lawyers. In 1988 I lectured throughout China on the U.S.
Legal/Judicial System.

Join San Francisco judges led by Presiding Judges Choppelas,
and Marie-Victoire, Mayor Art Agnos, President Harry Britt,
and the entire 11 Board of Supervisors, Assembly Speaker Willie
Brown, Assemblyman John Burton, Senator Milton Marks, For-
mer Police Chiefs Nelder/Cahill, DA Arlo Smith, PD Jeff
Brown, Sheriff Michael Hennessey and retain me as judge.

Lillian K. Sing

JEROME A. DEFILIPPO

My address is 1534 38th Avenue
My occupation is Attorney at Law
My qualifications for office are: A third generation San Fran-
ciscan, I have practiced law in The City since 1973, served as
the Legal Officer of the San Francisco Police Department and a
Deputy City Attorney. I am committed to the impartial applica-
tion of our laws in all judicial proceedings. Having served twenty
years as a Police Officer attaining the position of Lieutenant, I
am well aware of the frustrations each of us feel by the impact
of crime in our City. If elected, I am committed to the imposition
of the maximum sentence allowed by law for persons convicted
of violent crimes or narcotic sales.

Partial list of sponsors follows:
Ann Alberigi, Catherine Archbold, Alfred Arnaud, Martin
Bastiani, Chief Thomas Cahill, Ann Carrick, Peter Cimarelli,
Hon. Antone Cincotta, Clement Collins, Jean DeFilippo, Cantor
Martin Feldman, Nancy Feldman, H. Welton Flynn, John
Fracchia, Carol Fujikawa, John Gallagher, Judith Gallen, Kath-
leen Gee, Dr. William Gee, Susanna Lee, Margaret Leong,
Maureen Mahoney, Carmelita Mathais, Phyliss Moylan, James
Pagano, Renzo Panelli, Timothy J. Riordan, Rollin Schroth, Joan
Swendsen, Spiron Tentes, Paul Vigo, Rita Young

Jerome A. DeFilippo

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against these measures. All arguments, “official” and paid, are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None of them has been checked for accuracy by this office or any other city official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Official Arguments”

There is one “official” argument for and one against each measure, and they are published at no cost. “Official” arguments are selected by the Registrar of Voters in accordance with the priorities set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code as summarized below:

For:

1. Person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee supporting the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Against:

1. For a referendum, person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee against the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Rebuttals

Authors of official arguments may each prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. As with official and paid arguments, rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Each rebuttal follows immediately after its corresponding official argument.

Paid Arguments

All paid arguments are accepted for publication upon (1) deposit of an amount equal to $50 plus $1.50 per word, (2) submission of a petition containing valid signatures of registered voters in lieu of the printing fee at the rate of two signatures for each dollar of the fee, or (3) a combination of a printing fee and signatures which together equal the number of signatures and/or amount of money required to qualify the argument for publication.

For each measure, paid arguments follow after the official arguments and rebuttals. All paid arguments supporting a measure are printed together followed by all paid arguments against that same measure. Paid arguments within each group (e.g. all paid arguments in favor of Proposition Z) are not printed in any particular order. Rather they are arranged so that each page is fully utilized.

There is one ballot measure for which paid arguments were not accepted. The School Facilities Safety Special Tax measure is being proposed under state law; only one argument for, one argument against, and respective rebuttals for this measure are allowed.

Again, arguments and rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked by this office or any other city official or agency.
Public Safety Improvement Bonds

PROPOSITION A

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263
NO 265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City buildings were damaged by the October 17, 1989 earthquake and many may not survive another strong earthquake. Many City buildings contain asbestos and many are not accessible to disabled persons. Many City buildings do not meet current health, safety and building codes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $332,400,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This total would be reduced by the amount of grants the City receives from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the State of California for earthquake repair and hazard reduction. No more than $65,000,000 of bonds could be sold in any fiscal year.

This money would be used to pay for safety improvements to some City buildings, including repairing earthquake damage, making the buildings better able to survive earthquakes, removing or reducing the danger of asbestos in these buildings, making them more accessible to the disabled and bringing them up to current codes.

The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds for not more than $332,400,000 to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue bonds to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that the approximate costs would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond redemption</th>
<th>$332,400,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>244,314,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$576,714,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bond authorization limits the issuance of bonds to no more than $65 million per year. Assuming a single sale on a 20 year basis at current interest rates with no reduction for possible FEMA or State funding, annual debt service on each $65 million increment would amount to $5,638,750, which amount is equivalent to one and forty-eight hundredths cents ($0.0148) in the current tax rate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 26, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A the earthquake repair and protection measure.

Proposition A provides $332.4 million to repair earthquake damaged city buildings and to seismically reinforce many of them so that they would not sustain as much damage (or worse) during a future earthquake. This improves public safety while it also protects the investment we are making in repairs.

Your “Yes on A” vote will provide for:

Replacement of the broken and earthquake damaged water and sewer lines at the Zoo.

Proposition A represents a prudent investment which would protect many irreplaceable public buildings from major damage or collapse in a future earthquake.

In order to keep property taxes from rising more than 2-3¢ per $100 of assessed value, Proposition A will not allow more than $65 million in bonds to be sold in any one year. It further requires that any Federal or State earthquake relief money we receive to repair these buildings reduce the amount of bonds sold. This assures that local taxpayers will not be required to pay for repairs that can be made using Federal/State emergency relief assistance.

Vote Yes on Proposition A to protect city buildings and increase public safety in a next major earthquake.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Chief Administrative Officer.
Public Safety
Improvement Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

When future earthquakes strike, our libraries need to be safe. Proposition A will provide funds to help earthquake proof our library system.

Vote YES on A.

Michael Mellor, President
Friends of the San Francisco Public Library

This bond issue will help to ensure the seismic safety of the Palace of Fine Arts, home of the Exploratorium which is visited by over 600,000 people a year. Prop A represents a prudent investment to improve public safety and protect irreplaceable public buildings. We urge all citizens to vote “Yes” on Proposition A.

Exploratorium
F. Van Kasper, Chairman
William K. Coblenz, Vice Chairman
C. Richard Kramlich, Vice Chairman
G. Steven Burrill, Treasurer

Replacement of the earthquake-damaged, underground, 50-year-old water, gas and sewer lines at the San Francisco Zoo is critically needed for the safety and well-being of the animals. It will significantly improve public services to the 1.2 million children and adults who visit annually. The Zoological Society will endeavor to raise funds to renovate and build new above-ground facilities to supplement the $26 million included in the bond issue for the Zoo. Help make the Zoo a true sanctuary.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Zoological Society Board
Frances May McAteer
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Amy Meyer
People for GGNRA
Andrew Nash
President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Trent W. Orr
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Elizabeth D. Rieger
Zoo Volunteer
Fred A. Rodriguez
School Board Member
Carroll Soo-Hoo
Zoo Benefactor
Stephen V. R. Spaulding
Zoological Society Treasurer
James J. Walsh Jr.
Citizens Advisory Committee on Wastewater Management
Connie O’Connor
President, Recreation & Park Commission

David E. Anderson
Zoo Director
Phil Arnold
Assistant General Manager
Recreation & Park
William Brewster Ely IV
Headmaster, Town School
Mary Burns
General Manager
Recreation & Park
Margaret K. Burks
Executive Director, Zoological Society
Jack W. Castor
Animal Keeper Shop Steward, Local 858
Todd Cecil
Children’s Zoo Keeper
Sherri Chiesa
President, Local 2
Robert Todd Cockburn
Executive Director, Clean Water Program
Rosemary Davidson
Urban School
Dolores A. Donovan
Animal Control & Welfare Commission
Keith G. Eickman
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Roy Eisenhardt
Director, California Academy of Sciences
Becky Evans
Conservation Activist
Norman Gershenz
Director, Ecosystem Survival Plan
Arthur J. Goedewaagen
Board Member, SPEAK
John E. Hafernik Jr.
Professor Biology, SFSU
Roger Hoppes
Director, Children’s Zoo
Michael Housh
Assistant to the Mayor
David J. Howe
Animal Keeper
Mark Hurley
Animal Control & Welfare Commission
Norma J. Kristovich
Zoo Docent Council
Connie Lurie
Vice Chairman, Zoological Society Board

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

We must rebuild and repair our infrastructure. The October 17 quake was a warning. More resources going to earthquake preparedness programs today will save lives in the future. Vote YES on A.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

We urge everyone to vote Yes on Proposition A. The people of San Francisco have a $3.5 billion investment in public buildings. This bond issue will be used to fund repairs to many of our facilities damaged in last October’s earthquake, including City Hall, General Hospital, neighborhood libraries, police stations and cultural buildings. It will also provide monies necessary to make life-safety improvements to other city buildings.

Your Yes Vote on Proposition A will protect lives and property in the event of another major earthquake at a very small cost to businesses and homeowners. Because bonds to finance repairs will be sold over 6 - 10 years, replacing older bond issues as they are paid-off, the result will be an almost unchanged tax rate. In fact, the City’s independent budget analyst found that the tax bill for an average homeowner will increase by less than $5.00 a month.

Proposition A is a small price to pay to preserve our investment in the city’s valuable public facilities.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

We ask that you join with us in Voting YES ON PROP. “A”.

Your “Yes on A” vote will provide funds to protect the two remaining Police Stations which are not yet earthquake safe or provided for in previous bond issues.

In an emergency we can do our jobs only if our own police facilities are earthquake resistant and if we can get to those places in the City which most need our services. That is why it is important to us that as many City buildings as possible are made earthquake resistant. The less damage and street obstruction that results from a future earthquake, the better we can get to these parts of the City where we are most needed. The safer the public buildings in the City are made, the better we will be able to serve the rest of the City if we ever have to face a major earthquake emergency.

For security vote “Yes on A”.

Michael Keys President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

The damage done by the October 17th earthquake to San Francisco’s most important public buildings is considerable. To correct that damage and prepare for the future vitality of our City demands the kind of response represented by Proposition A. This proposition carefully earmarks funds to upgrade buildings such as City Hall, the War Memorial Opera House, and the Department of Public Health offices which are treasures that can never be replaced or reproduced. They not only need to be repaired, but strengthened structurally and improved, to meet today’s building codes. The Federal Government will pick up some of the damage, but much more will be needed if these vital components of our City’s daily life are to be improved and made ready for the next major quake. Proposition A requests a large sum, but this is a time when we as a City have to agree to such a request. We strongly urge your support of Proposition A.

American Institute of Architects/San Francisco Chapter

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

We ask you to join us in voting “Yes on A”.

The primary purpose of Prop “A” is to protect lives and public buildings from the effects of the next earthquake. As San Franciscans we all share the responsibility of having to do all we can to avoid the loss of life, the suffering and the huge costs which another, perhaps stronger or longer quake would bring. Thus we see Proposition “A” as a necessary, prudent investment in all our future.

We have a special reason to support “Prop A” and to ask you to vote YES ON “A” as well. That special reason is the fact that 20 of the buildings which will be repaired or strengthened against future earthquakes if Prop “A” passes will also be made fully accessible to the disabled. We want our City’s buildings to be repaired, to be made safe and to be made accessible to all San Franciscans.

Vote “Yes on A”.

Kathy Uhl, Executive Director,
Independent Living Resource Center
Michael L. Comini, Executive Director,
Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition “A”.

Many city buildings were damaged in the October 17 earthquake. If these buildings are repaired and strengthened the Fire Department will be much safer when responding to future emergencies. Please help the Fire Department do its job safely and effectively by voting “Yes” on Proposition “A”.

James D. Jefferson, President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn, Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bretz, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Soulis, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Frederick F. Postel, Chief of Department

We urgently request that you vote “Yes on A”.
The War Memorial complex of buildings, dedicated to San Francisco’s veterans, are one of our city’s treasures, irreplaceable architecturally and economically. They are central to our history and we owe it to ourselves to make sure they are made as fully earthquake-resistant as possible.
The October 17 earthquake was a warning which we must heed. Proposition “A” is a prudent and necessary response. It will protect our treasured buildings and, even more importantly, it will protect the lives of those who use them and the memories of those whose lives they commemorate.

Harold F. Jackson, Chairman, American Legion War Memorial Commission
Claude M. Jarman, Jr., Vice-President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Mark Ryser, Executive Director, Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage

Save lives.
Support earthquake safety.
Vote YES on Proposals A and B.
Also vote YES on Proposition N. Limit San Francisco Supervisors to two four-year terms.

Terence Faulkner
Republican State Assembly Candidate
San Francisco Republican Party Chairman (1987-89)

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Candidate
Past San Francisco Democratic Party Secretary
Max Woods
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic County Central Committee woman
Public Safety Improvement Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for your safety. Let us learn from the October 17th earthquake. 15 seconds of moderate shaking resulted in the need for $32 million in repairs to city buildings in the Civic Center alone. We need to be better prepared. We need to reduce known safety hazards.

Please, vote YES on Proposition A.

Ken Dowlin, City Librarian
Steve Coulter, Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson, Library Commissioner
Lonni Chin, Library Commissioner
Jean Kalif, Library Commissioner
Dennis Normandy, Library Commissioner
Roselyne Swig, Library Commissioner

Help the City of San Francisco and the Zoo rebuild. The animals will benefit, too! Vote YES on A.

Susanne Barthell,
Zoo Advisory Committee member,
Zoo Volunteer
Sophie Papageorge,
Zoologist
Jorge L. Garcia, D.V.M.
Zoo Medicine Specialist
John J. Alcaraz,
Retired Zookeeper
Roni Joan Howard,
Educator

David J. Howe
Animalkeeper
Terrence J. Moyles
Linda Caratti
Animalkeeper
Anthony Sharp
Animalkeeper
Martin E. Dias
A.K.A. Big Bison, Animalkeeper
Jack W. Castor
Lion House, Animalkeeper
Sandra Keller
Director, Citizens for a Better Zoo

Proposition A will help restore structural safety to the San Francisco County Jails in San Bruno, which were built in 1934 and are badly in need of repair. This is the oldest operating jail in California and sits near the San Andreas fault.

For the safety of City employees and county jail inmates, please vote YES on Proposition A.

Michael Hennessey
San Francisco County Sheriff
Deputy Albert Waters, President
San Francisco Deputy Sheriff's Association

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION A

This bond issue is iffy.
It should have been presented to the voters as two separate bond issues.
One for $75 million — earthquake repairs to be partly refunded by F.E.M.A. for our present estimated damages. Another for

$257.4 million to take care of our needed capital improvements so neglected by this and past administrations.

Vote NO and get one issue back on the November ballot.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1990, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCREASE THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, TO PAY FOR THE COST OF PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING ASBESTOS ABATEMENT, PROVIDING ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED, ALL RELATED TO PUBLIC SAFETY TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING RELATED ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT FOR THE FOREGOING PURPOSE; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT NO MORE THAN $65,000,000 OF SAID BONDED INDEBTEDNESS SHALL BE INCURRED IN ANY SINGLE FISCAL YEAR AND PROVIDED, FURTHER, THAT THE AUTHORIZATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $332,400,000 WILL BE REDUCED BY THE AMOUNT OF THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEMA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND THE CONTROLLER TO MONITOR THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEDERAL OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION AND TO TAKE ANY APPROPRIATE ACTION SO THAT THE BONDS ISSUED WILL NOT DUPLICATE FEDERAL OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; FINDING THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY, REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF THE ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on the 5th day of June, 1990, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the herein-after described municipal improvements in the amount and for the purposes stated:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, to pay for the cost of public safety improvements to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled, all related to public safety to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including related acquisition, construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purpose; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, Resolution No. 88-90, $332,400,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in said resolution are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. Authorizing and directing the Chief Administrative Officer and the Controller to monitor the issuance of the bonds and the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction and to take any appropriate action so that the bonds issued will not duplicate FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 4. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 5. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 5, 1990, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 31, 1990.

Section 6. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, (Continued on next page)
however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special election, each voter to vote for any said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 7. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 12 per centum per annum, payable semiannually, provided, that interest for the first year after the date of any of such bonds may be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 8. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 9. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 10. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.
School Facilities
Safety Special Tax

PROPOSITION B

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (I) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its after shocks), (II) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (III) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (IV) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269
NO 272

Analysis
by City Attorney

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Some School District buildings were damaged by the earthquake. Some District buildings do not meet present earthquake and fire standards.

The State Mello-Roos law allows the Board of Education to submit to the voters a measure authorizing a special property tax to pay for repairs and other improvements to school buildings.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize a special property tax to pay for costs of repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety. Some of the money would also be used for deferred capital maintenance. The repairs and maintenance would be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis. Since no money would be borrowed, there would be no interest costs to pay.

The tax would last for 20 years. The tax on single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels could be no more than $46 for each of the first six years and no more than $32.20 for each of the last 14 years. The tax on other types of parcels could be no more than $23 for each dwelling unit for each of the first six years and $16.10 for each dwelling unit for each of the last 14 years. Dwelling units occupied by persons 65 years of age or older would be eligible for an exemption from this tax. The measure would also set an annual appropriations limit of $12 million.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to authorize this property tax to pay for repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety and you want to authorize this annual appropriations limit.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to authorize this tax.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed special tax levy be approved, in my opinion, it would increase revenues for the San Francisco Unified School District, net of estimated senior citizen exemptions, by approximately $8 million per year for the first 6 years and $5.6 million per year for the next 14 years, based on the current assessment roll of the City and County. The approximately $127.2 million generated over a 20 year period by this special tax levy would be restricted for use by the District for the repair, restoration, replacement, seismic upgrading and capital maintenance of School District facilities."

How "B" Got on the Ballot

On February 13, the Board of Education voted 5-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Board members voted as follows:


NO: Leland Yee.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When the earthquake struck last fall, our school buildings suffered. Sustaining major damage and at special risk in the future are our buildings that were not earthquake proofed in the 1970's. In that category are our child care centers serving our youngest students. Also, in the fall of 1988 the City Fire Marshall inspected our schools and reported that the majority of our school buildings do not meet fire safety standards. Our 63,000 students and the community groups that meet at our schools in the evenings and on weekends must have buildings that can withstand earthquakes, and meet fire safety standards.

Proposition B will authorize a tax to provide for repairing earthquake damage at 131 sites including the reconstruction of John O'Connell High School, seismic improvement of nine Children's Centers, correction of fire code and safety violations at 97 sites and seismic improvement of John Swett, Jean Parker and Bessie Carmichael Elementary Schools and Parkside Curriculum Center. In addition, there will be funds for deferred capital maintenance.

Two years ago the citizens of this City voted to support major repairs for our school buildings. Now we must protect that investment by repairing the present earthquake damage and seeing that all our schools can withstand future earthquakes, be as safe as possible in case of fire and be well maintained into the next century.

Civic organizations who have joined in supporting Proposition B include: San Francisco League of Women Voters, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SF/PTA, Parents' Lobby, San Francisco Labor Council, United Educators of San Francisco, and Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth.

Submitted by Superintendent Ramon C. Cortines, San Francisco Unified School District, and Fred Rodriguez, President, Board of Education.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition B
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted in Favor Of Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

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

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California
February 13, 1990
(For Board Meeting February 13, 1990)


WHEREAS, the Board of Education (the "Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "District"), did, on January 9, 1990, adopt its Resolution of Intention (the "Resolution") to form Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "Community Facilities District"), and levy a special tax therein, pursuant to Chapter 2.5 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 53311) of the California Government Code, commonly known as the "Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982," as amended, (the "Act"); and

WHEREAS, a copy of the Resolution (which sets forth a description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, the name of the Community Facilities District and the types of facilities proposed to be financed by the District (the "Facilities")), providing that, except where funds are otherwise available, a special tax sufficient to pay for all Facilities and the financing thereof (to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District) is proposed to be levied within the proposed Community Facilities District specifying the rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the proposed Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, and setting a hearing thereon, is on file with the Clerk of this Board and is incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, notice of said hearing was duly published as required by law, as evidenced by the affidavit of publication on file with the Clerk of this Board; and

WHEREAS, on February 13, 1990 this Board held the noticed public hearing as required by law relative to the proposed formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, prior to the noticed public hearing a report (the "Report") containing a description of the Facilities and an estimate of the cost of providing the Facilities, including the estimated fair and reasonable cost thereof, was filed with this Board as a part of the record of said hearing; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing all persons desiring to be heard on all matters pertaining to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution, including all interested persons or taxpayers for or against the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent of the Community Facilities District, or the furnishing of specific types of public facilities, were heard and considered, and a full and fair hearing was held thereon; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing evidence was presented to this Board on the matters before it, and this Board at the conclusion of the hearing was fully advised as to all matters relating to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, written protests against the establishment of the District, the furnishing of specified types or types of facilities within the Community Facilities District as listed in the Report, or the levying of the special tax have not been filed with the Clerk of this Board by fifty percent (50%) or more of the registered voters, or six registered voters, whichever is more, residing within the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District, or the owners of one-half (1/2) or more of the area of land in the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District and not exempt from this special tax; and

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District, in the exercise of the authority vested in it by Chapter 2.5 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 53311) of the California Government Code, hereby resolves, determines, and orders as follows:

Section 1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.

Section 2. Written protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, or the extent hereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are insufficient in number and in amount under the Act, and this Board hereby further orders and determines that all protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are hereby overruled.

Section 3. As proposed in the Resolution, a community facilities district is hereby established pursuant to the Act, designated "Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District."

Section 4. The map and legal description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, filed with the Clerk of this Board on January 24, 1990, are hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the boundaries of the Community Facilities District.

Section 5. The facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District, set forth in Exhibit "B" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, shall be the facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District.

Section 6. As provided in Exhibit "B", it is the intention of this Board, subject to the approval of the qualified electors of the Community Facilities District, to levy a special tax sufficient to acquire, construct and improve the Facilities including administrative expenses to be incurred by the District and the Community Facilities District in connection therewith; said tax to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District.

The rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax, in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, is described in Exhibit "A" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.

Section 7. The description of the proposed voting procedure, as set forth in the Resolution, is hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the voting procedure to be used in these proceedings.

Section 8. The special tax has not been excluded by majority protest pursuant to Section 53324 of the Act.

Section 9. The facilities to be funded from the special tax are identified in Exhibit "B" hereto.

Section 10. In accordance with Section 53340.1 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, this Board shall designate the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District as the office, department or bureau which will be responsible for annually preparing the current roll of special tax levy obligations by assessor's parcel number on nonexempt property within the District and which will be responsible for estimating future special tax levies pursuant to Section 53340.1 of the Act.

The name, address, and telephone number of the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District, and the person responsible for administering the District, is as follows:

Director of Fiscal Services
Fiscal Services Department
San Francisco Unified School District
1600 Van Ness Avenue, 1st Floor
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 251-4390

Section 11. In accordance with Section 53328.3 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the

(Continued on next page)
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consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, the Clerk of this Board shall record the notice of special tax lien provided for in Section 3114.5 of the Streets and Highways Code. Upon recordation of the notice of special tax lien pursuant to Section 3114.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, a continuing lien to secure each levy of the special tax shall attach to all nonejectment real property in the Community Facilities District, and this lien shall continue in force and effect until the special tax obligation is permanently satisfied and the lien cancelled in accordance with law or until collection of the tax by this Board ceases.

Section 12. A boundary map of the Community Facilities District has been recorded pursuant to Sections 3111 and 3113 of the Streets and Highways Code at Book 39, Page 182-183 in the Book of Maps of Assessment and Community Facilities Districts in the Office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 13. All prior proceedings taken with respect to the establishment of the District were valid and in conformity with the requirements of the Act.

Section 14. In accordance with Section 53325.7 of the Act, the annual appropriations limit of the District, as defined by subdivision (b) of Section 8 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution, is hereby preliminarily established in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year, and said annual appropriations limit shall be submitted to the voters of the District as hereafter provided. The proposition establishing said appropriations limit shall become effective if approved by the qualified electors voting thereon and shall be adjusted in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 53325.7 of the Act.

Section 15. The Board hereby calls an election and submits the question of levying the special tax, and the establishment of the annual appropriations limit for the District in connection therewith, to the qualified electors within the District, at an election to be held on Tuesday, June 5, 1990, all in accordance with and subject to the Act, the terms of which shall be applicable to such election.

Section 16. The Board hereby further directs that the election at which the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith is submitted to the qualified electors within the District shall be consolidated and shall be combined in one ballot proposition, all as provided by the Act; and the Board further directs that notice of the consolidated election on the combined proposition of authorizing the levy of the special tax and of establishing an appropriations limit be published as required by law.

Section 17. If two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax are cast in favor of levying the tax, as determined by this Board after the canvass of the returns of such consolidated election, the Board may levy the special tax within the territory of the District in the amount and for the purposes as specified in this resolution. The special tax may be levied only at the rate and may be apportioned only in the manner specified in this resolution, subject to the Act, except that the special tax may be levied at a lower rate.

Section 18. The Clerk of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution, a certified map of the boundaries of the Community Facilities District, a statement description to allow the election official to determine the boundaries of the District, and the assessor’s parcel numbers for the land within the District to the Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco within three business days after the adoption of this resolution.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 13th day of February, 1990.

President of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District
ATTEST:
Clerk of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District

Ramon C. Cortines
Superintendent of Schools

EXHIBIT A

RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT BASIS OF SPECIAL TAX LEVY

The annual special tax shall be levied on each separate parcel within Community Facilities District No. 90-1, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco County, California ("CDF 90-1") as shown on the San Francisco County Assessor's records, subject to the maximum rates specified below, as established by the Board of Education ("Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District ("District").

DETERMINATION OF PARCELS SUBJECT TO SPECIAL TAX

The records of the County Assessor of San Francisco County shall be used to determine the parcels subject to the special tax. The basis for determining the parcels will be the Secured Property Tax Roll. The land use code contained in the Secured Property Tax Roll, in combination with records maintained by the Assessor of the number of dwelling units on each residential parcel in CDF 90-1, will be the basis for assigning the appropriate tax rate to each parcel. If the District determines that the records maintained by the Assessor are incorrect with respect to one or more parcels, the District will assign the applicable land use code and dwelling unit count based on its review of the property. All special taxes shall be based on parcels established in the County Assessor's records as of March 1 of each year and all land use categories shall be based on building permits and other relevant development approvals granted by the City and County of San Francisco or any successor jurisdiction as of June 1 of each year.

Using the records of the County Assessor, the District shall prepare a list of the parcels subject to the tax. The District shall establish the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.

1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which, supported publicly-owned and non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that leasehold/possessory interests shall be taxed.

2. From the parcels remaining identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor's data, and the District's review of building permits issued, and other changes in development status:

   a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
   b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
   c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
   d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on that parcel will be classified based on the uses that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CDF 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CDF 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $32.20 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CDF 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CDF 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the deter-

(Continued on next page)
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ministration of the parcels subject to the tax and their special tax assignments.

SENIOR CITIZEN EXEMPTION

A property owner may apply for a Senior Citizen Exemption which would provide an exemption from the special tax for the applicable tax year on dwelling units occupied by senior citizens, if the following conditions are met:

1. The applicant must show evidence that the dwelling unit is owned or rented by a citizen who is at least 65 years of age.

2. The applicant must show evidence of ownership of the property subject to the Exemption.

3. The Senior Citizen Exemption must be applied for annually.

4. If the applicant is a landlord, then he or she must certify that the entire tax exemption will be reflected only in the rent for the exempted dwelling unit(s).

EXHIBIT B

COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO.

90-1 — Description of Facilities to be financed:

(i) Repair, restoration, and/or replacement of District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), to the extent that (A) such repair, restoration, or replacement is outside the scope of work approved by federal and state agencies for assistance from such agencies; (B) costs incurred in such repair, restoration, or replacement are ineligible for federal or state assistance; or (C) insufficient federal or state funds are appropriated, obligated, or approved to pay for repair, restoration, or replacement which would otherwise be eligible for federal or state assistance. Pending receipt by the District of disaster assistance from federal and/or state agencies, the Community Facilities District may advance funds to the District to pay costs eligible for federal or state disaster assistance; provided that upon receipt by the District of federal or state disaster assistance relating to such costs, the District shall promptly reimburse the Community Facilities District for any such advances.

(ii) Seismic upgrading of children's centers and other District facilities.

(iii) Correction of fire safety violations of District facilities.

(iv) Deferred capital maintenance of District facilities. Incidental expenses, including the cost of planning and designing the Facilities and the cost of environmental evaluations thereof; all costs associated with the creation of the proposed Community Facilities District, the determination of the amount of and collection of taxes, the payment of taxes, and costs otherwise incurred in order to carry out the authorized purposes of the Community Facilities District; and any other expenses incidental to the construction, completion, and inspection of the Facilities and permitted under the Act.
BOUNDARIES OF SPECIAL TAX DISTRICT

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA THIS _______ DAY OF _______.

RAMON C. CORTINES, CLERK
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT


RAMON C. CORTINES, CLERK
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

FILED THIS _______ DAY OF _______, 1990, AT THE HOUR OF _______ O' Clock _______ M. IN BOOK _______ OF MAPS OF ASSESSMENT AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICTS AT PAGE _______, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER IN THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

BRUCE JAMISON
COUNTY RECORDER
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PROPOSED BOUNDARIES
OF
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1
OF
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

KCA ENGINEERS, INC.
CONSULTING CIVIL ENGINEERS

JANUARY 1990

CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE: TITLE 3 DIVISION 1 CHAPTER 2 ARTICLE 2, 23138 — SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY LIMITS

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER, BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN MATEO, IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN, ON THE EXTENSION OF NORTHERN LINE OF T3S OF MOUNT DIABLO BASE; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE PACIFIC COAST, TO ITS POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE WESTERLY EXTENSION OF THE LOW-WATER LINE ON THE NORTHERN SIDE OF THE ENTRANCE TO SAN FRANCISCO BAY, BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MARIN AND NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE, EASTERNLY, THROUGH POINT BONITA AND POINT CAVALLO, TO THE MOST SOUTHEASTERN POINT OF ANGEL ISLAND, ALL ON THE LINE OF MARIN THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERN LINE OF MARIN, TO THE NORTHWEST POINT OF GOLDEN ROCK (ALSO KNOWN AS RED ROCK), BEING THE COMMON CORNER OF MARIN, CONTRA COSTA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE DUE SOUTHEAST FOURS AND ONE-HALF STATUTE MILES TO A POINT ESTABLISHED AS THE CORNER COMMON TO CONTRA COSTA, ALAMEDA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, ON THE WESTERN LINE OF ALAMEDA COUNTY TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF T3S, RAW, M.D.B. & M., THENCE WESTERLY ON THE TOWNSHIP LINES AND AN EXTENSION THEREOF TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING. THE ISLANDS KNOWN AS THE PARRALONDES (PARRALONA) ARE A PART OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY.
PROPOSITION C

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277
NO 278

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City obtains computers, telephone systems and other equipment by paying for it all at once or by leasing it until it is paid for, which is called “lease financing.” The City may not enter into long-term leases for financing equipment unless (1) the voters approve it, or (2) the lease requires the Board of Supervisors to approve the payments each year. When the Board of Supervisors must approve the lease payments each year, interest rates are higher than when the lease payments are not subject to annual approval. Also, interest rates charged by for-profit companies are generally higher than interest rates charged by non-profit corporations.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment. Under Proposition C, the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval, could authorize the lease financing of equipment without the lease payments being subject to annual approval. A non-profit corporation would be created to buy the equipment and would issue tax-exempt debt to pay for it. The City would lease the equipment from the non-profit until it was paid for. The total principal of the debt issued by the non-profit corporation could not be more than $20 million in the first year. This limit on the outstanding principal would increase five percent each year. The Board could approve this type of lease financing only if the Controller certified that the interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application, costs could be increased or decreased in presently indeterminate but probably not substantial amounts.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would allow the City to lease finance needed equipment at the lowest possible interest rates. The City would establish a non-profit corporation, which would buy equipment approved by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors and lease it to City departments.

The charter currently requires the voters to approve lease financing if done through non-profit corporations. Financing through a non-profit is the less expensive method because interest rates are tax-exempt. The City has had to occasionally use the more expensive method because it is not always possible to delay purchasing critical equipment until an election is held.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Saves the City money by allowing current and future leases for equipment to be financed at lower interest rates (currently 6% to 7%) than must now be used with private corporations (ranging 9% to 16%).

By simply refinancing existing leases, the City could save over $500,000. Additional money could be saved on any future leases. Gives the City the option to pay cash for equipment or to finance it expeditiously at a low cost to the City. Allows quicker replacement of inefficient and outdated equipment, which will reduce maintenance costs, decrease down-time, and increase productivity for equipment which has outlived its economic useful life. Provides restrictions to insure prudent use of this financing mechanism. Requires the Controller to certify that the lease is the least costly financing method.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition C
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition C

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

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purposes of this section, "lease financing" occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

1. to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

2. to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

3. to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.

---

Remember to VOTE on Election Day, Tuesday June 5, 1990.
Your polling place is open from 7:00 in the morning to 8:00 in the evening.
Recycling is easier than you think.

Recycling is not only easier than you might think, it's a simple way you can do your part for environmental conservation—and feel good about it, too.

All you need is an ordinary brown paper bag.

Each time you set up your kitchen garbage, place an extra brown bag or two out for recycling. Then every day just drop your newspaper into a recycling bag—a week's worth of papers fits perfectly (and your newspapers will stop piling up on the floor!).

When you're finished with an aluminum soda or beer can simply pop it in a separate bag. The same goes for bottles: just put them in a bag, labels and all. Then when you're on the way to the supermarket or heading out for the day, drop off the bags at a Recycling Center near you. Or, you can tie your newspaper with string and the garbage company will collect it free of charge.

That's it. When you think about it, isn't recycling almost as easy as not recycling? And it really is the right thing to do.

For a free Recycling Guide and a list of Recycling Centers near you, call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL 554-6193
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no special City fund to pay for neighborhood beautification projects or graffiti clean-up. Money can be spent for this purpose only when the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors approve it in the City’s budget.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is an ordinance that would create a “Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund” (“the Fund”) to pay for cleaning up graffiti on public buildings and beautifying the neighborhood.

The Chief Administrative Officer would manage the Fund. Businesses could pay up to one percent of their payroll or business taxes into the Fund. Grants or money donated for graffiti clean-up would be deposited in the Fund. The goal of the ordinance is to produce for the Fund $1,000,000 each year, adjusted annually for inflation. The Controller would change the percentage of taxes businesses could pay into the Fund to produce $1,000,000 in the fund each fiscal year.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this fund.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

“Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, General Fund revenues could decrease by as much as $1.4 million in fiscal 1990 and as much as $1 million per year, adjusted for inflation, thereafter.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D asks the voters to make the revitalization of our neighborhoods and the wiping out of graffiti a top city priority without raising taxes.

Proposition D will permit those employers currently eligible in San Francisco to earmark up to 1% of their payroll or gross receipts tax bill to establish The Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

The fund will be used to award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city. The Budget Analyst has estimated that approximately one million dollars would be available every year.

Proposition D creates a unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers to keep our city attractive. It will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting and graffiti clean-up.

Also, Proposition D will fund public information and education campaigns to combat litter, and instill in our youth the old-fashioned virtue of respect for public and private property.

The fund created by Proposition D will be administered by the Chief Administrative Officer with public input from environmental organizations and neighborhood committees.

Proposition D was authored by Supervisor Jim Gonzales and has been submitted to the voters with the support of the Sierra Club, San Francisco Beautiful, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

According to their ballot argument, the Board of Supervisors wants to create a “unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers” to reduce graffiti. What’s stopping them from doing that now?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?
The supervisors also say they want to provide “seed money” for planting trees and improving street lighting. Well, why haven’t they placed items in the city budget to do so?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?
In their rebuttal argument, the supervisors claim that “many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle.” Whose fault is that, if not their own?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?
Finally, the supervisors have the temerity to state: “With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can

choose to earmark” funds for graffiti. What would be “fair” is if San Francisco businesses paid lower taxes. But no one should be “earmarking” tax dollars except elected representatives of the people!

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?
There’s no question that graffiti is a serious problem demanding serious solutions. But what good is it to divert $1,000,000 a year from other city programs? That’s robbing Peter to pay Paul! It’s bad government!

Why do we need Proposition D? We don’t.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

I know something about graffiti.
I wrote the city ordinances prohibiting the sale of spray paint and large, felt-tip pens to minors. I also authored the state law to allow police officers greater latitude in arresting juveniles who deface public transit vehicles. This year, I’m pursuing a bill to revoke for one year the driver’s license of any person convicted of graffiti vandalism.

Proposition D is not about graffiti or “neighborhood beautification”. It’s about diverting millions from the city’s General Fund. It’s about depriving existing city programs of critically needed revenue. Proposition D is a financial shell game.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Proposition D would allow any city business to designate up to 1% of its payroll tax check for deposit in a special fund. According to the supervisors’ Budget Analyst, Proposition D could divert up to $1,440,260 from the General Fund in the program’s first year. Thereafter, annual diversions would approximate $1,000,000, plus inflation.

That’s over $1,000,000 per year which cannot be spent on police services, fire protection, libraries, and public health.

As you can plainly see from my legislative record, I’m no soft touch when it comes to graffiti prevention and clean-up. But Proposition D is the wrong approach. “Special funds” and “segregated accounts” have no place in our city budget.

Graffiti programs deserve adequate city funding, and the Board of Supervisors and Mayor should move promptly to appropriate such funds in the next regular budgetary cycle.

The voters, meanwhile, should move promptly to reject Proposition D on June 5th!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We need a city plan that invests in the quality of our neighborhoods . . . Now. It’s obvious laws banning the sale of spray paint and felt pens have done nothing to stop the sprawl of graffiti or create a climate of cooperation between city officials and neighborhood groups to find real solutions.

Proposition D is about beautifying our neighborhoods consistently. Proposition D is about wiping out graffiti permanently. With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark a mere one-hundredth to be poured back into the neighborhoods.

Out of a greater than two billion dollar annual budget, the city can afford a guaranteed million dollars to help keep our city beautiful, clean, and graffiti-free. Year in and year out, many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle. Proposition D will provide a solid foundation for the revitalization of our neighborhoods, which no one can tamper with and that requires no new taxes.

Over the last few years, individual Supervisors have spent many weekends planting trees and removing graffiti with neighborhood groups. Working with groups such as SF ALIVE, San Francisco Conservation Corps, 24th Street Revitalization Committee and the West Portal Merchants Association to make our neighborhoods shine has taught us one thing . . . neighborhood environmentalists and city departments working together as partners will be a winning combination for San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

When City Hall and neighborhood organizations work together, problems can be solved. Vote YES on D.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

There is a reason that the San Francisco Beautiful, the Sierra Club and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, along with dozens of neighborhood groups support placing PROPOSITION D on the ballot.
San Franciscans are united in wanting to preserve and enhance our city's attractiveness and keep San Francisco one of the most beautiful cities in the world.
Our Supervisors put PROPOSITION D on the ballot for your approval because they realize that a more attractive city starts with people like you and me and our neighbors who truly care about San Francisco.
YES ON PROPOSITION D creates a working partnership between our neighborhoods and city government;
YES ON PROPOSITION D means a more beautiful city and enhancement of your neighborhood and mine;
YES ON PROPOSITION D accomplishes this with NO NEW TAXES, allowing large employers to earmark up to 1% of their current payroll tax for beautification and graffiti cleanup;
YES ON PROPOSITION D pays for neighborhood-generated projects, giving residents a say in how these reserved funds are spent;
YES ON PROPOSITION D is the first step to guaranteeing more beautiful and attractive neighborhoods.
Join your neighbors, business owners and environmentalists by voting YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Al Pross, Chair
COMMITTEE FOR BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBORHOODS

The quality of life in our neighborhoods will truly become a top city priority with the passage of Proposition D.
• Proposition D will provide over a million dollars a year from the business community to stop neighborhood decay (through a voluntary checkoff on their payroll or gross receipts tax bill).
• Proposition D will award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city.
• Proposition D will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting, and graffiti clean-up.
• Proposition D will fund an educational campaign to teach our youngsters a new respect for public and private property.
Let's protect our city's special livability. Let's foster civic pride. Let's invest in the long term health of San Francisco's residential neighborhoods. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Supervisor Jim Gonzales
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Graffiti is a blight on the beauty of San Francisco. We strongly encourage the continued generosity of grants and donations to eradicate this problem. However, during the current deficit-ridden period, it is irresponsible for the City to direct at least $1,000,000 a year from the General Fund for this purpose.

The San Francisco Republican Party urges you to vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley
William E. Grayson

Anna M. Guth
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"
Why add more government to your taxes.
$1 million per year to be funded from Payroll taxes which has a sunset clause to expire in 1990.
Then who pays the tab? You do.
If the police would assert their powers and nab the violators,
instead of the City offering to pay to clean up their "works of art" this ordinance would not be necessary.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION D

[Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund]

AN ORDINANCE, ADDING SECTIONS 10.98 AND 10.98-1 TO THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO ESTABLISH A NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND AND SPECIFYING THE PURPOSES THEREOF AND AMENDING PART III, SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, BY ADDING ARTICLE 128-1 THERETO, TO PROVIDE THAT ANY BUSINESS WHICH OWES A PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX OR BUSINESS TAX MAY ELECT TO DESIGNATE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE TAX FOR DEPOSIT IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND.

NOTE: All sections are new.

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Sections 10.98 and 10.98-1 thereto, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.98. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: FINDINGS AND INTENT.
(a) Findings.
The proliferation of graffiti on public buildings and other public property has created a blight which offends both citizens of and visitors to San Francisco. The removal of such graffiti will enhance the beauty of the city in which we live and will encourage others to visit and to relocate here. Removal will thus both reflect and renew our civic pride and contribute to our economic viability. Providing a source of funds for the promotion of neighborhood beautification projects will support the efforts of local residents and businesses to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and the local economy, and assist in reducing the amount of graffiti in San Francisco.
(b) Statement of Intent.
The Board of Supervisors wishes to address the above concerns by establishing a neighborhood beautification and graffiti clean-up fund which will promote neighborhood beautification projects, including projects designed to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and which support the efforts of local residents and businesses to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and the local economy, and assist in reducing the amount of graffiti in San Francisco.

SEC. 10.98-1. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: ESTABLISHMENT; ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS; DUTIES.
(a) Establishment of Fund. There is hereby established a special fund for the purpose of receiving all donations of money which may be collected by the City and County of San Francisco for the purposes enumerated in Section 10.98(b). Monies deposited in the fund shall only be expended for the purposes enumerated therein, provided that such expenditures shall include reimbursement to City and County departments for expenses incurred in the administration of the fund. The special fund shall be known and designated as the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

(b) Acceptance of Gifts. All donations of money which may be offered to the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund are hereby accepted for such purposes. Any grants, gifts and bequests from private sources for this purpose shall be deposited into said special fund.
(c) Duties of the Chief Administrative Officer.1. The Chief Administrative Officer, or his or her designee, shall be responsible for the administration of the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund, and shall have all such authority as may be reasonably necessary to carry out those responsibilities.
2. The Chief Administrative Officer shall promulgate such rules and regulations as he or she may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Section and Section 10.98. Before issuing or amending any rules and regulations, the Chief Administrative Officer shall provide a thirty (30) day public comment period by publishing notice in an official newspaper of general circulation in the City of the intent to issue or amend the rules and regulations. The rules and regulations shall be approved by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. Such rules and regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the qualifications of applicants and factors to be considered in the award of grants to fund programs to help remove graffiti and promote neighborhood beautification projects, including preference for the following projects: youth programs and innovation, projects that are neighborhood generated, and projects designed to benefit areas of San Francisco that are economically disadvantaged.
3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall submit a semi-annual report to the Board of Supervisors setting forth an accounting of the amounts disbursed and the uses for which said funds were made.
(d) Budgetary and Fiscal Provisions of the Charter. The monies in this fund are subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter and may be expended only when authorized by appropriation ordinance of the Board of Supervisors.
(e) Interest. Interest earned from the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund shall be deposited in the principal thereof, and shall not be expended for any purpose other than that for which said fund is established.
(f) Accumulation of Monies in Fund. The balance remaining in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Charter Section 6.306 and shall be carried over and accumulated in said fund for the purposes recited herein.

Section 2. Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code is hereby amended by adding Article 128-1 thereto, to read as follows:

ART. 128-1. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND TAX

OPTION.
SEC. 1030. Initial Option. Commencing in tax year 1990, any business, as defined in Section 1002.1 of this Code, that is subject to the Payroll Expense Tax or the Business Tax may elect to designate up to one per cent (1%) of its tax liability for deposit in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.
SEC. 1031. Amount of Fund Annually. It is the intent of the voters of the City and County of San Francisco that one million dollars ($1,000,000.00), derived from tax proceeds designated by the taxpayers pursuant to Section 1031, shall be deposited annually into the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund. The Controller shall annually adjust this figure for inflation to reflect changes in the most recently available U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose Metropolitan Area, or its successor index.
SEC. 1032. Subsequent Option. For each tax year after 1990, the Controller shall determine the amount of fund revenues actually generated in the prior year, including the interest thereon and the balance, if any, remaining at the close of the tax year. On the basis of the prior year's experience of taxpayer contributions and total revenues generated by the payroll expense and business taxes, the Controller shall calculate a percentage ceiling of total tax liability which taxpayers may designate for deposit in the fund following the tax year. The Controller shall set, the percentage ceiling so that the revenues produced thereby are most likely to generate a total of one million dollars (adjusted for inflation) in the fund for the forthcoming tax year. The Controller shall transmit his or her calculation to the Board of Supervisors, which shall adopt a new tax designation ceiling, if necessary, in advance of the tax year to enable the Tax Collector to perform his or her calculation.

SEC. 1033. Severability. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective. In addition, the voters declare their intention that any portion of this initiative ordinance or all of it be declared invalid in whole or in part, such invalidity shall have no effect upon the continued validity of the Payroll Expense Tax and Business Tax.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PROPOSITION F

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 284
NO 285

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Fire Commission has the authority to decide the number and staffing of fire companies and the number and location of fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors may change the number of firefighters. The Fire Commission may close or move fire stations or reduce the number of fire companies if it decides they are no longer needed. A fire company typically consists of a fire engine or other emergency vehicle and the firefighters needed to operate it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would specify a minimum number of fire stations and fire companies and minimum levels of staffing for those fire companies. Proposition F would increase the number of firefighters assigned to some types of fire companies. This means that the number of firefighters on duty at all times would increase from 297 to 322. Where necessary, Proposition F’s minimum level of staffing would be met by firefighters working overtime. Overtime pay for firefighters is one and one-half times their normal salary.

Proposition F would limit the power of the Fire Commission, Mayor and Board of Supervisors to set the number of fire stations and staffing levels.

Before closing any fire station or reducing the number of fire companies or units required by Proposition F, the measure would require (1) a recommendation by the Fire Chief; (2) approval by the Fire Commission, after public hearings; (3) approval by the Board of Supervisors; and (4) approval by the voters.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current salary rates and staffing levels of the Fire Department, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $4.9 million per year.”

How “F” Got on the Ballot

On March 2, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition F to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,485* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 21 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 56,364 of the signatures submitted were valid, 15,879 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WHAT IS PROP F?

PROPOSITION F IS A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WILL ESTABLISH A MINIMUM LEVEL OF FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS FOR SAN FRANCISCO. IT GIVES THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE FIRE CHIEF THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MANAGE THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITIZENS.

SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT BECAUSE IT WILL:

1) GUARANTEE THAT THE PRESENT 41 FIRE STATIONS STAY OPEN
2) GUARANTEE FULLY-STAFFED FIRE TRUCKS AT ALL TIMES
3) GUARANTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BEFORE ANY FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED
4) GUARANTEE THAT YOUR FIREBOAT WILL BE STAFFED WITH A FIREFIGHTING CREW OF TWO

THE 7.1 QUAKE OF OCTOBER 17 WARNED US AGAIN — WE MUST BE PREPARED!

ITEM A — MAYOR AGNOS CUT THE FIRE DEPART-
MENT ON-DUTY STAFFING BY 19 PERSONS A DAY IN 1989.

PROP F RESTORES THOSE CUTS.
ITEM C — PROP F DOES NOT REQUIRE "GUARANTEED OVERTIME" AND, IN FACT, BY JULY 1992 NO OVERTIME WILL BE NEEDED FOR THE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS OF PROP F.

(Overtime is now caused by large numbers of vacant positions. New hiring will eliminate all vacancies and overtime by July 1992. Prop F will safeguard this full-staffing.)

PROP F IS A COMMON SENSE MEASURE TO GIVE ADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION TO ALL CITIZENS.

VOTE YES ON F!

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F;
COMMITTEE FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTH-QUAKE PREPAREDNESS
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

It is clear that Proposition F is not a Fire Safety Issue.
It is clearly an issue to guarantee overtime.
1. This Mayor and Board of Supervisors have never closed a single fire station and have no intention to close firehouses.
2. Most major cities in America considers five firefighters per truck to be fully-staffed. More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire.
3. Proposition F will not restore cuts in firefighters. We are mandated by law to provide 90 new firefighters this year. Proposition F only guarantees overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day, $3.5 million per year.

Our firefighters do a tough job! But we compensate them well! We need new equipment — not more overtime. Following the earthquake, a fire truck had to be taken from the fire museum to fight fires. Let's not waste money which could be used for new firefighting equipment.

San Francisco voters rejected a similar proposal in 1987 and it should be rejected again in 1990.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will waste millions of your tax dollars. Just look at the facts.

Fact: Proposition F does not hire new firefighters. The Federal Consent Decree already sets hiring standards — 90 new firefighters will be hired this year without Prop. F.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that Assistant Chiefs and Battalion Chiefs will continue to have chauffeurs.

Fact: Proposition F is not needed to save fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors have no intention of closing any fire stations.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that 18 current firefighters will get daily time-and-a-half overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day . . . or more than $3.5 million extra per year.

Fact: Proposition F is not a fire safety issue. Virtually every major American city deploys five or fewer firefighters on fire trucks. A sixth firefighter is featherbedding, not firefighting.

More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire. That's enough people to raise ladders, ventilate rooftops and carry out lifesaving tasks.

FACT: Our firefighters do a tough job. But they are well compensated already and do not need additional guaranteed overtime . . . especially when there are so many other pressing needs in San Francisco.

FACT: Firefighters in San Francisco are currently paid $300 more per month than the average salaries of firefighters in the four largest California cities. But the other firefighters work 15 percent more hours than San Francisco.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters already receive 23 percent more vacation, sick and holiday leave than other city workers. A recent study by the Controller shows that increased overtime results in increased sick leave and disability.

Study the facts and you'll agree. Proposition F is nothing more than $7 million per year in unnecessary guaranteed overtime.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

FACT: PROP F does:

• Guarantee that the 90 new firefighters cannot later be eliminated by politicians.

• Require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people before cutbacks can be made to the minimum staffing.

FACT: The Mayor DID cut back Fire Department staffing in August 1989 from 315 to 296.

FACT: Assistant and Battalion Chiefs DO NOT have “chauffeurs.” They DO have an operations and communications assistant.

FACT: Prop F IS needed to guarantee public review and input before any fire station can be closed.

FACT: SIX fire stations have been closed by the Mayor’s office since 1972 without any public review.

FACT: Prop F DOES guarantee that the 19 on-duty firefighters cut by the Mayor in 1989 will be restored. When sufficient new firefighters are hired, NO OVERTIME will be required.

FACT: PROP F IS A FIRE SAFETY ISSUE!

FACT: San Francisco firefighters ARE REQUIRED to work overtime because previous policies of politicians allowed large numbers of vacant positions to occur.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters DO NOT get a paid health plan for dependents, nor do they get longevity pay or other benefits enjoyed by firefighters in the four largest California cities.

FACT: ALL city employees, including firefighters, receive EXACTLY THE SAME vacation, sick and holiday leave. This is a city Charter requirement.

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F

JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN

JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

I STRONGLY SUPPORT PROP F!

Prop F will benefit all the people of San Francisco. Over 71,000 voters from every part of the City signed the petition to put Prop F on the ballot. They expressed enthusiastic support for a stronger Fire Department.

The City is becoming increasingly built-up, causing greater congestion. This means that fire hazards are increasing and adequate fire protection will be even more important to us than ever.

The October 17th earthquake was an urgent reminder of how fragile our city is and how important our Fire Department is to all of us.

When you, the people, call for help, whether it is for a medical emergency, a rescue, or fire, the firefighters come.

BILL MAHER, Member
Board of Supervisors

PROP F MAKES SENSE FOR ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

It allows you to participate in fire safety decisions that affect your neighborhood.

Our neighborhoods are the “heart” of San Francisco. OUR FAMILIES, HOMES, CHURCHES, FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS NEED SATISFACTORY FIRE PROTECTION.

PROP F WILL MAKE SAN FRANCISCO A SAFER PLACE TO LIVE IN.

VOTE YES ON F!

Bill Maher, Member
Board of Supervisors

I STRONGLY SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!

They provide vital services to our citizens. Last year, our firefighters answered a record-breaking 58,000 alarms and saved thousands of lives. The greatest number of calls came from the Tenderloin, the Inner Mission, the Fillmore, Civic Center/Hayes Valley, Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley. I WANT TO BE SURE YOU GET THE HELP YOU NEED — WHEN YOU NEED IT!

Over the past 20 years, unlike other city departments, Fire Department staffing has been slashed by 40%! THREE FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT AGREE THAT THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY ARE TOO FEW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS! THEY AGREE THAT NO MORE FIREFHOUSES SHOULD BE CLOSED.

We NEED Proposition F. It will:
- Put firefighters back on the ladder trucks
- Put firefighters back on our fireboat
- Bring daily staffing up to an adequate level
- Guarantee that any proposed closings of fire companies will be subject to a public review and vote by the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people
- Guarantee the SFFD the funding it needs

THE COST OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT IS ONLY 2 CENTS A DAY FOR EACH OF US! That 2 cents could easily save a life — maybe yours, or that of a loved one. PROP. F WILL BENEFIT ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

I STRONGLY SUPPORT IMPROVED FIRE PROTECTION IN SAN FRANCISCO!

I SHARE THE CONCERNS OF THE 71,000 VOTERS WHO PUT THIS PROPOSITION ON THE BALLOT. Fire Department daily staffing has been forced so low that our safety is threatened. WE MUST KEEP OUR FIREFHOUSES OPEN AND FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED.

In addition to fighting fires, our firefighters perform many services for our elderly, disabled and low income families that no one else does. FIREFIGHTERS RESPONDED TO OVER 58,000 EMERGENCIES LAST YEAR, INCLUDING 26,000 MEDICAL CALLS.

We depend on our firefighters to protect our families, homes, and businesses. Our narrow streets, steep hills and rows of wood frame buildings make firefighting very difficult. SAN FRANCISCO HAS SPECIAL FIREFIGHTING AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL NEEDS! We are different from other California cities with their wide streets, flat terrain and detached buildings!

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING FOR PROPOSITION F. THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL BENEFIT ALL OUR CITIZENS.

WENDY NELDER, Member
Board of Supervisors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

STOP REDUCTIONS IN CITY FIRE PROTECTION! VOTE YES ON F!

Over 71,000 San Francisco voters from every neighborhood, ethnic group and economic level joined to put PROPOSITION F on this ballot. They are concerned because politicians have reduced daily staffing to a dangerous all-time low while emergency calls reached an all-time high of 58,000 last year. People want their neighborhood firehouses to stay open and their fire engines, aerial ladder trucks and fireboat fully staffed to meet their emergency needs. They want a Charter amendment to take politics out of fire safety decisions.

Remember October 17! We learned that we need a strong Fire Department to fight fires, perform rescues and coordinate civilian volunteers. When both bridges are down, we need a strong SFFD!
THIS IS A COMMON SENSE PROPOSITION — IT IS SUPPORTED BY 3 FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT!
Join your friends and neighbors! VOTE YES ON F!

John L. Molinari
Former member of the Board of Supervisors

ONLY YOU CAN STOP FURTHER DANGEROUS CUTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

Over the years, the San Francisco Fire Department has assisted hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans in time of great personal need. The people understand how important the SFFD is in their lives, and OVER 71,000 OF THEM SIGNED THE PETITION TO PLACE PROPOSITION F ON THE BALLOT. The citizens want to be heard!

SFFD EMERGENCY RESPONSES ARE INCREASING DRAMATICALLY EVERY YEAR! Fiscal year totals have gone from 28,000 in 1970 to over 58,000 in 1989, while politicians have slashed daily on-duty staffing from 482, when I was Fire Chief, to today's all-time low of 296. Department resources are being stretched thinner and thinner despite greater and greater needs. THIS DANGEROUS TREND MUST BE STOPPED!

The Department must be able to meet the complex and highly varied needs of today's San Francisco. These include fighting structural fires, providing medical assistance, performing cliff and water rescues, responding to BART and MUNI fires and accidents, controlling hazardous materials emergencies, assisting victims of industrial accidents, and responding to many other emergency needs.

Many seniors, low income families and handicapped people rely on the SFFD to help them. THE PERSONAL ATTENTION THAT THE SFFD PROVIDES CAN NEVER BE CONVERTED TO SELF-SERVICE OR AUTOMATED! Firefighters, not machines, put out fires, perform rescues and meet all the other emergency needs of our city. You need these firefighters! THE NEXT CALL MAY BE YOURS!

The need for Fire Department services crosses all social, ethnic and economic strata. We can all get behind this quality of life issue. Proposition F will strengthen your Fire Department and take politics out of fire safety.

William F. Murray
Chief of Department, SFFD, Retired

VOTE YES ON PROP F!

It takes teamwork to put out a fire. Without it, lives and property can be lost. Without it, firefighters can pay a hard price, for their lives, when in danger, may depend on having a buddy to lend a hand or go for help. As much a part of their job as hose, ladders, and water is that firefighters work in pairs when possible. It can be critical where dense smoke obscures vision or — as so many San Francisco neighborhoods well know — when trying to maneuver on a steeply pitched roof.

Current staffing of aerial ladder trucks leaves one firefighter without a buddy, the team short one vital hand. Proposition F will restore the balance that a fire — and time-tested system needs.

It also will mean two firefighters ready to move out with the fireboat when it has a job to do. Because they weren't readily available, the fireboat was delayed in pumping bay water to put out the disastrous Marina fire after last October's earthquake.

That's why I'm voting "Yes" on Prop F and am urging all San Franciscans to do the same.

Edward J. Phipps
Chief of Department, SFFD (Retired)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I OWE MY LIFE TO THE QUICK AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS STATIONED AT MY LOCAL FIREHOUSE

Over 26,000 San Franciscans received emergency medical assistance last year by the SFFD. Many lives were saved because firefighters were on the scene in 3 minutes of less. The neighborhood firehouse is an essential part of San Francisco’s complex fire protection system.

The October 17th earthquake and the great Marina fire showed us how vital it is to have our Fire Department maintained at an adequate level. There were no firefighters on board the Fireboat Phoenix when it arrived in the Marina, and for over 1 1/2 hours firefighting and search and rescue operations were hindered by a lack of firefighters, as well as by a lack of water. UNDERSTAFFING CAN CAUSE FIRE DEATHS.

Proposition F will answer these critical needs by restoring funds for adequate staffing of fire companies, including the fireboat, and it will require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission and Board of Supervisors before any further cutbacks in fire protection can be made.

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING YES ON F!

John Barbagelata

---

PENNY-POWER! LOOK —
HOW CAN YOU BUY SOMETHING PRICELESS FOR ONLY PENNIES A DAY?

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F!
FOR ONLY 2 CENTS PER DAY, YOU WILL:
• KEEP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIREHOUSE OPEN
• KEEP FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED
• KEEP YOUR FIREBOAT IN SERVICE AND STAFFED WITH FIREFIGHTERS
• GUARANTEE THAT NO FIREHOUSES OR FIRE COMPANIES WILL BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT
• REMOVE POLITICS FROM FIREFIGHT SAFETY

THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL COST EACH OF SAN FRANCISCO’S 732,000 RESIDENTS JUST PENNIES A DAY:
YEAR 1 — COST $5.3 MILLION = 2 CENTS PER DAY!
YEAR 2 — COST $2.8 MILLION = 1 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 3 — COST $0.8 MILLION = 1/2 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 4 — NO ADDITIONAL COST!

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE POLICY YOU WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON’T MISS THE CHANCE!

VOTE YES ON F!

W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

---

WE STRONGLY SUPPORT PROPOSITION F!
No one worries more about costs than working people. For their hard-earned dollars, breadwinners demand value in return. Value is what Proposition F is all about. It restores adequate staffing of engine and ladder truck companies, staffs the fireboat, and assures that you and I will have a voice in any proposed closing of a fire company or firehouse.

Proposition F is an insurance policy that is clearly a benefit to all San Franciscans. And, there is no question that the benefits greatly exceed the cost — to each of us, just 2 cents a day for the first year, 1 cent a day for the second year, and no cost thereafter.

Without adequate fire protection, San Francisco has too much to lose.

VOTE YES ON F!

Walter L. Johnson
San Francisco Labor Council
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
They provide absolutely essential services for our citizens, and no one else can do their job! We have 500 high rise buildings, BART and MUNI tunnels, and large businesses, schools and hospital complexes where firefighting requires many firefighters.

On October 17, we were lucky! It was just a warning.

THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY IS TOO LOW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS!

Let’s all get behind Proposition F! It will assure stability in Department funding, guarantee adequate staffing for our firehouses and apparatus, and permit long-range planning and improvements. Our firefighters need your vote!

James A. Hood
Chairman
San Franciscans for Fire Safety

VOTE YES ON F!
San Francisco is a fragile city. Over 90% of all structures are of wood frame construction. Your homes are built in solid blocks of wooden buildings. This situation presents the possibility of a disastrous fire or conflagration occurring, especially following an earthquake.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS THE LIFELINE FOR ALL OF US WHO LIVE IN THIS CITY. THE EARTHQUAKE ON OCTOBER 17TH AND THE GREAT FIRE IN THE MARINA SHOW HOW IMPORTANT THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS TO SAN FRANCISCO.

Politicians are using shrill rhetoric and other offensive tactics in an attempt to mislead the public as to what the real meaning of Prop F is. Do not be misled! PROP F PROVIDES THREE MAIN POINTS:

- Establishes the present 41 neighborhood fire stations as a minimum standard
- Puts a firefighting crew on the fireboat
- Requires public hearings and approval of the fire commission, the board of supervisors and the citizens before a fire station can be closed or relocated.

These are common sense measures that provide a minimum level of public safety for our families and city.

Please join me, and the 70,000 other San Franciscans who signed the petitions to put Prop F on the ballot, and vote yes on "F!"

Frank T. Blackburn
Assistant Fire Chief

VOTE YES ON F!
Fire protection is vital for our families and businesses.
Prop F will stabilize protection and prevent further cuts in the Fire Department.

Protect our city. Vote Yes on F.

Robt. E. Donohue
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
Charles D. Cresci
Deputy Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Charles H. Lee
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DONT TAKE YOUR FIREFIGHTERS FOR GRANTED! San Francisco firefighters answered a record 58,000 calls for help last year. Of these, 26,000 were for medical emergencies. Heart attacks, auto accidents, building collapses, childbirths were just a few. BUT EVERY YEAR THERE ARE FEWER AND FEWER FIREFIGHTERS TO HELP YOU! In 1970 there were 482 firefighters on duty each day — in 1990 there are only 296! Six firehouses and 12 fire companies have been closed.

FIRE SAFETY DECISIONS MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE HANDS OF POLITICIANS! Only a Charter amendment will assure that your Fire Department is adequately staffed to meet San Francisco's special needs — now and in the future. FOR JUST 2 CENTS A DAY, WE CAN KEEP OUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS OPEN AND OUR FIRE APPARATUS ADE-QUATELY STAFFED.

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE WE WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON'T MISS THE CHANCE! VOTE YES ON F!

Walter G. Jebe
John J. Figone
Cesar A. Churchwell
Alessandro Baccari
Virgil Caselli
Marsha Garland
Tom Creedon
Ed Farrah
Michael Salerno

NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS

Pride, trust, reliance. They're all wrapped up in a San Francisco institution. The neighborhood fire station turns out to be more — it's a rock, an anchor, a point of reference in people's lives.

City residents have said so loud and clear in endorsing Proposition F. Besides setting a minimum number of firefighters to be on duty each day, the June ballot measure guarantees a public hearing in the area concerned and a vote of the people, if needed, before any fire station may be closed.

Seventy thousand people petitioned to put F on the ballot. Their reasons all had a common core. It's not THE fire station but OUR fire station, they said — a place to expect and get help in a fire or medical emergency, a place the local community can turn to and rely on if the earth shakes, buildings fall, and other resources break down.

Neighborhoods and fire stations. The one requires the other, San Franciscans say.

John W. Flaherty
Mark L. Kaplan
Robert L. Barisone
Elvera Jane Barison
William A. Roberts Jr.
Maureen Porter
William Porter Jr.
Homer G. Miles
Dorothy L. Miles
Peter C. Gardner
Joan M. Gardner
John Daly
Lucia R. Flaherty
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T BE MISLED BY MAYOR AGNOS!
PROP F IS A LIFE AND DEATH ISSUE!
FIRE, INSURANCE AND EARTHQUAKE EXPERTS AGREE: SAN FRANCISCO FACES THE HIGHEST RISK OF CONFLAGRATION OF ANY CITY IN THE UNITED STATES!
FIRE RISK IS HIGHER THAN IN 1906!
SAN FRANCISCO'S FIRE PROTECTION NEEDS ARE DIC-
TATED BY THE NATURE OF OUR CITY, with its:
- Blocks and blocks of adjoining wood frame buildings
- Steep hills
- Narrow streets
- Traffic congestion
- Network of overhead electrical, trolley and telephone lines
- Prevailing winds
- 500 high rise buildings
- High density residential areas
- Large population of seniors and low-income families
- High vulnerability to severe earthquake damage
- Isolation from outside help in time of disaster
SAN FRANCISCO IS IN TROUBLE BECAUSE THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY. Former SF Fire Chief Emmet Condon in his book "Denial of Disaster": "THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT IS BELOW THE DAILY MANNING LEVEL THAT ANY EXPERIENCED CHIEF OFFICER KNOWS IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SERVICE TO THE CITY."

"I WOULD AGREE THAT THE HAZARD OF FIRE TO THE CITY AFTER A SIMILAR DISASTER TODAY IS MUCH GREATER THAN IN 1906." And,
"SYNTHETIC MATERIALS HAVE GREATLY INCREASED THE FIRE RISK IN MODERN BUILDINGS AND WILL MAGNIFY THE FIRE PROBLEM IN THE MULTIPLE FIRES THAT WILL BREAK OUT AFTER A SERIOUS EARTHQUAKE."

At least 400 of the city’s 500 high rise buildings do not have modern life-safety systems! HIGH RISE FIRES CAUSE A HUGE DRAIN ON FIRE DEPARTMENT RESOURCES.
PROP F IS STRONGLY SUPPORTED BY INDIVIDUALS;
CITIZEN, BUSINESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS;
FIRE SAFETY EXPERTS, AND A BROAD SPECTRUM OF KNOWLEDGEABLE CIVIC LEADERS.

There is no significant opposition to Prop F.
PROTECT YOURSELF, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR FRIENDS — YOU HAVE A LOT TO LOSE! VOTE YES ON F!

GERRY LONG
Concerned Citizen

WHY VOTE YES ON F? WHY A CHARTER AMENDMENT?
City politicians have been consistently unresponsive to your fire safety concerns. It is the duty of the City to provide its citizens with adequate fire protection and earthquake preparedness. Instead, Fire Department staffing has been cut to a dangerous level. THE POLITICIANS SAY, "TRUST US!"
We can see that this has not worked, and a Charter provision is necessary. YOUR EMERGENCY NEEDS ARE TOO VITAL TO BE LEFT VULNERABLE TO POLITICAL GAMES.
You hear the sirens every day — BUT HAVE YOU COUNTED

THE FIREFIGHTERS? Fewer firefighters means greatly reduced firefighting capacity. FIRE DEPARTMENT STAFFING IS NOW AT AN ALL-TIME LOW AND CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO FALL FURTHER!
WE NEED A STRONG FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

John Flaherty
Battalion Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Past President, S.F. Fire Chiefs Assn.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

HIGH RISE BUILDINGS AND BART AND MUNI UNDERGROUND FACILITIES MAKE SPECIAL FIRE PROTECTION DEMANDS

Today, San Francisco has over 500 high rise buildings. Fires in these buildings require many firefighters because equipment must be carried by hand to the fire — often up many flights of stairs.

In 1988 in Los Angeles, a fire on three floors of a high rise building required 383 firefighters to bring it under control. In San Francisco, our entire on-duty force would be required, leaving the rest of the city completely unprotected. Mutual aid from neighboring communities would be totally inadequate to cover our needs.

BART and MUNI underground facilities present special fire and rescue problems. Large numbers of firefighters are required to fight these fires and perform rescue and evacuation operations.

In July 1989, Mayor Agnos forced reductions in truck company staffing — the key players in rescue and ventilation operations. Now these aerial ladder teams can no longer function properly.

Building ventilation is delayed, greatly increasing the risk of deadly backdrafts.

The Department’s daily staffing has fallen to 296 firefighters, the lowest in history, while fire, medical and other emergencies are higher than ever. Proposition F will bring SFFD staffing up to 320. This is critically needed to meet these ever-increasing demands.

In the past, some Fire Chiefs have thought that you could safely relocate or close a firehouse, but I now recognize that this is dangerous. The SFFD can now get to most emergencies within 3 minutes, but if we close a firehouse we lose that prompt response. With our rows of wood buildings, our large population of elderly citizens, we must get there quickly.

The SFFD is your lifeline. Protect it! I strongly urge all citizens to vote YES on F!

James P. Olson, President
San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

Any firefighter responsible for any racist act or statement on duty, after due process, should be disciplined. Repeat occurrences must result in severe penalties.

Expensive overtime can be largely eliminated by adding more firefighters.

Differences between the union and the mayor should be resolved through good faith negotiations, not through the election process. Maintaining high morale is the only way to insure efficiency.

The neighborhood service cuts need to be restored. Vote YES on F.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Becoming a victim in another major earthquake or runaway fire in one of San Francisco’s densely populated neighborhoods continues to be a hazard for all of us.

Nonetheless, because the Firefighters Union did not endorse him, Mayor Agnos has seen fit to reduce the staffing levels of the Fire Department in any twenty-four hour period from 315 to 296. The San Francisco Republican Party believes these cuts are penny-wise, pound-foolish, and politically motivated.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. DO NOT let the Mayor’s political vendetta jeopardize public safety.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley

William E. Grayson
Anna M. Guth
Tina H. Frank
Christopher L. Bowman
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition F. This proposition, if passed, will require twenty-five extra fire fighters to be hired each day — five of these fire fighters will have no specific functions — their daily assignment will be at the discretion of the Chief of Department. It will also require that daily truck staffing be increased from five to six persons and the fireboat staffing be increased by another two fire fighters daily. These increases are unnecessary and are not required — fire suppression units are now staffed to provide effective and efficient fire service for San Francisco.

Proposition F will take management control and responsibility away from the Chief of Department by requiring organizational changes to be approved by the voters at a regular election. This would not allow the Chief, through the Fire Commission, to respond to the changing demands placed on the Fire Department. Fire protection decisions can’t wait until an election. To provide for and maintain the most cost effective and efficient fire department, I urge you to vote NO on Proposition F.

Frederick F. Postel
Chief of Department

Overtime pay is bleeding the Fire Department’s budget dry! Over 92 percent of the budget goes for personnel costs. In 1988-89 uniformed personnel were paid salaries totaling $53,567,000 plus mandatory fringe benefits of $53,543,000 and still another $11,893,000 for overtime!

Proposition F would increase that bleeding by creating new positions not necessary for the safety of San Franciscans despite the scare statements made by the firefighters’ union.

Proposition F would cost $4,900,000 in overtime thereby siphoning away money needed to make major improvements!

We already have excellent protection but we want to upgrade it by developing a comprehensive earthquake program, by improving our response to emergency medical calls (over 4 1/2 times the number of fires) and by purchasing more modern fire equipment.

During the October quake S22 off-duty fire fighters reported back immediately yet there were not enough engines and trucks for them; in fact, one old piece had to be taken out of the Fire Museum to help fight the Marina District fire.

Our fire fighters work nine days out of 31 in shifts of approximately 24 hours on and 48 off.

Many are “double-dippers” holding down well paid outside jobs such as contractors, lawyers, plumbers and electricians. They still put in overtime because the Charter provides for such generous pay.

Overtime pay for a firefighter is $585 per shift, for a Captain $776 and for an Assistant Chief $1077! Last year the average firefighter’s cost to the City was $90,000, including salary, fringe benefits and overtime.

Do not pay out more money just for overtime. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

James Jefferson
President, Fire Commission

Frank Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission

Henry Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Sharon Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Ted Soulis
Commissioner, Fire Commission
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

San Francisco has the finest fire protection in California. Now is not the time to jeopardize it with Proposition F. Proposition F is an ill-advised and wasteful measure. First, it would wrest management of the Fire Department away from the Fire Commission and the Chief, where management properly and historically belongs. Management of the Fire Department should remain accountable to the citizens of San Francisco, through its appointed Fire Commission. This principle is violated when rigid language is placed in the Charter. Second, Proposition F would unnecessarily increase the Fire Department’s budget by approximately $4.9 million a year. The San Francisco Fire Department already has staffing levels on its fire engines and aerial ladder trucks that are equal to the best in California. To overstaff the engines and trucks would be counterproductive as well as wasteful, especially in a time of limited resources and ever-increasing demands for City services. Let life and death decisions of fire protection in San Francisco remain in the control of the Fire Commission and the Chief.

Let the buck stop where it has always stopped — with the Fire Commission and the Chief. And let San Francisco’s first-rate fire protection continue. We can’t afford to play around with fire, or with Proposition F. A similar Proposition was defeated in November, 1987. Vote NO on this Proposition in 1990. Vote NO on Proposition F.

James D. Jefferson
President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Souls
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Vote No on Proposition F.
Proposition F has little to do with fire protection and earthquake preparedness and a lot to do with unnecessary Fire Department staffing.

Vote No on Proposition F. Don’t tie the hands of the Chief and Fire Commission, preventing them from managing the department and our tax dollars. Proposition F will take $6 million a year from health services, libraries, homeless programs and other vital city services. Why? Because Proposition F will require the city to pay more overtime to firefighters who already receive higher salaries than those in Los Angeles, San Jose, Long Beach or San Diego.

Employment of unnecessary personnel is called “featherbedding.” Proposition F is just that — at a cost of $6 million. San Francisco has the best fire protection services in the country. We already pay more per person for that service than any other city in California. Stop a $6 million raid on the City Treasury. Vote No on Proposition F.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Like all San Franciscans, we want a safe and healthy city. But Proposition F could jeopardize our safety and health.

By spending more than $7 million on unnecessary overtime, Proposition F will take money away from other vitally needed services like fire equipment, police protection, health care and children's programs.

The annual fire department budget is already $150 million. Firefighters are already getting a pay raise of almost 10%. That's more than most city workers — and most of us.

San Francisco already has more firefighters per thousand residents than any other major Western city.

Yet San Francisco has fewer fire and emergency alarms than other cities. In 1986, San Francisco had 78,000 emergency calls.

Oakland had 95,000.

We appreciate the job that our firefighters do. But we cannot support this multi-million dollar attempt to win back overtime for just 18 firefighters per day.

Susan J. Bierman
Agar Jaicks
Mauri Schwartz
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Sunset Democratic Club
Margaret Brodkin, Director Coleman Advocates for Children
Carole Migden, chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

I respect and admire the work done by San Francisco's firefighters.

It's a dangerous job.

That's why they're paid more than firefighters in any other large city in California, even though our firefighters work 15 percent fewer hours.

But today our average cost per firefighter has hit $96,000 per year.

We have been reducing this amount — and improving fire service at the same time — by hiring more new firefighters and reducing costly overtime payments.

That overtime runs as much as $585 per day for a fourth-year firefighter, and up to $1077 per day at the higher ranks.

When they argue for Proposition F, the union avoids mentioning this fact. They raise a false alarm about closing down firehouses, when in reality we are adding new firefighters as quickly as we can train them.

Ninety new firefighters are being hired this year alone. We have full classes in the Fire Academy for the first time in years.

Prop F asks you, the voters, to put an unnecessary sixth firefighter back on every fire truck, in order to give current firefighters millions in guaranteed overtime.

There's no need for it. Even a one-alarm fire in San Francisco draws 30 firefighters in response.

It's easy, when you think about the heroic work firefighters do, to justify giving them whatever they ask for.

I made the same mistake myself three years ago, before I was mayor. As a State Assemblyman and a strong union supporter, I lent my name to a measure that was similar to Proposition F.

But no group, however much we appreciate their work, is entitled to millions of taxpayer dollars a year in guaranteed, unnecessary overtime — especially when they are trying to feather their own nests by keeping out women and minorities.

With all the pressing needs facing our city, we can't afford to give away $7 million and get nothing in return. Please vote No on Proposition F.

Mayor Art Agnos
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NOTE: This entire section is new.
The Proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

NEW CHARTER SECTION: 3.548:
MINIMUM LEVELS OF FIRE
PROTECTION FOR THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Notwithstanding any other section of this Charter, the minimum levels of fire protection for the City and County of San Francisco shall be specified as follows:

A. The MINIMUM level of Fire Protection for the City and County of San Francisco, in fire suppression, effective July 1, 1990, except as specified in Section C shall be as follows:

1. Engine Companies: 41
2. Truck Companies: 18
3. Rescue Companies: 2
4. Fireboat Companies: 1
5. Battalion Districts: 10
6. Divisions: 3
7. Service Units: 1
8. Bureau of Equipment: 2
9. High Pressure System: 1
10. Tank (staffed): 1
11. Assigned Firefighters: 1
12. At Chief's Discretion: 5

2. Fire station: The minimum number of stations shall be 41, at locations listed on the SFFD Station Directory for July 1, 1987.

B. MINIMUM daily staffing of Fire Companies and other Units:

1. Engine Companies: 1 Officer and 3 Firefighters
2. Truck Companies: 1 Officer and 5 Firefighters
3. Rescue Company: 1 Officer and 3 Firefighters
4. Fireboat Company: 1 Officer, 1 Pilot, 1 Marine Engineer, 1 Firefighter
5. Service Units: 1 Firefighter
6. Bureau of Equipment: 2 Firefighters

7. Battalion District: 1 Battalion Chief, 1 Chief's Aide, 1 Assistant Chief, 1 Chief's Aide
8. Division: 1 qualified person to operate gates, valves and communications equipment of the High Pressure System.
9. Jones Street Tank: Required minimum staffing shall be maintained on a constant basis, 24 hours per day. Sufficient personnel and positions shall be authorized and funded to maintain MINIMUM required staffing levels established in this section. When assigned personnel are not available, then staffing shall be maintained by working of overtime.

C. CLOSURE AND RELOCATION OF FIRE STATIONS, DEACTIVATION OF FIRE COMPANIES OR OF UNITS REQUIRED BY THIS SECTION:

1. Fire Stations, Fire Companies or other Units required by this section may be closed or deactivated only when each of the following procedures is completed:
   a. It is recommended by the Chief of Department and approved for consideration by the Fire Commission.
   b. The Fire Commission shall hold at least two public hearings on the matter so that affected citizens may appear to express their views.
   c. At least one of the public hearings shall be held in the neighborhood of the Station, Company, or Unit to be closed or deactivated. Such meeting to be held at a time and place most suitable for maximum public attendance.
   d. Except as provided by this section, other facilities or units may be closed or deactivated by majority of the five members of the Fire Commission upon recommendation by the Chief of Department.
   e. Upon conclusion of public hearings and approval by a majority of the five members of the Fire Commission for the closure or deactivation of a Company or Unit, the Fire Commission shall forward its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors within 30 calendar days.
   f. Upon receipt of the Fire Commission recommendation, the Board of Supervisors may hold public hearings on the matter and they may approve or disapprove of the recommendation of the Fire Commission for closure or deactivation of a Station, Company or Unit. Such approval or disapproval shall be by majority vote of the Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors approves of the Fire Commission recommendation, then they shall direct the Clerk of the Board to have the matter put on the ballot of the next regular election for final determination by the voters of the City and County.

D. DEFINITIONS — EQUIPMENT:

1. ENGINE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying hose and a pump to pump water of at least 1,500 gallons per minute.
2. TRUCK COMPANY: A tractor-trailer vehicle carrying ladders and rescue equipment with a 100-foot aerial ladder or equivalent device to reach upper floors of buildings.
3. RESCUE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying rescue equipment capable of heavy rescue and diving equipment for underwater rescue.
4. FIRE BOAT COMPANY: A boat equipped with pumps, hose, monitor nozzles and able to navigate San Francisco Bay for firefighting and rescue duty along the shorelines of the City and County.
5. SERVICE UNIT: A vehicle carrying spare supply of air and equipment for self-contained breathing apparatus and resuscitators.
6. HIGH PRESSURE SYSTEM PUMP STATION: A facility capable of pumping at least 10,000 gallons per minute from San Francisco Bay or other water source into the mains of the high pressure water system.
7. BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT: A vehicle capable of carrying equipment for emergency repairs or towing of fire apparatus under emergency conditions.
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?

YES 288
NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Health Service System provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Supervisors may not continue to receive health insurance from the Health Service System after they leave the Board of Supervisors.

Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Board of Supervisors could allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G will allow former Supervisors to buy health insurance coverage from the City's Health Service system, when they leave office. THERE WILL BE NO COST TO THE CITY.

The Health Service System now provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Proposition G simply allows former Supervisors to BUY continued health coverage in the City's Health Plan, at their own expense.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition G
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "G"
Former supervisors are either those who have decided not to run; or those the electorate voted out of office.
Even as it claims they will pay their own health plan benefits, why continue to have them in the system.

Cut bait.
Vote NO.

Marguerite Warren
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.425 Persons Covered

Each plan may make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system by the dependents of members, retired city and county employees, temporary city and county employees, such other dependents of deceased and retired city and county employees as the board of supervisors may authorize by ordinance, teachers and other employees of the San Francisco Unified School District retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees of the city and county and resigned teachers and employees of the school district whose resignations occur after June 15, 1955, and within 30 days immediately prior to the date on which, but for their resignations, they would have become retired members of the said retirement system, on whose relinquishment of retirement allowances as permitted by the charter occurs after such date and resigned employees of the San Francisco Unified School District not otherwise included. A resigned employee or teacher is one whose employment has terminated other than by retirement, discharge or death or who has relinquished retirement allowances. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system to the aforementioned resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District is to enable them, subject to the health service board's exercise of its power, to participate in the benefits of the system after transferring to the State Teachers' Retirement System from the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for participation in the benefits of the system by the aforementioned resigned employees of the city and county and other resigned employees of San Francisco Unified School District is to permit the health service board to have power to treat them the same as it treats resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District.

As used in this section, and for the purpose of this section, the terms "city and county employees" and "employees of the city and county" shall include officers and employees of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco.

The board of supervisors may also provide by ordinance for the continuation in any plan by former supervisors who agree to and do pay the full cost of such benefit.

Moved since you last voted? Then you must re-register. Phone 554-4375.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?

YES 290
NO 292

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers belong to the City's Retirement System. Under the charter, the Board of Supervisors may contract with the State's Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) to make certain safety employees to be members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, if there is no additional cost to the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, if there would be no additional cost to the City.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want these employees to continue to be covered by the City's Retirement System.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
Fire Inspector and Engineer Retirement Benefits

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This Charter Amendment would provide for safety retirement for eighteen civilian Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers employed by the San Francisco Fire Department, at no additional cost to the City.

Fire Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers are classified by the State of California as safety personnel and properly belong in a safety retirement program that is not offered by the City’s Retirement System for non-uniformed employees. Instead, the City contracts with the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) for its public safety officers who are not police officers or firefighters.

Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers, along with their counterparts in the uniformed firefighter ranks, provide the professional expertise necessary for the City’s fire prevention program. Proposition H provides a retirement plan for this small group of civilians equivalent to the retirement plan for their uniformed firefighter counterparts, at no additional cost to the City.

Voters approved similar measures in recent years that provided safety requirement for probation officers, investigator groups and various other safety personnel.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition H
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by **strike-out type**.

8.506-2 Miscellaneous Safety Employees
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the board of supervisors or the community college board shall have the power to contract with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees’ Retirement System of the State of California to provide that the probation officers, airport police officers, district attorney and public defender investigators, coroner investigators, juvenile court counselors, and institutional police, fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers who are not members of the Section 8.588 plans, shall be members of the public employees’ retirement system, and the board of supervisors, the community college board and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such contract.

The power to contract created herein shall be limited to a contract with no net increase in cost to the city and county or the community college district.

Any person who shall become a member of the public employees’ retirement system pursuant to such contract shall have the right to be a member of the health service system and the health board shall make provision for the participation in the benefits of the health service system by such persons.

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐

Out of town on June 5, 1990? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐
Residents are TONS, SAN FRANCISCO, recycling in record numbers!

Nearly 70,000 homes in the southern and eastern parts of the City have curbside recycling. By 1991, every resident will have curbside collection service.

Until curbside reaches your neighborhood, you can recycle at our many community recycling centers.

For a free Recycling Starter Kit and information on where to recycle call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL
554-6193
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

PROPOSITION I

Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits? YES 293 NO 295

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the State Retirement System are allowed to work for the San Francisco Unified School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. Retired San Francisco teachers in the City Retirement system are not allowed to do so.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow retired teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. While they are consultants they would not make retirement contributions or earn additional retirement credits.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, costs could increase, the amount of which, being dependent upon the dollar amount and the number of personal service contracts executed, cannot be determined, but should not be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Jim Gonzalez and Richard Hongisto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is necessary to correct an inequity that exists between teachers in the State Teachers' Retirement System and those in the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. Teachers in the state system can retire up to three years early and supplement their reduced retirement income by serving as consultants to the school district developing curriculum, orienting new teachers, substituting for absent teachers, tutoring students, etc. The Charter denies the right to the four hundred teachers in the city retirement system to continue serving students and schools in these ways. Proposition I would correct this inequity by extending the same right to teachers in the city retirement system.

Proposition I will save taxpayers' money by encouraging teachers at the top of the salary scale to retire early. New hires at the low end of the salary scale will earn little more than half as much as those at the top.

Proposition I will also improve education in San Francisco schools by continuing to take advantage of the experience and expertise of retired teachers. It will also help to solve the shortage of qualified substitute teacher.

Vote YES on Proposition I for equity, economy, and educational excellence.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition I
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition I
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will bring equity and fairness to retired teachers, save the taxpayers money and improve the educational system in San Francisco.

Assemblyman Willie Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John Burton
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Jim Gonzales
San Francisco Democratic Party
Fred Rodriguez, President of the Board of Education

United Educators of San Francisco, Joan-Marie Shelley
Judy Dellamonica
Joanne Miller, vice-president of the San Francisco Board of Education
Thomas Amniano
Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council
Larry Martin, Transport Workers of America
Robert Barnes
James Wachob
Jose Medina
Harry G. Brit, President of the Board of Supervisors

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the charter on January 1, 1969, and persons who become miscellaneous officers and employees after February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under Section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under Section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(a) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meanings:

"Retirement allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payments is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workers' compensation laws of the State of California, shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the retirement board, which would have been earned by the member had he worked, throughout the period under consideration, the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police department as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under Section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in Section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in Section 3.670 of the charter.

"Charter" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural; and the plural the singular.

"Intestacy" shall mean at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(b) Any member who completes at least 20 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 50 years, or at least 10 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 60 years, said service to be computed under Subsection (g) hereof, may retire from service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after reaching the age of 60 years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of two percent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of 65 years, if the allowance available to such member, pursuant to the provisions of Subsection (f) of this section, shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this Subsection, then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this Subsection, an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said Subsection (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of 60 years, after rendering 20 years or more of such service and having attained the age of 50 years, computed under Subsection (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken at the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under Subsection (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/4</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/2</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-3/4</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-1/4</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed 75 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or Subsection (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly or an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of 65 years may elect, without right of reversion, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system, and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of Sec-
tion 8.514 of this charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county’s contributions shall not be less than $100 per month upon retirement after 50 years of service and after attaining the age of 60 years, and provided further that as to any member within 15 years of retirement at the compulsory retirement age of 65, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county’s contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $100 per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculations of retirement allowances.

(c) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least 10 years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in Subsection (g) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in Subsection (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds 40 percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age 60, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed 40 percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earnable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one year immediately preceding his retirement. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied as full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board’s own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

(d) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers’ compensation laws of the State of California.

(e) If a member shall die, before retirement, (1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member’s estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus the member’s contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of 12 months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member’s estate or designated beneficiary.

(C) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired from service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated-beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse’s death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under Subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) shall be paid in lump sum as follows:

(A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election, but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 years, may make the election herein provided before benefit has been paid under this Subsection (e), for and on behalf of such children leftist, in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this Subsection (e), any allowance payable under this Subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member’s death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

(I) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least 10 years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed $1,000, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrecoverable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service

(Continued on next page)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued)

retirement, but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1-2/3 percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

(g) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

(1) Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.

(2) Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitling him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contributions standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member, to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of Section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under Section 8.507.

(5) The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and service rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefor shall be required of the city and county.

(h) All payments provided under this section shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation paid to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to 7-1/2 percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of Subsection (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members, and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this Subsection (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, with which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), Subsection (h), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement, and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year, and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this Subdivision (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(i) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said Subsection (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(j) Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it shall conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsections (b), (c), (f), and (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and

(Continued on page 92)
Human Rights Commission

PROPOSITION J
Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Human Rights Commission was created by an ordinance. Under that ordinance, the Human Rights Commission has 15 members.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment that would make the existing Human Rights Commission a charter commission; it would reduce the number of members from 15 to 11.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you want to reduce its size to 11 members.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you do not want to reduce its size to 11 members.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government in an amount not to exceed $4,200.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Thomas Hsieh.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
ONICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Let us make human rights a fundamental part of the fabric of San Francisco. San Francisco is the birthplace of the United Nations and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, our Human Rights Commission is not even a part of our constitution — the Charter. Proposition J will make the Human Rights Commission a charter commission. Proposition J will take the position of the Human Rights Commission out of politics and ensures its place in the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco. Please vote in favor of Proposition J to recognize the importance of human rights to San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition J
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition J
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department and a candidate for Municipal Court Judge I urge you to vote for Ballot Measure J.

The Human Rights Commission has been a positive voice for 25 years. Thousands of San Franciscans have directly benefited from the Commission’s efforts. Its mandate will be greatly strengthened by extending Charter status through this measure. Please join me and vote yes on J!

James Harrigan
For Municipal Court

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “J”

We have a Human Rights Commission NOW, appointed by the Mayor. A new one in the charter would have the same appointing officer.

We don’t need a confirmation of said committee. It will not take it out of politics. No reason for this.

Just another layer of government — for what.

Vote no on "J".

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: This entire section is new.
PART TWENTY-FOUR: HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
3.699-5 Commission; Composition
A human rights commission is hereby established. The human rights commission shall consist of eleven members broadly representative of the general public to be appointed by the mayor. Three of the members who are first appointed shall be designated to serve for terms of one year, three for two years, three for three years and two for four years from the date of their appointments. Thereafter, members shall be appointed as aforesaid for a term of office of four years, except that all of the vacancies occurring during a term shall be filled for the unexpired term. Members of said commission shall be compensated for each commission or committee meeting actually attended by said members in an amount as may be established and amended, from time to time, by ordinance of the board of supervisors, but not less than $50 per meeting provided, however, that no member shall be paid for attending more than two commission or committee meetings in any one calendar month.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued from page 68)

County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system, an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

8.584-10 Limitation on Employment During Retirement
(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.584 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.
(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.
(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.
(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.584, he shall re-enter membership under Section 8.584 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.584. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.
(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for service or disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 60 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he held the position which he held at the time of his retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he held the position from which he was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
Seven Member Commissions

PROPOSITION K
Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?

YES 298
NO 299

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department, Fire Department, Social Services Department, Port of San Francisco, Public Utilities Commission, Board of Permit Appeals, Civil Service Commission, Airports Commission and Parking and Traffic Department are managed by a board or commission. Each of these boards and commissions has five members appointed by the Mayor.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K is a charter amendment that would increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the size of these boards and commissions to stay the same.

Controller's Statement on "K"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $18,800 annually beginning January, 1991."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh, Bill Maher, and Wendy Nelder.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K expands the opportunity for San Francisco’s varied communities to participate in City government. Proposition K increases, from five to seven, the membership of the Board of Permit Appeals and seven City commissions: Police, Fire, Social Services, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports, and Parking and Traffic. It also includes the Port Commission, subject to amendment of state law to authorize such an increase.

Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities. Only five members of these crucial commissions is insufficient to address the diversity of concerns in our City; seven members will provide greater representation and greater leadership from a variety of communities. The expansion of the size of these commissions enhances the possibility for all San Franciscans to be part of decision-making and policy-making processes at every level.

The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions. Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor, but instead of the many underrepresented voices in San Francisco.

Proposition K would make these commissions representative of the interests of more San Franciscans, while maintaining the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants. San Franciscans want accessible, responsive, and active commissioners. We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns, and Proposition K is a method for achieving these goals.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

You need a decoder ring to read the Supervisors’ argument in favor of creating 18 new commissioner slots. Here’s what the Board says, and here’s what they really mean.

The Board means: “Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities.”

The Board means: All you interest groups out there, it’s time to get yours.

The Board says: “The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions.”

The Board means: With 18 more political appointments, a mayor won’t offend as many supporters by passing them over for city jobs.

The Board says: “Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor.”

The Board means: Adding 18 new city commissioners isn’t really a boon to the incumbent mayor — unless he’s re-elected.

The Board says: “Proposition K would... maintain the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants.”

The Board means: Increasing commission memberships by 40% isn’t that big a deal.

The Board says: “We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns.”

The Board means: A fair hearing before city commissions isn’t enough; we want guaranteed results!

Let’s stop speaking in code and talk plainly. Proposition K is based on the notion that people should be treated as groups — not individuals — in the political process. That’s offensive, and so is Proposition K.

Please vote NO on K!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is a textbook example of what's wrong with contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K demeans us because it lumps city residents into groups, rather than respecting their rights as individuals.

Proposition K divides us because it stresses what such interest groups (the polite euphemism is "communities") disagree about, rather than what all San Franciscans share in common.

Proposition K debases us because it is premised on a "quota system" for city boards and commissions. There shouldn't be "white seats" or "black seats", "gay seats" or "straight seats" on city commissions. There should be but two qualifications for service as a city commissioner: San Francisco residency and individual ability!

Vote NO on Proposition K!

San Francisco is indeed a polyglot and richly diverse community. City residents come from all corners of the country and the globe. Their political opinions range from radical to reactionary and all points in between.

It's impossible for each point of view, each ethnic group, each political persuasion, each neighborhood to be represented on city commissions. Increasing the membership on those bodies from five to seven persons is like buying a bigger umbrella in a hurricane. It won't make a bit of difference.

It is possible, however, for city commissioners from all walks of life to represent views and interests other than their own. It happens all the time in countless actions by city boards and agencies. And if we want to encourage consensus and better understanding among San Francisco's many "communities", we must resist attempts - such as Proposition K - to make the labels we all wear easier to read.

Three years ago, Mayor Agnos campaigned on the slogan, "One City, One Future". The supporters of Proposition K have failed to heed those words.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The opponents of Proposition K are clearly on the wrong page of the textbook of contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K values us because it gives city residents greater ability to be heard, individually and as a community.

Proposition K unites us because it reinforces what we all share in common: respect for democracy. If, as the opposition claims, the ability to have more access to representation is divisive, democratic ideals such as checks and balances must therefore also be divisive and undesirable.

Proposition K elevates us because it originates from that respect for democracy. This does not limit or allocate, but reasonably expands available seats on the commissions. Proposition K effectively dilutes the influence of special interests in favor of more broad-based views.

San Francisco is an extremely diverse city and that diversity should be reasonably represented. Democracy requires the opportunity for representation of all points of view. Good government demands that the number of appointed officials be limited so that debate can be functional. Proposition K addresses these two needs: increased citizen participation, and reasonable size to facilitate getting work done.

If you take the opposition's argument - that it is not meaningful to have representatives from different neighborhoods, ethnicities, political persuasions - to its logical extreme, you could have one member commissions achieving a consensus at the price of democracy.

Proposition K is good government, since it integrates the multiplicity of voices into a united future for the residents of San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition K!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

We need to create an open, democratic, and participatory local government.
This measure will encourage more participation.
Vote YES on K.

Individuals and community groups strongly support K. Increasing the membership on these bodies expands the opportunity to participate for all San Franciscans.
Vote YES on K!

Mayor Art Agnos
Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John L. Burton
State Senator Milton Marks
Fr. James Goode
Carole Migden
Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes
Political Action Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Catherine Baccari
Bob Dockendorff
Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Robert McCarthy
Ruth Picon
President, Latino Democratic Club
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead, Pres.
Bernal Heights Community Foundation
Jake McGoldrick
Arnie Scher
Natalie Berg
Sodonia Wilson,
San Francisco Board of Education
Alma Jackson
Margaret Brady
Reverend Amos Brown
Yori Wada

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

Vote No on Proposition K.

Proposition K unnecessarily tinkers with our commission system for managing city departments.

Many of the most important city functions — police and fire services, libraries and health care — are governed by five-member city commissions. Proposition K would increase the size of these commissions to seven members. The Planning Commission would be expanded to nine members.

For what reason? The supporters say that the commissions cannot reflect our diverse community unless we allow the mayor to appoint more commissioners. They miss the point of the commission system. Commissioners are not advisors or members of a community-wide study panel. They are managers. They set city policy, recommend hundreds of millions of dollars in spending, and hire and fire key departmental personnel.

Preserve our system of citizen management. Don’t make city commissions debating societies.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Are not seven Deputy Mayors at the rate of $94,000 a year a sufficient number of political plums for the Mayor? Does he really need eighteen more commissioners to achieve good government in San Francisco?

Do not give the Mayor additional tools to promote his re-election efforts. The San Francisco Republican Party urges voters to Vote No on Proposition K.

San Francisco Republican Party
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Anna M. Guth

William E. Grayson
Honor H. Bulkley
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Brian Mavrogeorge
Ronald G. Kershaw
Sam T. Harper
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

No sound arguments have been presented which support the need for Proposition K. Enlarging Boards and Commissions would increase city costs without improving productivity. Indeed, extra members may impede efficiency and result in protracted proceedings.

Don’t give the Mayor additional opportunities for patronage. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw

Brian Mavrogeorge
Paul Kavouksarian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence
Martin Keller

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K
PROPOSITION K WILL ADD TO BUREAUCRACY
Proposition K will hinder quick and fair response to citizen concerns. Larger commissions do not mean better commissions; on the contrary, they mean a less efficient, more cumbersome process. PROPOSITION K WILL NOT MAKE COMMISSIONS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INTERESTS OF SAN FRANCISCO
Present commissions serve a diverse San Francisco by appointment of individuals who reflect and possess sensitivity, respect for different backgrounds and points of views.

Sharon Bretz
Susann L. Danielson
Jean Kalil
Victor Makras
Esther Marks
Beverly Prior

Larger commissions and larger support bureaucracy are not the answer to better representation. The answer is less political patronage and more appointments based on experience and knowledge. This proposal only makes government more cumbersome and less effective.

... Vote NO on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Proposition K is not about democracy. It is about patronage. It is about creating many new commission positions to hand out as political plums. To whom? For what? And why should the taxpayers be forced to pay for it?

No one, not even the author, Supervisor Ward, claims that it will improve the efficiency of the government, yet it will certainly add to the costs. The true costs will include trips, staff time, expenses, etc., with no discernable benefit to the public.

This measure will lead to longer meetings, more arguments, divisiveness and politics while providing less management oversight.

Proposition K is an insider’s game. They gain and the voters pay. It is a costly bad idea and should be soundly rejected by the voters.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Bill Maher

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”
If qualified commissioners were appointed who understood they represented ALL of San Francisco this charter amendment would not be necessary.

There are nine commissions listed for additional members — 18 more appointments. Just another avenue for political appointments.

Vote No on Proposition “K”.

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

PART FOUR: POLICE DEPARTMENT
3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, police force, an office of citizen complaints and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of five seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission to seven members, shall continue to hold their respective positions, subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 1, 1947, and shall have all the powers and duties thereto, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the police department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the police commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-20 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter, provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The police commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

PART FIVE: FIRE DEPARTMENT
3.540 Fire Department

The fire department shall be under the management of a fire commission, consisting of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1948, 1949, and 1950, respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The chief of department shall have power to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for fire-fighting purposes.

The commissioners shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the fire department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the fire commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-20 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter.

Positions of officers and employees of the fire department legally authorized shall continue, and the incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall continue as the officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments, and except as in this charter otherwise provided.

PART EIGHT: SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
3.570 Composition of Department; Commission

There is hereby established a social services department. This department shall consist of a social services commission of five seven members, a director of social services, and such employees and assistants as may be necessary to carry out the work and functions of said department.

The members of the social services commission shall be appointed thereto by the mayor and shall be selected for their respective positions on the basis of their interest in and understanding of the problems of public welfare. The members of said commission shall serve without compensation and no person shall be eligible to serve on said commission while holding a salaried public office, position or employment.

The term of office of the members of the said commission, subject to the provisions hereof relative to removal and the terms of the first mem-

(Continued on next page)
bers of the commission, shall be four years.

The mayor shall appoint seven members to said social services commission, one member to be appointed for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1938; one for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1939; one for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1940, and two for terms to expire on the 15th day of January, 1941; and two for terms to expire on the 15th day of January, 1946; and upon the expiration of the terms of each of said members of said commission as appointed, the mayor shall fill the vacancy arising by reason of the expiration of said term by the appointment of a member to said commission for a term of four years. Vacancies occurring in the membership of said commission shall be filled by an appointment to be made by the mayor for the unexpired term of said person in whose place said appointment is made; and when the term of any member of said commission shall expire, then said appointment shall be made for the full period of four years from the date of the expiration of the term. All vacancies shall be filled within 30 days of the occurrence thereof.

Members of the commission shall be subject to removal from office by the mayor for cause, but only upon written charges made and signed by the mayor, copy of said charges to be served upon the offending commissioner; and said charges shall be heard by the mayor and on said hearing of said charges the said commissioner so charged shall have the opportunity to appear and to be heard.

The commission shall be a policy-determining and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in Section 5.50 of the charter.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART NINE: PORT COMMISSION

3.580 Commission; Composition

The San Francisco Port Commission shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, their appointment being subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors. Each of said members shall serve for a term of four years. Vacancies on the commission shall be filled by the mayor for the unexpired portion of the term. Initial appointive members of the commission shall consist of the incumbent members of the San Francisco Port Authority, who shall serve as commissioners for a term corresponding to the unexpired portion of their tenure as members of the port authority. Subject to amendment of state law to authorize an increase in membership, the port commission shall consist of seven members. The two additional members shall be appointed by the mayor after the eighth day of January, 1992. The initial term of office not to exceed four years shall be fixed by the mayor to insure that the term of office for a majority of the commission shall not expire in the same year. In addition, the director of finance and secretary of agriculture and services, or their designated representatives, shall be ex-officio members of the commission. Persons appointed to the port commission shall be subject to recall, suspension and removal in the same manner as an elected official.

The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3.590 Commission; Composition

A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o'clock on the 5th day of January, 1932, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of the two other commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936. The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992, and (c) On the expiration of these and successive terms, the mayor shall appoint their successors for four years. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS

3.650 Board Composition

The mayor shall appoint five seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $5,000 $7,000 per year. One such term shall expire at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934 and 1935, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936, and two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January 1996, and upon these and successive expirations the mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SEVENTEEN: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county.

The civil service commission shall consist of five seven members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the 1st day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and, provided further, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1990, and the terms shall be as follows: one shall expire on June 30, 1996 and one on June 30, 1998, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. No less than one member of said commission shall be a woman. The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this

(Continued on page 128)
PROPOSITION L

Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Candidates for elective office and members of charter boards and commissions must be San Francisco residents and electors. For other boards, commissions and advisory bodies, the law creating them may set residency requirements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L is a charter amendment that would require the members of all boards, commissions and advisory bodies to be San Francisco residents and electors.

This rule would not apply where a non-charter board, commission or advisory body requires a person with specific qualifications, and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found. Also, this rule would not apply to the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Fine Arts Museums, the Asian Arts Commission, the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission and the elected members of the San Francisco Retirement Board and Health Service Board.

Proposition L would delete the current requirement that candidates and members of charter boards and commissions be residents and electors for a certain length of time before assuming office, which courts have found unconstitutional.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “L”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh and Bill Maher.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

This charter amendment provides that all individuals serving on city boards and commissions and committees with few exceptions, must be citizens of voting age of San Francisco.

Members of boards and commissions and committees often have policy making and regulatory responsibilities. Clearly, San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco. With a population of 750,000 residents, surely we have enough qualified and talented San Franciscans who can get the job done.

This charter amendment offers the appointing officer with some flexibility. If a qualified candidate for a public post requiring specialized skills cannot be found in our city, then, following such a declaration, the appointing officer may search elsewhere.

Let's open up more opportunities for our residents to serve San Francisco. VOTE YES FOR THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERSHIP ON CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I was mistaken in one of my objections to Proposition L. Some years ago, a court decision invalidated the voter-adopted Charter requirement that a person be a San Francisco resident for five years before appointment to a city commission. I disagree strongly with that decision, for the reasons cited in my ballot argument appearing on the opposite page. The inoperative language remained in our Charter, however, and Proposition L disingenuously removes it — like pruning a dead branch from a tree.

But, there are still plenty of reasons to vote against Proposition L.

(1) Proposition L eliminates the requirement that a commissioner be an "elector" of San Francisco (a voter, meaning also a U.S. citizen) for at least one year. This Charter provision has not been altered by a court, but Proposition L would strike it from the books.

A person could move into town, register to vote, and be appointed that day to a city post.

(2) Proposition L exempts three city commissions — Health System, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board — from any residency requirement whatsoever.

(3) Proposition L would allow non-residents to serve on any board or commission created by the Board of Supervisors. In fact, Proposition L could even be interpreted to allow the appointment of non-citizens to such posts!

Don't be misled or confused. If you want San Franciscans to make decisions about San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition L!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

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

If you want San Francisco residents to serve on all city commissions established by the charter, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you think San Franciscans should serve on boards and committees created by the Board of Supervisors, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you favor city residents serving on the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees, vote NO on Proposition L.

The Board of Supervisors says "San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco." I agree completely. Trouble is, Proposition L weakens the existing residency requirement in our City Charter.

Charter Section 8.100 states that no person "shall be appointed as a member of any board or commission unless he shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years." Proposition L eliminates the five-year residency requirement! Proposition L also exempts from any residency requirement whatsoever members of the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees.

The idea behind the five-year residency rule is that city commissioners should have first-hand knowledge and personal experience of San Francisco’s people and neighborhoods, its problems and possibilities. City commissioners should not just rely on staff reports and statistical abstracts. Proposition L would destroy this sensible safeguard. Instead, a person could move into town and be appointed, that day, to a city post!

Finally, Proposition L purports to extend the Charter’s residency rules to advisory boards and committees established by the Board of Supervisors. But the residency requirement can be waived for a person "with specific experience, skills, or qualifications". That's a loophole big enough to drive a truck through!

San Franciscans should make decisions about San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition L.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for most advisory panels of the City.

Under Proposition L, panel members MUST be residents of San Francisco.

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for membership on the Health System Board, Retirement Board and War Memorial Board.

Under Proposition L, there is no change. Membership on the Health System Board and Retirement Board is by DIRECT ELECTION of city employees. The Health Fund and Retirement Fund are operated by and for city workers. Because employees are not required to live in the city, there are serious constitutional problems with denying a worker the right to be a candidate for trustee of a fund controlled by employees.

The way things are now, the courts have thrown out San Francisco's five-year residency requirement. Reports the City Attorney:

"In the years since Charter Section 8.100 (residency rule) was originally adopted, the California courts have struck down all durational residency requirements applicable to candidates for elective or appointive office."

Most Supervisors like the durational requirement. But even Supervisors cannot overrule the Supreme Court.

The bottom line: Proposition L does not cover everything. Just most things. It’s time San Franciscans were making the decisions about San Francisco. Proposition L is a major start in the right direction.

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE. YES ON PROPOSITION L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

San Franciscans deserve to be represented by commissioners who live within San Francisco, not by employees filling in for their ex-officio bosses. Vote for San Francisco commissions made of San Francisco voters.

... Vote Yes on Proposition L!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

---

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Don’t clutter the Charter with unnecessary provisions. Vote No on Proposition L.
Proposition L would require almost all commissions and advisory board members to be city residents. That makes sense — so much sense that, for most commissions, it is already the law.
This is one more example of a needless Charter amendment. If the Board of Supervisors wants to require members of any advisory body to be city residents, they can pass an ordinance to accomplish it.
Adding an unnecessary provision to a Charter that is already too long and complicated is not the answer.

Vote No on Proposition L.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.100 Qualifications
(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she is shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for at least one year immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retirement system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.680, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 7 through Tuesday, June 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
REAL LEMON
CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease.
Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals
it's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be
TOXIC FREE 554-4333

HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR
YOUR HOME'S
TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday
8 am. to 4 pm. 554-4333

San Francisco
Household Hazardous
Waste Program
PROPOSITION M
Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by the Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex? 

YES 302
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter requires some City boards and commissions, such as the Police and Fire Commissions, to have at least one woman member. However, the charter does not have a general policy on balancing the number of men and women on City boards and commissions.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a charter amendment that would create a City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex. This charter amendment does not apply to the Commission on the Status of Women.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex.

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

Controller’s Statement on “M”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “M”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Bill Maher and Wendy Nelder.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The 1990s are here — but you would never know it by the few women serving on City boards and commissions. In fact, of ten major commissions — Police, Fire, Airports, Ports, Public Utilities, Parking Authority, Social Services, City Planning, Elections, Housing Authority — women hold just 18 percent of the seats. And only one woman serves as a president of these commissions.

Women do not fare much better on other key commissions. For instance, women hold just two seats on the seven-member Recreation and Park Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission. Three women serve on the eleven-member Small Business Advisory Commission.

Despite the enormous influence and regulatory controls most commissions have over the lives of all citizens, women’s voices and leadership on city panels do not equal their numbers in society.

These gloomy statistics aside, women have begun to make gains during the past two years. Women are now being regularly considered and appointed to boards and commissions. But, clearly, much more needs to be done.

Proposition M will emblazon into the Charter a policy goal of gender equality on all boards and commissions. This amendment, authored by Supervisor Richard Hongisto, is a simple measure of justice.

Only the Commission on the Status of Women is excluded from the provisions of this charter amendment, since its sole purpose is to serve as an advocacy forum for women.

Increasingly, communities and groups are instituting gender parity provisions in their constitutions with much success. For instance, the Democratic Party has dramatically brought about near gender equality of delegates to its national and state conventions.

Let’s start the 1990s off with a renewed commitment to fairness and equality.

VOTE YES ON THE GENDER PARITY AMENDMENT.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition M
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition M
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M moves San Francisco into the 1990s. It is stunning to review the composition of our city boards and commissions and see just how few women are serving. Women comprise 18 percent of the seats on ten major commissions. This is an untold tragedy. Women have been making gains in recent time. We can do even better.

Proposition M is about fairness and equality. Iowa enacted a law in 1987 to require greater gender balance on all boards, commissions, committees, and councils.

Vote Yes for Gender Justice. Yes on Proposition M.

SF Chapter, National Organization for Women
Legal Advocates for Women
San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Creating political leadership opportunities for women will strengthen the public policy decision-making process.

Vote YES on M.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw
Paul Kavouksarian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence

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

Requirement that any commission be comprised of a certain number of persons of any gender is as inappropriate as requiring a certain number of persons who have red hair or blue eyes. Please vote to maintain the mayoral prerogative to appoint the best San Franciscans for the job.

Vote No on Proposition M.
Like Proposition L, but only more so, Proposition M does not belong in the City Charter.
The power to make appointments to boards and commissions rests with the Mayor. Proposition M would write into the Charter a non-binding policy statement urging the Mayor to fill not more than 50% plus one of any commission with members of the same sex.
The City Attorney advised the Board of Supervisors that the Constitution prohibits the city from adopting a quota for male and female appointments. Instead, the Board of Supervisors proposes to clutter up the Charter with a non-binding, legally unenforceable policy statement.
If the Board of Supervisors wants to send a message to the Mayor it should be done by resolution, not costly and unnecessary Charter amendments.
Vote No on Proposition M.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "M"
There is nothing in the charter NOW that prevents the Mayor or Board of Supervisors to appoint more women to achieve gender parity now.

Why now does it have to be written in concrete.
Vote NO on "M".

Marguerite Warren

... Vote NO on Proposition M!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Entire section is new.
3.503 Composition of Boards and Commissions.
It is the policy of the city and county, which shall be considered a goal when filling vacancies on boards or commissions appointed by the mayor, or otherwise provided by this charter, except for the Commission on the Status of Women, to achieve gender parity on these boards and commissions by limiting to a simple majority of board and commission membership the number of members who are of the same sex.

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 24.
MISSING SOMETHING IN YOUR LIFE?

If your life seems to be missing that special warmth that comes from having a pet, come and see us at the new San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department. We have a wide variety of dogs, cats and other animals available for adoption.

A waggly tail, a sweet meow or a gentle squeak - it'll make you glad to come home at night.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PROPOSITION N

Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter does not limit the number of consecutive terms a person may serve on the Board of Supervisors. A full term on the Board of Supervisors is four years.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a charter amendment. Under Proposition N, no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors. After two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, a person must wait four years before serving again. Any person appointed to the Board of Supervisors to complete more than half a four-year term would be considered to have served one full term. A member of the Board of Supervisors who resigned with less than half a four-year term remaining would be considered to have served a full term. This charter amendment would go into effect July 1, 1990. Each Supervisor holding office on that date would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when his or her current term ends.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the charter so that no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors and you want to prohibit persons who served two consecutive four-year terms from serving on the Board of Supervisors again until four years after their second consecutive term in office.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to limit Supervisors to serving two consecutive terms.

Controller's Statement on "N"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How "N" Got on the Ballot
On January 25, 1990, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition N to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,151* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 45,408 of the signatures submitted were valid, 5,257 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is a non-partisan, reasonable, fair and democratic measure to reform our government and improve the present city-wide system for electing supervisors. Neighborhood, civic leaders, current and former elected officials, community activists, business owners, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, unionists, and minorities all support Proposition N.

Limiting politicians' consecutive terms is not radical or extreme. In fact, it helps to prevent political corruption and power grabbing. More than 150 cities, towns and counties in the United States have laws limiting politicians terms. Governors in 30 states can only serve two terms. San Mateo county limits supervisors terms and for more than 30 years San Francisco's mayors have been limited to two consecutive terms.

Proposition N is a very modest and reasonable proposal. Proposition N does not recall or force any current member of the board from office. Proposition N allows supervisors whose terms expire in 1991 to serve until January 1995 if they are reelected. Supervisors whose terms end in 1993 may serve until 1997 if reelected. Former supervisors may run for office again after 4 years.

The current system favors incumbent politicians and denies experienced newcomers a fair chance to serve. Since 1973, only 3 newcomers have been elected to the city-wide board. 5 supervisors have already served 10 years. By 1995 most board members will have been in office 14 years or more.

We know that a lake or pond will stagnate unless its waters are replenished from time to time. So too will an elected body grow stale without a regular infusion of fresh faces and new ideas.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Richard Bodisco
Chairman, San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
Steve Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu
Harold Hoogasian
Joseph L. Powell
Raymond Chalker
Robert A. Reveles
Robert C. Sanchez
Joel Ventresca
Barry Lastra
Daniel Willsan

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N backers have misrepresented the facts to get you to vote for N. Since just 1982 three non-incumbent supervisors have been independently elected to the Board. Proposition N is not true reform — it only tinkers with the citywide election process. It is not democratic — it takes power away from the people. It is not a solution — it's an additional problem.

Supervisors are elected to carry out the will of the people. When they fail to serve, they are unelected — by vote of the people. Appointed department heads, who are not supposed to have their own political agendas, are balanced only by the Mayor's and the Board's overseeing eyes.

With the Mayor already limited to two terms, the Board must not consist only of rookies and lame ducks, or department heads can consolidate their power and bide their time, waiting until watchdog Supervisors are automatically thrown from office. Proposition N threatens accountability and increases the chances for bureaucratic corruption.

Uninformed actions are foolish actions — closely examine the facts, and you'll agree that blindly forcing change is a bad plan. If Proposition N passes, nothing can stop department heads from installing power bases immune to voter inspection. Voters have the right to choose — this measure permanently limits that right.

PROTECT YOUR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Two years ago, San Francisco voted on Proposition O, a recall of the Board of Supervisors thinly disguised as a ‘good government’ initiative. San Franciscans saw through this scheme, and sent the measure down to defeat.

Last year, the same group attempted to offer a similar proposal to the voters, but failed to collect enough signatures to qualify it for the ballot.

Now they’re at it again.

They say that Supervisors have lost touch with the people of San Francisco, and should automatically be thrown from office after they’ve served two terms — but by bringing up this rejected issue again and again, they’re proving that THEY are the ones who are out of touch.

San Francisco doesn’t need a two-term limit. When supervisors stop working for the people, they stop getting elected. If Board members are prematurely removed, more power falls into the hands of civil servants and department heads, who are unaccountable to the voters. These unelected officials who already hold great power must be balanced by supervisors free to do their jobs, or citizens lose their representation.

The diversity of our City is one of our greatest strengths. San Franciscans have always individually evaluated our city’s varied issues, judging each on its specific merits. The Board of Supervisors is similarly diverse, and should also be evaluated selectively. Citizens should use the election process to tell their representatives when they’re not doing their jobs — not by acting blindly and installing an arbitrary time limit. San Franciscans are smart enough to tell the difference between voting an incompetent out of office and firing a valuable employee without cause.

Proposition N denies San Franciscans the right to vote for legislators of their choice, and that’s not fair.

Vote NO on Proposition N.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Let’s talk about what WE want City Hall to do for US, not the politicians.

Politicians will tell you anything to advance their political careers.

They won’t tell you the TRUTH about the Two Term Limit.

The politicians say we failed to collect enough signatures last year to qualify for the ballot.

But here’s what their appointee, the city’s Chief Administrative Officer says:

“Last year’s Proposition removal was forced by an error, one which we admitted, apologized for and tried to repair . . .”

(Letter to Two Term Limit — Chairman — Richard Bodisco, dated February 7, 1990.)

We need new leadership in City Hall.

We have some hard and serious problems to solve in San Francisco and we can’t solve them with political rhetoric and name calling.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N removes experienced supervisors from the Board.

FACT:

Proposition N insures that San Francisco will always have 5 or 6 supervisors with seniority and experience on the Board. Proposition N also gives experienced and concerned citizens an opportunity to serve without needing to become professional career politicians.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N will take away your right to vote for a legislator of your choice.

FACT:

Proposition N gives you more choices because it removes the current system which favors incumbent politicians.

The politicians have spoken too long for themselves.

It is time City Hall spoke for us.

Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Submitted by San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Richard Bodisco

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

Vote YES on N.

SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

... Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Harold M. Hoogastian
Small Business Owner

The longer supervisors remain in office the more likely they become captives of special interests who bankroll their costly campaigns.

Entrenched incumbent politicians often end up working against the public interest, rather than for it.

Only two supervisors have been defeated at the polls since the end of 1980.

New faces, new ideas, new leaders, and new directions are needed at City Hall.

Vote YES on N.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

The Two-Term Limit is an idea whose time has come!

The United States Constitution limits the President to two terms in office. Similarly, the San Francisco Charter limits our Mayor to two terms.

Incumbent San Francisco Supervisors, however, continue to win re-elections year after year. This has made many of them less accountable to the voters.

Eight years is enough! Let’s bring new people, new ideas, and new energy to our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Citizens for a Better San Francisco

It works for executive offices, let’s put a limit on the terms of service for our supervisors. As Thomas Jefferson called it, “rotation in office”. Let’s have some healthy competition for these positions, let’s take advantage of the many experienced people around who are willing to serve. Let’s vote YES on Proposition N for reasonable reform.

John and Carol Maerzke
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will ensure that we have a Board of Supervisors of concerned citizens, not career politicians.

For almost forty years, San Francisco has limited its Mayor to eight years in office. Many cities around the Bay Area, such as San Jose, Richmond, Mountain View and Redwood City, limit terms in office for their city councils. Yet we have had supervisors serve up to 16 years in office. Why? Because by raising large sums of money and using the power of incumbency, supervisors face little chance of defeat when running for re-election.

Proposition N will not remove any member of the Board of Supervisors from office. It is a fair proposal that allows each current supervisor to run for one more four year term. But in the future, each supervisor will be limited to eight years in office.

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will give the city fresh leadership on the Board of Supervisors. It will open up the city’s political processes, reversing the trend in recent years towards full-time professional politicians. Most importantly, it will mean that our elected representatives put the city’s needs and interests ahead of their desire for re-election.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

I’m supporting Proposition N because of my concern about the status of women and children in San Francisco.

As a long time supporter and treasurer of a shelter for battered women in the City, I have had the opportunity to closely observe how our City government works. I think there are more important things than politics.

San Francisco needs leaders in government who will show more compassion and concern about peoples’ lives as opposed to their reelection campaigns.

I don’t feel that every member of the Board of Supervisors is bad, but the two term limit will improve the current system and help our Supervisors do a better job for us.

That is why I am voting YES on Proposition N.

Millie Favetti

Over the past 20 years women have made enormous gains in electoral politics. The situation is far, far from ideal but some positive changes have taken place. Therefore, we think it is important to encourage and support the entry of women into elective politics.

We’re supporting Proposition N because it ensures that more women will have the opportunity to assume leadership roles in City government. The two year experiment with district elections produced more women supervisors than at any other time in San Francisco’s history.

The gains women have made could be easily lost under the current city-wide system. Proposition N will prevent the clock from being turned back because it allows newcomers a fair chance to compete without always having to run against entrenched incumbents.

Proposition N is equitable and fair to everyone. Join us and vote YES on Proposition N.

Helen Dawson
Miriam Smith

As a small business owner and long time resident of San Francisco, I’m supporting Proposition N because it makes good sense for our City.

Limiting Supervisors’ terms will create a Board of Supervisors more accountable to the needs of San Franciscans. Under the current city-wide system, too many Supervisors see service on the Board as a career.

They worry more about keeping their seats than about doing the job they were elected to do. As a result, politics is all to often put ahead of the City welfare.

Let’s get politics out of City Hall.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Zdenka Bodisco
Mike Salerno
Harold Hoogasian
Small Business Owners
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Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

We’re supporting the Two Term Limit because San Francisco needs new political leadership. The Two Term Limit will open the “Door of Opportunity” for new candidates to serve on the Board of Supervisors.

The Two Term Limit will allow a new generation of civic leaders to represent our City. It is a fair and democratic way to reform the current system and to restore citizens’ confidence in City Hall.

San Francisco’s government should reflect the diversity of the people who live here. This is the meaning of a Democratic and free system. The Two Term Limit insures that new people with new ideas will have a fair chance to serve the City.

Don’t be fooled by arguments of professional, career politicians. The Two Term Limit is good for our community and it is good for San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Steve M. Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu

WHY DIDN’T WE GET TO VOTE ON THE TWO-TERM LIMIT LAST YEAR?

Because Louise Renne found a legal loophole to get the measure thrown off the ballot after the Registrar of Voters had certified that it qualified for submission to the electorate.

Never mind that when Renne violated a number of election laws several years ago she got everyone to overlook the “technicality.”

But what do you expect?

This is the same Louise Renne who sued the Olympic Club because it had no female members conveniently “overlooking” the fact that her husband Paul belongs to the all-white, all-male San Francisco Golf Club.

Say “No” to Renne’s legal machinations!

Vote “Yes” on “N.”

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

WHAT ARE THEY AFRAID OF?

Why are the Supervisors and their contributors fighting the two-term limit so hard?

Why did City officials use a legal loophole to get this same measure thrown off the ballot last fall?

Are they afraid they won’t be able to give away another city street worth $9 million to the Rockefellers for free like they did in 1987?

Are they afraid that the people might vote to turn them out?

Clean up City Hall! Yes on N!

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic Senate Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The Two-Term Limit is a reform whose time has come! At the Federal, State, and Local levels, political reformers agree that the powers of incumbency virtually preclude incumbents from being defeated at the polls, and that term limitation is the only way to ensure turnover in legislative bodies. Even Attorney General John Van de Kamp has proposed a twelve-year limit for State legislators.

Since the return to City-wide elections in 1980, only two incumbent Supervisors have been defeated at the polls. They were replaced by Wendy Nelder and Angela Alioto — the daughters of a former Police Chief and Mayor, respectively. Because of this trend, Supervisors have become burned-out, complacent, less accountable to the voters, and more beholden to the special interests who contributed to their re-election campaigns.

Proposition N would limit San Francisco supervisors to two consecutive terms of office, just like the mayor. It’s a modest reform that deserves your vote.

Proposition N would not force any incumbent out of office. All current supervisors could run for one more term after their present term expires. And after four years, they could run again and hold office for two more terms.

The President of the United States has been limited to two consecutive terms of office since 1951. The Mayor of San Francisco has been limited to two consecutive terms since 1953. San Mateo County has a term limit for its board of supervisors. Proposition N is not a new or radical idea; it’s an overdue reform for a stagnant system.

The founders of our city charter envisioned supervisors as part-time citizen legislators, not full-time professional politicians. Proposition N respects and revives that tradition.

A bit of fresh air never hurt anybody — even two-term supervisors!

Please vote YES on Proposition N.

Harold M. Hoogasian
Christopher L. Bowman

Senator Quentin Kopp

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

The current system of electing supervisors in San Francisco badly needs reform. But Proposition N is not the answer. The Board of Supervisors is not accountable to the people, largely because of the pernicious influence of large monetary contributions. A two-term limit would only exacerbate the problem. All supervisors would either be rookies or lame ducks, resulting in a tremendous shift of power to the bureaucracy, without lessening the powerful influence of money in campaigns.

What San Francisco needs is real campaign reform — limiting the ability of supervisors to vote on the pet projects of their major contributors, and district election of supervisors. Both would greatly reduce the enormous sums of money needed to run for office citywide.

Proposition N is a false promise of reform. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N!

Dennis Antonenore
Robert Barnes
Ron Braithwaite
Supervisor Harry Britt
Gordon Chin
Brother Kelly Cullen
Catherine Dodd R.N.
Noah Griffin
Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Geraldine M. Johnson
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leslie Katz
Tony Kilroy
Myra G. Kofp
Steven M. Krefling
William J. Brandt Moore
Jim Morales
Connie O’Connor
Ruth Picon
Mauri Schwartz
Yori Wada

Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead
Harold T. Yee
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION N

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943 and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and a public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, 11 members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large. All of the aforesaid officers, except as set forth herein, shall be elected to a term of four years, from the commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the eighth day of January, 1981, shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on said date and the 11 persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said office on said eighth day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms. Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the eighth day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the eighth day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor, or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

The effective date of this section as amended is July 1, 1990. All supervisors holding office on that date shall be deemed to have served one full four year term upon the expiration of their then current terms of office.
Hypodermic Syringes

PROPOSITION O
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles? YES 309  NO 310

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law regulates the sale, distribution and use of hypodermic syringes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

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

Controller’s Statement on “O”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

“Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “O” Got on the Ballot
On September 15, 1989 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,173 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,774 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.
Hypodermic Syringes

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

The connection between AIDS and unclean needles is unchallenged. Virtually every authority on the subject agrees that sharing needles increases the chances of contracting AIDS. San Francisco has an estimated 13,000 IV drug users, each of whom is at risk of contracting AIDS and spreading it to their sexual partners or their unborn children. Tens of thousands of people are being directly threatened with contracting AIDS because it is illegal to obtain clean, safe needles.

Some groups are trading clean needles with addicts for their dirty ones. This removes contaminated needles from circulation and can dramatically cut the infection rate among drug users and their partners. But these groups face up to a six months in jail and a $1,000 fine. One member of this group, who lost her mother to AIDS, contracted through a dirty needle, said, “I lost a parent to this because this bureaucracy sits around and talks while lots of people are dying.” Dr. John Newmeyer of the Haight Ashbury Free Medical Clinics said, “People are dying because of our institution’s resistance to AIDS risk reduction methods.”

In an attempt to stop this disease from being spread to drug users and their partners AIDS prevention workers are risking legal persecution. Jerry De Jong, who works with substance abusers and is a member of the Mayor’s Narcotic’s Task Force, said “... with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives.” But in a sane, free society it shouldn’t be necessary to break the law to save lives.

The only way this deadly policy can be changed is for the state legislature to change the law. These State laws should be repealed.

Pamela Williard Pickens
Secretary San Francisco Libertarian Party

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition O
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition O

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

Dr. John Watters of the Urban Health Study says that, "The middle class have access to clean needles." Poor people can't get clean needles, because they are illegal. Black and Latino IV drug users have a more difficult time finding clean needles and are thus more likely to be infected with AIDS. Because minorities are more likely to be infected with AIDS a higher proportion of their sexual partners or un born children are being infected. AIDS is likely to become the leading cause of death in young Blacks and Latinos if things continue as they have. Legal clean needles will help save their lives.

Christina Groth

The San Francisco Department of Health estimates that there are 13,000 IV drug users in the city. If clean needles remain unavailable to them the AIDS infection rate can easily reach over 60%. If these 60% infect just two other people either through shared needles or sex, the total number of infected people can reach 23,400. San Francisco can't afford the financial burden it is under today from AIDS cases. Prevention through clean and legal needles can save us millions of tax dollars without costing us a cent. Legal needles make financial sense.

Isaac Klein

The San Francisco Chronicle has reported on the use of needles for IV drug use in Scotland. The newspaper said that in Edinburgh police launched a crackdown on the availability of clean needles. Within 18 months of the crackdown 50% of all IV drug users were infected with AIDS. Soon their sexual partners and un born babies were infected with the disease. But 30 miles away in Glasgow the police took no action against the availability of clean needles and only 4 to 7 percent of needle users were infected. Dr. Roy Robertson, Edinburgh's leading authority on AIDS said, "Making needles available to addicts is not the only answer to the problem of AIDS among drug users but certainly, it has to be part of the solution."

VOTE YES!

George Meyer

WHAT IS CANADA DOING RIGHT?

In Canada, fewer than 1% of AIDS cases are from needles! In the United States, about 50% of new cases now involve needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners and babies, (up from about 20-30% in the beginning of the epidemic).

What is Canada doing right?

The AIDS epidemic has hit here many times worse than there. Why?

In Canada, drug-users can buy sterile needles in drugstores.

GRASSROOTS
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Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

SURGEON GENERAL KOOP ON CLEAN NEEDLES

"One of the strongest advocates of making needles legal is Surgeon General Koop who addressed that issue last November (1987):

"I'm asked about clean needles everywhere I go. I've always said the same thing. If clean needles will do anything to contain a part

of the epidemic, we should not have any foolish inhibitions about doing."

(S.F. Sentinel 1/22/88)

Wm. Schwartzman, M.D.

Clean needles cause no diseases.
Legal needles are clean needles.
Vote Yes.

William Schwartzman, MD

Does this initiative "condone drugs"?
If you vote Yes, that could be interpreted as condoning drugs.
But if you vote No, that could equally well be interpreted as
condoning the spread of AIDS (and hepatitis, and many other
diseases).

The present state law is like the "death penalty" — not just for
drug abusers, but also their spouses, their babies, transfusion
recipients and others. Who can "condone that"?

GRASSROOTS

The AIDS epidemic was caused by a combination of germs,
working together to collapse the immune system.
N.Y.'s health department has concluded that the HIV epidemic
That epidemic existed only because New York has laws against

addicts buying clean needles.
If we keep these deadly laws, no one can predict what future
epidemics might result.

GRASSROOTS

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

ENCOURAGES STERILE NEEDLES

The National Academy of Sciences the country's most presti-
gious scientific organization in 1986, issued a major study titled
"Confronting AIDS". Many lives could have been saved if Califor-
nia had promptly implemented the conclusion drawn by America's
leading scientists:
"IT IS TIME TO BEGIN EXPERIMENTING WITH PUBLIC

POLICIES TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF STERILE NEED-
DLES AND SYRINGES BY REMOVING LEGAL AND
ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS TO THEIR POSSESSION
AND USE."

Wm. Schwartzman, MD
Wm. Steinsmith, MD

The issue is not "free needles".
Some of us believe that mass giveaways of clean needles is best.
Others of us believe it would be enough if doctors and pharmacies
were allowed to sell needles, as with diabetes.
Legal needles are as cheap as ballpoint pens, so cheap that price

would be no barrier.
This initiative takes no position on "free needles" programs, only
for legalization — a prerequisite for either approach.

GRASSROOTS
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Under present California law, even doctors aren’t allowed to provide needles except for approved purposes. So far “stopping AIDS” is not an approved purpose. Under “legalization”, needles are a medical question, not a police question. A doctor’s prescription could still be required, as with diabetes. Whatever controls are adopted, needles will be better controlled under legalization than they are now.

William Steinsmith, M.D.

Dr. Don Francis, an epidemiologist with the Centers for Disease Control said, “We can’t overstate the threat of AIDS among addicts in the minority population in the inner city.” Dr. Francis says that there is no evidence that legal, clean needles increase the use of drugs. The only thing stopping clean needles is the law. It’s time for Sacramento to repeal the law and save lives.

Will Wohler

According to the New York Times a new, rare virus known as HTLV-II is spreading through the IV drug community because of needle sharing. Spread in the same manner as AIDS, this virus “could cause leukemia or other serious diseases and may exact a rising toll in future years.” Surveys have found that 20% of addicts in New Orleans were infected and in San Francisco a preliminary survey of blood donors showed this new disease has a higher rate of incidence than the AIDS virus. Because it can take as long as 20 years to develop no one can know for sure how many people have been infected. Clean, legal needles will stop the transmission of this disease. VOTE YES!

John Whisman

Clean needles save the lives of innocent victims of AIDS. Not everyone who gets AIDS because people share needles is an addict. Some are small babies. The Centers for Disease Control says 314 babies were born in 1988 with AIDS because their mothers used infected needles. Dr. James Buehler of the CDC said “We need to do what we can to prevent the sharing of dirty needles. Sharing dirty equipment is the worst problem.” In California it is illegal to obtain clean needles so addicts share. Because they share, babies are born with AIDS. Save lives. Legalize needles. VOTE YES!

Mark Pickens

Illegal needles, which force IV drug users to share unclean needles, is now the cause of over one-third of all AIDS cases in the United States according to the federal government’s Centers for Disease Control. In 1988, 10,747 people contracted AIDS because of sharing unclean needles. Some of these people never used needles themselves. 226 were men who had sex with women who used needles, 623 were women who had sex with men who used unclean needles and 314 were unborn babies. Over 1,000 people who don’t use drugs were infected because clean needles are illegal. VOTE YES! FOR LEGAL, CLEAN NEEDLES!

Pamela Williard Pickens

Proposition O was endorsed by the Central Committee of the Democratic Party of San Francisco on March 21, 1990. VOTE YES!

John Whisman
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Clean, legal needles will save lives. Jerry DeJong of the Mayor’s Narcotics Task Force said, “The bottom line is that this is not a moral or legal issue. Unfortunately with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives.” Something is very wrong when its illegal to save lives; and that wrong must be corrected. Tell Sacramento that we want to legalize saving lives. We need clean, legal needles now!

Ron Dorsey

Illegal needles are the primary means of spreading AIDS to minority communities. Most of the IV drug users and their partners who have been infected with AIDS are Black or Latino. Most of the babies born with AIDS because of needle sharing by their mothers are also Black and Latino. Blacks and Latinos are now more likely than ever before to become infected with AIDS because clean needles are illegal. Legal, clean needles will slow down the infection rate and decrease the number of deaths in minority communities. Illegal needles hurt Blacks and Latinos more than they hurt others. Support legal needles.

Jim Peron

Prof. Ethan Nadelman, in the Washington Post, reported that “The governments of England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, the Netherlands and several other countries have actively attempted to limit the spread of AIDS by removing restrictions on the sale of syringes . . . .” Dr. Nadelman notes that there is growing evidence that legal needles do not increase the use of drugs but they do save lives.

George O’Brien

A former prosecutor of high-level drug dealers, Ben Clark, said in The Daily Recorder, a law newspaper, that legal restrictions on clean needles “have had the disastrous effect of forcing drug users to share syringes. Over half the addicts in New York State are infected with AIDS, and the rate of infection among intravenous drug users in Illinois is growing dramatically.”

While some people may say addicts deserve to die, Clark notes, “. . . the issue is not simply whether society should sit back and watch addicts kill themselves off: AIDS transmitted by needles does not stay within the druggie population. Unborn children of AIDS-infected female users may become infected. The sex partners of persons with AIDS are exposed to the disease. Needle-sharing prostitutes interact with the drug-free heterosexual community on a daily basis.” Clark says that clean, legal needles have never been proven to increase drug use but they do save lives. VOTE YES!

Sam Grove
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PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION O

There is no scientific evidence that unlimited and uncontrolled availability of hypodermic syringes/needles will stop the spread of AIDS. Proposition "O" would open the floodgates to the purchase and distribution of hypodermic syringes, without prescription, in drug stores, supermarkets and in the streets without medical supervision under the guise of stopping the spread of AIDS. Addicts will continue to commit crimes to pay for the dope since possession and sale of drugs, such as crack cocaine and heroin, will still be illegal.

Latest statistics show that over 80 percent of inmates in our already overcrowded jails are there for illegal drug offenses.

Who will protect the public against the careless disposition of these used needles by addicts?

Black communities in San Francisco are under siege from the sale of illegal drugs and the crime this produces. Approval of Proposition "O" by the voters permitting use of unprescribed legal needles and illegal drugs could leave the City open to millions of dollars in lawsuits for unsupervised use of a medical procedure by intravenous drug addicts from death and other causes.

WE URGE A "NO" VOTE ON PROPOSITION "O". It should not be City policy to support the removal of all restrictions in the distribution, sale and use of hypodermic syringes.

Rev. Amos Brown
Hon. Naomi Gray
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Senator Quentin Kopp
Dr. Raye Richardson
Lulann McGriff
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Melvin Miles

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We, the people of the City and County of San Francisco, California, call upon the California State Legislature to eliminate all sanctions, criminal, regulatory, or civil, on the manufacture, use, sale or other distribution of hypodermic syringes. We do this to reduce the spread of AIDS and other diseases.

charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of $100.

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such a time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission after the regular daily working hours of 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

This amendment shall become operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY: AIRPORTS COMMISSION
3.690 Commission; Composition

An airports commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on September 1, 1996. On the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

All rights, claims, actions, orders, obligations, proceedings and contracts relating to the airport department under the public utilities commission existing prior to the effective date of these amendments shall not be affected by the adoption thereof, and shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the airports commission.

This amendment shall be operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY-TWO: PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION
3.698 Commission — Composition

A parking and traffic commission and the department of parking and traffic are hereby established. The parking and traffic commission shall consist of five seven members. If not in conflict with state law, members of the parking and traffic commission shall serve ex-officio as members of the parking authority.

The term of each member shall be for four years; provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section shall, by lot classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided further, that terms of the two commissioners created by the amendment of June, 1990 shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fifth day of December, 1992; and on the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month. Any person may serve concurrently as a member of the San Francisco parking authority and the parking and traffic commission.
Did you know that you can vote before Election Day? Vote absentee in person at City Hall (Room 158) starting May 7 or by mail — fill out the application on the back cover.
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IS GOING TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON ELECTION DAY A PROBLEM?

If you are unable to go to your polling place to vote on Election Day (Tuesday, June 5, 1990), you may vote by absentee ballot in one of two ways:

1. **Vote at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.** Starting on May 7 through June 5, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., you can vote in Room 158 at City Hall.

2. **Vote by mail.** Complete the application for an absentee ballot on the back cover. Tear or cut off the back cover, fold it in half with the address of the Registrar of Voters on the outside, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated, and mail the form.

Voters who have specified disabilities may apply to be a **permanent absentee voter.** Please refer to page 24.

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside  
(do not cut or tear off)
LOCATION OF YOUR
POLLSING PLACE

MAILING
ADDRESS

DO NOT REMOVE LABEL

BALLOT TYPE
N6 53
90

NON-PARTISAN
19th Assembly District

PRECINCTS
APPLICABLE:
8400's, 9400's,
9700's

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION
Must be received by the Registrar of Voters
no later than May 29, 1990
June 5, 1990 Consolidated Primary Election

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FIRST NAME

MIDDLE INITIAL

LAST NAME

DATE OF BIRTH

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX OR MAIL DROP ADDRESS)

NUMBER AND STREET

CITY

ZIP CODE

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (if different from above)
P.O. BOX OR STREET

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

I HAVE NOT AND WILL NOT APPLY FOR AN ABSENTEE BALLOT BY ANY OTHER MEANS.

X

SIGNATURE (DO NOT PRINT)

DATE

DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER

EVENING PHONE NUMBER

I understand that voters with specified disabilities may qualify as Permanent Absent Voters. See page 24.

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
VOTE!

Polls are open from 7 am to 8 pm. See the label on the back cover for the location of your polling place.

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q. Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:30 a.m. to about 9:00 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name ____________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________ Apt. #__________

Telephone No. (required) ____________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s): ____________________________
Second choice locations (if any) ____________________________

Signature ________________________________________
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### Purpose of the Voter Information Pamphlet

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 5, 1990 election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. A Sample Ballot (i.e., a copy of the ballot you see at your polling place or the one you receive when you vote)  
   - Page 5-21
2. The location of your polling place  
   - (see label on the back cover)
3. Application for absentee ballot  
   - Back cover
4. Definitions of words you need to know  
   - Page 22
5. Information for disabled voters; and application for permanent absentee voter status  
   - Page 24
6. Rights of voters  
   - Page 25
7. Statements from the candidates who are running for office  
   - Page 26-34
8. Information about each proposition, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the proposition, and the legal text  
   - Page 37-128
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张票插入。

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

C 第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

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

D 第三步
请把带锤之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入，并孔投票。

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

E 第四步
投票選擇之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOBERNADOR  治長</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEFFREY T. GREENE</td>
<td>2 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Hygiene Supervisor</td>
<td>Supervisor de Higiene Industrial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DONALD L. BULLOCK  |  4 ➔  |
| Gun Show Producer  |  Productor de Espectáculos con Armas  |

| DAVID M. WILLIAMS  |  6 ➔  |
| Businessman-Engineer  |  Hombre de Negocios- Ingeniero  |

| PETE WILSON  |  8 ➔  |
| U.S. Senator  |  Senador de los Estados Unidos  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICEGOBERNADOR  副州長</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SEYMOUR</td>
<td>21 ➔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td>Senador Estatal de California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| MARIAN BERGESON  |  23 ➔  |
| California State Senator  |  Senador Estatal de California  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO REPUBLICANO</th>
<th>ESTADO</th>
<th>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICAN PARTY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECRETARIO DE ESTADO</th>
<th>總務卿</th>
<th>SECRETARY OF STATE</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GORDON P. LEVY       | 州總務官 | Deputy District Attorney | Fiscal Asistente del Distrito | 29 ╚--------
| JOAN MILKE FLORES    | 領導女性議員 | Los Angeles Councilwoman | Concejal de Los Angeles | 31 ╚--------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRALOR</th>
<th>市計官</th>
<th>Controller</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MATT FONG | 會計律師 | Business Attorney | Abogado de Negocios | 36 ╚--------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TESORERO</th>
<th>財政部長</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| THOMAS W. HAYES | 領導財政部 | Appointed State Treasurer | Tesorero Estatal Nombrado | 45 ╚--------
| ANGELA “BAY” BUCHANAN | 領導財務主任 | Chief Financial Officer | Funcionario Financiero Principal | 47 ╚--------
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>PRIMARY ELECTION</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICAN PARTY</td>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS</td>
<td>WES BANNISTER</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dueño de una Pequeña Empresa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN S. PARISE</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney-Insurance Broker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado-Agente de Seguros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN L. &quot;JACK&quot; HARDEN</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance Adjustor / Investigator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ajustador de Seguros / Investigador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THOMAS A. SKORNIA</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman / Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de Negocios / Abogado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, CONSEJOR ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL DUPLISSEA</td>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH</td>
<td>Business Executive, Controller / Ejecutivo de Negocios, Contralor</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS</th>
<th>United States Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN NICHOLS</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)

(No candidates filed nomination papers to appear on the ballot for state assembly in this district)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Title in Spanish</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER L. BOWMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Titular del Cargo 现任</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR BRUZZONE</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Titular del Cargo 现任</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE YATES</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Titular del Cargo 现任</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPHEN DAVID MAYER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRK MILLER</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Titular del Cargo 现任</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSE CHUNG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX WOODS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUEL A. ROSALES</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
<td>Titular del Cargo Nombrado 委任現職</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRIET ROSS</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Titular del Cargo 现任</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM T. HARPER</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Titular del Cargo 现任</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

MARK ISLER
Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios 退休教師·商人

CAROL S. KOPPEL
Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador 退休法官·教育家

SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ
College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria 學院學監

BILL HONIG
State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública 州教育司

JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3
Superior Court Judge, Office #3

ALEX SALDAMANDO
Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal 地方法院法官

J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY
Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal 地方法院法官

JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5
Superior Court Judge, Office #5

CARLOS BEA
Incumbent / Titular del Cargo 現任

KAY TSENIN
Attorney / Abogada 律師

JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15
Superior Court Judge, Office #15

JEROME T. BENSON
Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior 高等法院法官

DONNA HITCHENS
Attorney / Abogada 律師

Vote for One
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>DEPARTAMENTO #1</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM J. O'CONNOR</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Law Teacher / Abogada / Maestra de Derecho</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney / Fiscal Asistente del Distrito</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
<td>Sheriff's Department's Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>ASESOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td>Real Estate Portfolio Manager / Administrador de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogado; Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Supervisor / Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td>Deputy Assessor / Asesor Asistente</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>DEFENSOR PUBLICO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The text includes some non-English words and phrases, indicating that this is a bilingual ballot. The positions listed include Municipal Court Judges, Assessor, Public Defender, and other legal roles, with corresponding vote counts for each position.
HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

107 YES 185

NO 187

PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

108 YES 189

NO 190

GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

109 YES 192

NO 193

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

110 YES 195

NO 197

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

111 YES 200

NO 203
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
CUIDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 SI
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDA Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990.
Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ciento de $100,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) atenciones para personas con necesidades especiales, (2) viviendas con servicios de transporte para personas con discapacidades, (3) viviendas de arriendo para familias de bajos ingresos y (4) viviendas de arriendo para familias de alto ingreso.

187 NO

189 SI
ACTA DE BONOS PARA INTERCAMBIOS PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990.
Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por $100,000,000 para el aporte de fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) atenciones para personas con necesidades especiales, (2) viviendas con servicios de transporte para personas con discapacidades, (3) viviendas de arriendo para familias de bajos ingresos y (4) viviendas de arriendo para familias de alto ingreso.

190 NO

REVOCACIÓN DE LA LEY DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Establece el tiempo en que el gobernador puede vetar la legislación propuesta. Comienza la fecha en que se anuncia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ninguna impacto fiscal directa.

192 SI

193 NO

195 SI
EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto sobre las viviendas a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ninguna impacto fiscal directa. Impacto fiscal: Ninguna impacto fiscal directa.

197 NO

ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESECHOS DE LíNEAS. Esta medida establece un programa de descongestionamiento del tráfico para toda la ciudad y privilegia el uso de las bicicletas. Impacto fiscal: Ninguna impacto fiscal directa.

200 SI

202 NO

1990年份的與 Gardens 可能是公投法案。此法案提高發行公金 $50,000,000 關連的房屋計
划包括以下：(1) 無家可歸者及家屬的慈善hy居
所及電氣公共照明，(2) 反對此提案的特別條款及海
屋及控制租金的修補及延緩措施給予第一次買賣人
稅金的減免。

90年份的與 Gardens 可能是公投法案。此法案提高發行公金 $50,000,000 關連的房屋計
划包括以下：(1) 無家可歸者及家屬的慈善hy居
所及電氣公共照明，(2) 反對此提案的特別條款及海
屋及控制租金的修補及延緩措施給予第一次買賣人
稅金的減免。

107

108

109

110

111

203 NO

13-N
112 STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure. **YES 211 → NO 213 →**


114 MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands "peace officer" definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder. **YES 218 → NO 220 →**

115 CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact. **YES 222 → NO 224 →**

116 RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million). **YES 226 → NO 228 →**

117 WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs. **YES 230 → NO 232 →**
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
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211 SI  
FUNCIÓN ESTATAL, ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crear una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales. Otras disposiciones legales. Impacto fiscal: Los costos se desconocen al estar sujetos a regulaciones federales. Se reduce el horario de trabajo y las vacaciones. (3)

213 NO  

215 SI  
PRÁCTICA DE LA QUIROPRÁCTICA. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Enmienda el Acta de la Quirópractica. Regula la renovación de la licencia durante el mes de nacimiento. Aumenta las multas por quebrantamiento del Acta. Impacto fiscal: Mensual en el Fondo de Examinadores de Quirópracticos en 1990-91 al modificar el sistema de renovación y locales debido al aumento en las multas. (1)

217 NO  

218 SI  
ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefinir y expandir la definición de "asesinato del orden público" para que incluya el asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Costes adicionales conocidos como resultado de que se expanda la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado. (4)

220 NO  

222 SI  
DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; elevar los cargos y aumentar la pena. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectuaría significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondría en vigor y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber un aumento en el impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales a pesar haber un mayor impacto fiscal. (3)

224 NO  

226 SI  
TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ENMIENDA DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,000,000; principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones). (1)

228 NO  

230 SI  
PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ENMIENDA DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir árboles. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobrecarga al alquiler y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General. No se menciona la legislatura efectúa otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por mano de obra. (1)

232 NO  

N 51, N 52 & N 53
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>probably minor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT; STAT-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offsetting savings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>facilities through new construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public higher education institutions, which include the University of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propuesta</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE SIRMONS Y REHABILITACION DE EDIFICIO PÚBLICOS DE 1969</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE SIRMONS Y REHABILITACION DE EDIFICIO PÚBLICOS DE 1969</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE SIRMONS Y REHABILITACION DE EDIFICIO PÚBLICOS DE 1969</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCION, ÉTICA, ENMENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA.** Rechaza la retribución de distritos a los 23 partidos de la elección legislativa a mejoramiento de las elecciones en Comité de Ética Legislativa, Impacto Fiscal: Los efectos de la limitación en los gastos de retribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente en su totalidad por los costos de la elección pública y los posibles réditos de recogida por la norte. Los costes para las disposiciones para el mismo serían necesarios.

**REDISTRIBUCION FOR COMISION, ENMENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA.** Establece la retribución de distritos a los partidos de la elección legislativa, las elecciones en Comité de Ética Legislativa, Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en mil millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costes estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los salarios.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción de las escuelas de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes de Hastings, la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1° de julio de 1990 Instructivo. El uso de los fondos asumidos bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clases, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medios de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la autodirección y seguridad.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SIRMONS Y REHABILITACION DE EDIFICIO PÚBLICOS DE 1969.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, acondicionamiento y mejora de viviendas, reparación, equipamiento y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejoras de escuelas públicas.

1990年6月5日
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

A

SHALL COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO

FINANCE (I) REPAIR, RESTORATION, AND/OR REPLACEMENT OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT FACILITIES DAMAGED BY THE EARTHQUAKE OF OCTOBER 17, 1989 (OR ITS AFTECHOSES), (II) SEISMIC UPGRADE OF CHILDREN’S CENTERS AND OTHER SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT FACILITIES, (III) CORRECTION OF FIRE SAFETY VIOLATIONS OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT FACILITIES, AND (IV) DEFERRED CAPITAL MAINTENANCE OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT FACILITIES, AND CERTAIN INCIDENTAL EXPENSES RELATING TO THE FOREGOING THROUGH THE LEVY OF A SPECIAL TAX TO BE COLLECTED FOR TWENTY (20) YEARS WITH A MAXIMUM ANNUAL RATE (A) FOR SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PARCELS AND NON-RESIDENTIAL PARCELS OF $46.00 PER PARCEL FOR THE FIRST SIX (6) YEARS AND $32.20 PER PARCEL FOR THE FOURTEEN (14) YEARS FOLLOWING THE SIXTH YEAR AND (B) FOR MIXED-USE PARCELS (PARCELS WITH ONE OR MORE RESIDENTIAL UNITS IN ADDITION TO ONE OR MORE COMMERCIAL USES) AND MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PARCELS OF $23.00 PER DWELLING UNIT FOR THE FIRST SIX (6) YEARS AND $16.10 PER DWELLING UNIT FOR THE FOURTEEN (14) YEARS FOLLOWING THE SIXTH YEAR, WITH THE DEFINITIONS OF SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, MIXED-USE AND NON-RESIDENTIAL PARCELS, AND PARTICULARS RELATING TO THE METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT AND MAXIMUM RATES, EXEMPTIONS FOR SENIORS, CERTAIN PUBLICLY-OWNED PROPERTY AND OTHER USES, AS MORE PARTICULARLY SET FORTH IN RESOLUTION NO. 02-13-B1 ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT ON FEBRUARY 13, 1990; AND SHALL AN APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT IN THE AMOUNT OF $12,000,000 PER FISCAL YEAR IN CONNECTION THERewith BE ESTABLISHED FOR THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT?

B

SHALL THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, WITHOUT VOTER APPROVAL AND SUBJECT TO SPECIFIED DEBT LIMITS, BE AUTHORIZED TO APPROVE THE LEASE FINANCING OF EQUIPMENT FROM A NONPROFIT CORPORATION, IF THE CONTROLLER CERTIFIES THAT THE NET INTEREST COST TO THE CITY WOULD BE LOWER THAN UNDER OTHER TYPES OF LEASE FINANCING?

C

SHALL THE CITY CREATE A NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND TO PAY FOR BEAUTIFYING CITY NEIGHBORHOODS AND CLEANING UP GRAFFITI, ALLOWING BUSINESSES TO DIRECT UP TO ONE PERCENT OF THEIR BUSINESS TAX TO THE FUND, THIS PERCENTAGE TO BE ADJUSTED ANNUALLY SO THAT $1 MILLION IS AVAILABLE IN THE FUND EACH YEAR?

D

WITHDRAWN

E

SHALL A MINIMUM NUMBER OF FIRE STATIONS AND LEVELS OF STAFFING FOR THE FIRE DEPARTMENT BE SPECIFIED IN THE CHARTER, AND SHALL THE CLOSING OF ANY FIRE STATION OR DEACTIVATION OF ANY FIRE COMPANY OR UNIT BE SUBJECT TO PRIOR APPROVAL BY THE FIRE COMMISSION, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND SAN FRANCISCO VOTERS?
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, Elecciones Primarias Consolidadas 5 de Junio de 1990

Proposiciones A Ser Sometidas al Voto de los Electores — Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco

263 SI 赞成

支持

增加的教育和培训

通过

265 NO 反对

反对

减少的教育和培训

通过

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para continuar una década de crecimiento en el Distrito de Educación de San Francisco, se incluyó el reforzamiento de edificios existentes, el mejoramiento de sistemas de comunicación, la adquisición de equipos de seguridad y la instalación de equipos de seguridad en todos los edificios del distrito. Estas medidas garantizan un entorno seguido para los estudiantes y la mejora de la calidad educativa. 

1990年公共安全改善公債。發行公債
$32,400,000。目的是為了繼續改善三藩市
公立學校的設施。包括對現有校舍的改
建，安全防護系統的增強，通訊設備的設
置，以及在所有校舍內設置安全系統。遏
制犯罪和提高教育質量，讓學生在一個安
全的環境中學習。

269 SI 赞成

支持

Tendrá el Distrito No. 51 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco establecido en el Día de la Escuela de San Francisco el 17 de octubre de 1990 (o cualquier día subsiguiente). En la ciudad de San Francisco, y otras zonas rurales cercanas al distrito, se establecerán más instalaciones de tipo comunitario. Estas medidas garantizan una educación de calidad para todos los estudiantes.

市議會會在未來選舉投票之前及在某些
指定的範圍內，向年輕和有成就的非利
公司提供租賃補助。只要這些計劃被市政府
批准的利息比其他各種租賃計劃利率為低。

272 NO 反对

反对

$32,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los menores para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias.

277 SI 赞成

支持

Legislativo para Superintendentes, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de decisiva especificación, la autorización de aprobar el inmatriculación de equipos para alquiler de una empresa sin fines de lucro, así como el Contrato certificar que el costo neto a los intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler.

市政府擬決定美東街坊及清華園的基金
金來支付三藩市街坊及清華園的費用，讓
各位家家戶戶在街坊的營養及日常之養生
金，每年此基金會被調整以保持實質收
金。

280 SI 赞成

支持

Crea el Fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escribanías en las Parques para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y fomentar la limpieza en la ciudad, permitiendo que las empresas digan hasta un 10% de sus impuestos comunales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de 10% de este porcentaje de manera tal como tener $1 mil millón disponible en el fondo cada año.

ELIMINADA

284 SI 赞成

支持

No se realizará una emisión a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48.7 horas (después de la cual un hombre gana hora extra) y (2) permitir el cambio para la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a una máxima establecida mediante medio de una escucha, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los hombres, en vez de requerir turnos de 48 horas que comiencen a las 8 a.m.

市議會擬決定消防局至少應有多少消
防局及各類的職工人數，並應不通過消防
委員會，市報議會及三藩市選民的贊同，消防
局，其消防的公司及單位均能閉門停業。

285 NO 反对

反对

N 51, N 52 & N 53
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290</td>
<td>NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293</td>
<td>NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298</td>
<td>NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305</td>
<td>NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309</td>
<td>NO 310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
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288 SI 贏成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?

289 NO 反對
市參議會是否可有權容許曾任市參議員繼續參加本市的健康服務，即使他們不付全部費用？

290 SI 贏成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad continúen en el puesto de los miembros del PERS en caso de fallecimiento del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique en costo adicional para la Ciudad?

291 NO 反對
市參議會是否有權與加州公務員退休制度（PERS）簽約以便使市長安全檢查官及防火工程師成為公務員退休制度的會員而無需退休制度只要市府不要付附帶的費用？

293 SI 贏成
¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultoría con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?

295 NO 反對
現職市退休制度的退休教員能否與三藩市聯合校區或三藩市社區大學簽約作諮詢顧問而不失掉他們的退休權益？

296 SI 贏成
¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?

297 NO 反對
人權委員會應否被立為市選委員會，並且會員人數應由15名減至11名？

298 SI 贏成
¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Parques de cinco a siete miembros?

299 NO 反對
市警局、消防、社會服務、海港、公共事業、服務員、停機場和交通、轉運和上訴委員會的委員會人數應由5名增至7名？

300 SI 贏成
¿Será un requisito que los miembros de las comisiones y los servidores de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se suministren listas a los miembros de las comisiones, consejeros y empleados de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esta requisito no se aplique a ciertas comisiones especiales, en los cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, conocimiento o aplicaciones especiales que puedan encontrarse tan cerca de la residencia de San Francisco que simplemente no son disponibles?

301 NO 反對
市參議會委員或執委會的委員必須在市內
現有的規則規定對民主的正常的職務，
委員會或執委會不能利用對市議員
的委員會，委員會，或增選—a—相關職務，技
術，資料的人員自選 poorly 的可能選任？

302 SI 贏成
¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión Abarca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unífero de miembros del mismo sexo?

304 NO 反對
除選舉委員會外，市選委員會應該成立一
旦選出市長或市選委員會的董事會或委員會應
否有過多或的同性委員？

305 SI 贏成
¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que están en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?

307 NO 反對
市參議會禁止任何人市參議會連任多過
兩期的「一期」市參議員及連任四年後後才
可再出任市參議員？而1990年7/1在任的參
議員應否當作已任滿一期「四年」的參議員？

309 SI 贏成
¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles relevantes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?

310 NO 反對
市有此政策來要求加州立法局撤消廢止
注射器的製造、使用、銷售或分配所涉及的
民事懲罰？
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — If you do not wish to go to your polling place to vote, you may vote by mail or by going to the Registrar’s Office in City Hall in person. This is called absentee voting.

BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest.


CHARTER BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (PROPOSITION J, K, L) — Boards and commissions created by the Charter, either directly or indirectly.

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

DEFERRED CAPITAL MAINTENANCE (PROPOSITION B) — Major building repair projects that have been postponed.

ELECTOR (PROPOSITION L) — A person who is eligible to register to vote.

FINANCE (PROPOSITION C) — Various ways to pay for something over time. This may include raising money or offering something in trade.

FISCAL YEAR (PROPOSITION A, D) — The twelve months from July 1 to June 30 make up a fiscal year. The City budgets revenues and expenses on a fiscal year basis.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INITIATIVE (PROPOSITION F, O) — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE (PROPOSITION D, J) — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters. For such a law to be passed by the Board of Supervisors, a majority, (or in some cases, three-fourths) of the Supervisors must vote to approve the law at two consecutive meetings.

OUTSTANDING PRINCIPAL (PROPOSITION A, C) — The actual amount of borrowed money, not yet paid back. Principal does not include interest charges.

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A person who has turned in the required papers and signatures with the Registrar of Voters to run for an office as a write-in candidate. The name of this person will not be on the ballot. Voters who want to vote for this person can do so by writing the name of the person on the inside of the grey envelope given with the ballot.

SPECIAL PROPERTY TAX (MELLO-ROOS DISTRICT) (PROPOSITION B) — A flat tax on a parcel of land, which is not based on the property’s value. The special tax would be in addition to current property taxes. This tax requires a two-thirds majority vote.

STAFFING LEVEL (PROPOSITION F) — The number of employees on duty at any one time.

TAX EXEMPT DEBT (PROPOSITION C) — Money borrowed by the City which is paid back with interest. The lenders are not taxed on the money earned from these loans.

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now," "The Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters’ rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.
### VOTER SELECTION COUPON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 15</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNOR</td>
<td>(Check Ballot for the number of candidates to vote for)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.T. GOVERNOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARY OF STATE</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROLLER</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURER</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE COMMISSIONER</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, BOARD OF EQUALIZATION</td>
<td>STATE SUPT. OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 3</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOCAL PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC DEFENDER</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, and Molly Wood

Board of Supervisors appointees: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gillham, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that absentee ballots be mailed to them or they may vote in person at City Hall from May 7 through June 5 during normal working hours (see “Your Rights as a Voter” section of this pamphlet). In addition, voters with specified disabilities enumerated below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library’s Branch for the Blind at 3150 Sacramento Street produces and distributes tape recorded copies of the State and Local Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually-impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voter’s office by calling 554-4386.

ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them. The persons providing assistance may be someone who came with the voter, or poll workers can be asked to provide needed assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the sidewalk in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If your polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided that this will not impede the flow of traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large print instructions on how to vote and magnifying sheets to enlarge the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows for seated voting.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip tool and pen to be used in punching the ballot and signing in.

APPLICATION TO BE A PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

The physically disabled may apply to be permanent absentee voters. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, you will automatically receive an absentee ballot every election until you move or re-register.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the form below and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158, City Hall, San Francisco, 94102. Each time you move or re-register to vote, you must apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases you do not need to re-apply.

I hereby apply for “Permanent Absentee Voter” status in San Francisco by reason of:

☐ Lost use of one or more limbs. ☐ Lost use of both hands.

☐ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g. cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair).

☐ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease.

☐ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities.

☐ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

☐ PLEASE SEE EXPLANATORY LETTER ATTACHED.

Name

FIRST MIDDLE LAST

Residence Address

STREET APT. #

Mailing Address

(if different than residence address given above)

CITY ZIP CODE

I declare under penalty of Perjury that the above is true and correct:

Date __________________ Signature __________________

(Return only this page; do not return the whole book)
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens over 18 years old who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 8, 1990.

Q — I moved before May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the city between May 8 and June 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — If you are registered as a member of a political party you may choose a candidate for: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Member-State Board of Equalization (District 2), Member-State Assembly, State Senator if you live in Senate District 8, United States Representative, and members of the County Central Committee.
Non-partisan offices are:
Superintendent of Public Instruction, Superior Court Judge, Municipal Court Judge, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 5, 1990. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let us know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help you.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don’t know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to my polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 5 by:
• going to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall from May 7 through June 5, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday; or
• mailing in a request for an absentee ballot. You may send in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. The application must be received by the Registrar of Voters before May 29, 1990.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include:
• your home address
• the address to which you want the ballot mailed
• your printed name and your signature.
Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is paid $98,670 a year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is paid $102,882 a year.
The Public Defender represents the following persons unable to pay for their own lawyer: 1) persons accused of crimes, 2) juveniles in legal actions, and 3) persons in mental health hearings.
Candidates for Assessor

PAUL E. SCHWENGER

My address is 16 Ord Court, Apt. #4
My occupation is Deputy Assessor
My age is 53
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Francisco, Mission High School graduate, and San Francisco State University graduate. I have been a Deputy Assessor for San Francisco for the past 22 years. I have been awarded the SRPA, Senior Real Property Designation, which is one of the highest awards for professional appraisers. My 22 years of experience will enable me to effectively represent homeowners’ and renters’ concerns before State Legislative Committees. I will analyze property values to make sure business pays its fair share and I will oversee the operations of the Assessor’s office in an experienced and professional manner.

Paul E. Schwenger

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: With 28 years of public service, I am the only candidate with real management experience.
As Sheriff of San Francisco, I managed 399 employees; as Police Chief, 2,500; as New York Prison Commissioner, 13,000. While this would be the largest managerial responsibility faced by the other candidates, it would be my smallest.
I want to be your assessor so I can make it a model agency. I know government and real estate. I am dedicated to public service and to lower taxes for you.
Mayor Agnos agrees I am the rational choice.
I would appreciate your vote.

Richard D. Hongisto

The sponsors for Paul E. Schwenger are:

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Assessor

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Attorney/Supervisor
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have absolutely no ownership or income interests in real property which create any conflict of interest as Assessor.

As attorney for 25 years, Supervisor for three terms, and past President of the Board, I have a proven record of unique, practical accomplishments.

Just as I’ve fought for reduced local government spending, I’ll work for new statewide lower assessment formulas with the same energy that created the nationally copied No-Smoking Ordinance; the Police Fingerprint Computer which reduced our crime rate; laws allowing earthquake victims to quickly replace damaged buildings.

My goal is to achieve fair, reduced property assessments.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred S. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Chief of Police.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St. #20D, Attorney-Legislator.

RONALD G. KERSHAW

My address is 3533 21st Street
My occupation is Real Estate Portfolio Manager
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are: B.S. Accounting, Brigham Young University 1975
MBA Real Estate, Golden Gate University 1986
Eleven years experience in all aspects of property management, appraisals, renovation and property sales
Currently responsible for supervising a real estate portfolio of $150,000,000
Past President SF Chapter, Institute of Internal Auditors
Currently, President, Log Cabin Club of San Francisco
San Francisco homeowner and resident since 1975
San Francisco needs a fiscal conservative who is the only qualified candidate to become the City’s new Assessor.

Ronald G. Kershaw

The sponsors for Ronald G. Kershaw are:


Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender represents people in trouble who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. The responsibility must be performed ethically, competently, and efficiently. During three terms in office, with the help of a superb staff of men and women, that duty has been fulfilled with compassion, dignity, and with the highest professional standards of the American legal system.

In the next term, I pledge to continue to carry out the special trust of this office: to guarantee that everyone in this City has the full benefit of our Constitution and is treated with fairness and with justice.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:


Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #3

ALEX SALDAMANDO

My address is 700 Arkansas Street
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: In my 11 years presiding as a Municipal Court Judge, I have worked to protect the citizens of San Francisco. I have delivered justice swiftly and firmly, in a fair and impartial manner. As a Superior Court Judge, I would bring the same approach to felony criminal cases and complex civil disputes. I am currently President of the California Judges Foundation. My background includes experience as a prosecutor and a public interest lawyer. A graduate of the University of California (Berkeley) and Hastings College of Law, I live with my wife and two children on Potrero Hill.

My sponsors include: Judge Ira Brown, Jr.; Judge John Deerman; Judge Isabella Grant; Judge Ed Stern; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Lillian Sing; Former Judge Charles Renfrew; Mayor Art Agnos; Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein; Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi; Assemblyman Willie Brown; Assemblyman John Burton; Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Harry Britt; Supervisor Jim Gonzalez; Supervisor Terence Hallinan; Supervisor Willie Kennedy; School Board Member Rosario Anaya; School Board Member Libby Denebeim; School Board Member Fred Rodriguez; Commissioner Paul Melbostad; Larry Mazzola, President, Local 38; Thelma Shelley, Director, Performing Arts Center; Benny Yee; Stan Smith, Building Trades Council; and Police Commissioner John Keker.

J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY

My address is 340 Magellan
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a Municipal Court Judge since 1974, native Californian, resident San Francisco since 1937; attended local schools, N.D.V., St. Ignatius, USF and USF School of Law; married Patricia M. Berti, admitted State Bar 1960, devoted thirty years to public service; adjunct Professor of Law, USF; participant, member and/or lecturer for many organizations — Salesian Boys Club, 44 years — Municipal Court Speakers Bureau — California Judges Association — California Center for Judicial Education and Research — San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project; Supervising Judge, Preliminary Courts, Presiding Judge, Assistant Presiding Judge, Court Administrative Committee member eight years; honored by: San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Irish-Israeli-Italian Society, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, Lawyers Club, USF School of Law and USF Law Society for outstanding community service.


Alex Saldamando

J. Dominique Olcemondy
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #5

KAY TSEMIN

My address is 637 Steiner Street
My occupation is Attorney and Counselor at Law
My age is 43 years
My qualifications for office are: B.A., San Francisco State University (Dean’s List), graduate, University of San Francisco School of Law. Attorney for sixteen years specializing in civil litigation. Pro-Tem Municipal Court Judge in San Francisco for five years.

Born in China, moved to San Francisco as a child, graduate of George Washington High School.

Broad Community service includes founding of environmental law societies while in law school, Vice President for Legal Affairs for California National Organization for Women (NOW), Board Member for the Russian American Credit Union and San Francisco Trial Lawyers and Board Advisor for the Legal Advocates for Women. Vice-President, Alamo Square Neighborhood Association.

Strong commitment to equal justice for all without prejudice or bias. The following San Franciscans support me because they feel that the Superior Court needs a judge with my background, legal expertise and perspective on the law:


Kay Tsenin

CARLOS BEA

My address is 2727 Pierce Street
My occupation is Judge Superior Court #5
My qualifications for office are: I am a Superior Court Judge in San Francisco and author of articles in several professional journals, such as California Trial Lawyers and Defense Research Institute’s. Am recognized by the State Bar for pro bono work with members of the Hispanic Community. Have served two terms as a member of the Board of Visitors, Stanford Law School. Was a panelist and lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar. Was an adjunct professor, Hastings College of Law and Stanford Law School. I graduated from Stanford Law School and have been an attorney in San Francisco since 1959.

Sponsors include: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Ollie Marie-Victoire, all the judges of the Superior Court, Angela Alioto, Ernest Chuck Ayala, Willie Brown, Jr., John Burton, Jim Gonzalez, Quentin Kopp, H. Jesse Arnelle, James Herman, Mary Noel Pepys, Robert McDonnell, G. Joseph Bertain, Edward McFetridge, Zeppelin Wong, Paul Renne, Leo Murphy, Jr., Gina Moscone, James Brosnahan, Barbara Caulfield, Robert Morales, Paul Haerle, Michael Hardeman, Howard Nemerovski, Edwin Heafey, Jr., Larry Mazzola, Vincent Friia, Putnam Livermore, William Coblentz.

Carlos Bea

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DONNA HITCHENS

My address is 468 30th Street
My occupation is attorney
My age is 42 years
My qualifications for office are: Over the past thirteen years, I have represented clients in San Francisco courts, taught law to San Francisco students and served on the Boards of Directors of private and public agencies designed to further the cause of justice in our city.

   My experience as a mediator, counselor and advocate demonstrates my willingness to pursue alternative dispute resolutions. Judicial leadership and integrity are standards that the community should demand. My record attests to my ability to meet those standards.
   • J.D. UC Berkeley 1977
   • Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates, a public interest firm specializing in sex discrimination cases. 1978 – 1984
   • Co-founder, Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom
   • Staff Counsel, ACLU. 1984 – 85
   • Partner, Hitchens & Brenner. Small Business, non-profit corporations, civil rights and family law. Presently
   • Former chair, San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women.
   • Member, Board of Directors, Pacific Primary PreSchool.

SUPPORT: Assemblymember John Burton; Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisors Nancy Walker, Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, and Terence Hallinan; Judge Lillian Sing, Judge Mary Morgan, and Judge Herbert Donaldson; Commissioners Jim Jefferson, Adrian Bermudez, Jr., James Morales, Paul Melbostad, Richard Grosboll, and Leni Marin; Hon. Libby Denebeim; Hon. Leland Yee; Carol Migden; Will Leong; Catherine Dodd, R.N.; Jeff Mori, and Mauri Schwartz

Jerome T. Benson

My address is 187 Robinhood Drive
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the Superior Court
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are:
• 23 years public service in the courtroom protecting victims, litigants and the community.
• 7 years as Chief of the Criminal Division in the District Attorney’s Office including:
  • 65 felony jury trial prosecutions for murder, rape, child abuse, drugs, white-collar fraud.
  • Stanford Law School graduate 1964.
  • Chairman, State Bar of California Subcommittee on Jury Instructions (Criminal).
  • Member, Project Safer California.
  • Fair and equal application of the law without regard to race, sex, or economic status.
  • I am a native San Franciscan and homeowner living with my wife and two daughters near Miraloma Park.
  • My judicial office is dedicated to fair rulings, hard work, human sensitivity, and legal equality.

CITYWIDE SUPPORT:
State Senator Quentin Kopp; Justice Harry Low; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Public Defender Jeff Brown; Sheriff Michael Hennessey; Former Chief of Police Alfred Nelder.
SUPERVISORS:
   Angela Alioto, Tom Hsieh, Wendy Nelder;
JUDGES:
   John Ertola, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Ina Gyemant, Paul Alvarado, Isabella Grant;
LABOR:
   Mike Hardeeman, Stan Smith, Kevin Ryan;
ATTORNEYS AND COMMUNITY:
   William Coblenz; Harold Dobbs; Charles Breyer; Airport Commission President Morris Bernstein; Wayne Friday; Benny Yee; Louis Giraud; Doris Thomas; Christopher Bowman; Haddie Redd; Elizabeth Aguilar-Tarchi; Ron Huberman;

   Donna Hitchens

   Jerome T. Benson
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

JAMES HARRIGAN

My address is 494 Mangels St.
My occupation is Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department.
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I live in Glen Park with my wife, Serena Lee, and our three children.
I received my law degree with academic awards and Law Review distinction in 1975 from Golden Gate University, San Francisco.
I have completed more than 80 jury and court trials in Municipal and Superior Court, representing thousands of citizens and victims of crime in civil and criminal cases in private practice, as a public defender, and as Legal Counsel to the Sheriff.
My expertise includes: employment law, labor relations, criminal, landlord/tenant, and constitutional law. As Counsel to the Sheriff, I resolve the legal affairs of a major law enforcement agency. My work brings me before the civil and criminal justice system each day.
"James Harrigan is by far the best qualified candidate. No other candidate has his broad range of experience: public service and private practice; law enforcement and defense law; extensive courtroom experience and administrative expertise. I strongly urge your vote for James Harrigan."
— Sheriff Michael Hennessey

I have not listed my sponsors. I firmly believe the voter's decision should be based on one's qualifications and experience — not on political connections.
I pledge equal application of the law. I ask for your support.
Thank you.

James Harrigan

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Ave.
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My qualifications for office are: What I am in life, I owe to my family and to an excellent education: M.A., counseling, Stanford University; B.A., psychology, University of San Francisco; Juris Doctorate, Hastings College of Law. I began practicing law in 1982 and have been an assistant district attorney since 1983; with experience in criminal prosecution and family law enforcing child support. I have served 10 years on the College Board; my colleagues elected me president three terms because of my firm but fair judgment. My duties include equitably settling conflicts, grievances and contracts. In my years of public service, compassion, integrity and common sense have always guided my decisions; and as a judge that will continue to be the case.

My supporters:
Justice Harry Low
Judges: Isabella Grant, Lenard Louie, David Garcia, Larry Kay, Mary Morgan, Bill Mallen, Herbert Donaldson.
District Attorney: Arlo Smith
Public Defender: Jeff Brown
Senators: Milton Marks, Quentin Kopp
Attorneys: Charlie Clifford, Harriet Ross, William Coblentz, Cedric Chao, Roberta Achtenberg
BART Director: Mike Bernick
Commissioners: Rosario Anaya, Tim Wolfred, Chuck Ayala, Naomi Gray.
Supervisors: Thomas Hsieh, Angela Alioto
Walter Johnson; Alex Esclamado; Reverend Amos Brown;
Carole Migden;
UC Regent Yori Wada.

Julie Tang

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: I’m honored that MAYOR ART AGNOS and 8 PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION — who know my courtroom experience and qualifications in civil and criminal law — endorse me.

As a lawyer in private practice 18 years, mother of 2 children, married 19 years, I care about the strength and integrity of San Francisco’s courts.

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred community trust — not a consolation prize for a restless politician. A lawyer lacking courtroom experience is unqualified to be judge.

In HUNDREDS of court appearances and trials, as chair of the Bar Association Criminal Justice Advisory Council, as a San Francisco Delinquency Prevention Commissioner, and as a Hastings Law School teacher, I have demonstrated a longstanding commitment to professional excellence.

Community and law enforcement leaders who acknowledge my legal service and endorse me:

SPEAKER Willie Brown
SUPERVISORS Nancy Walker, Bill Maher, Harry Britt, Terrence Hallinan
JUDGES Dorothy vonBeroldingen, John Dearman, Edward Stern
COURT COMMISSIONER George Colbert
SENATOR Milton Marks
SCHOOL BOARD JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Libby Denehein, Myra Kopf
POLICE COMMISSIONER John Keker
FIRE COMMISSIONER Sharon Bretz
SHERIFF LIEUTENANT Connie O’Connor
POLICE OFFICERS VICE PRESIDENT Paul Chignell
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY Charles Wood
BUSINESSMAN Mel Swig
PUC COMMISSIONER Rodel Rodis

Ellen Chaitin

WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR

My address is 3615 Buchanan St. #206
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: I am the most qualified candidate for this office. I have had judicial experience, serving as Municipal Court judge pro tem for over five years, and have been commended by the Presiding Judge for the quality of my service. I have been a journeyman lawyer for 15 years, with both criminal and civil experience, and have done over 30 jury trials.

With Amnesty International and Church representatives, I have been an International Trial Observer.

I have been a Board Member of the Elizabeth Frye Center and the Irish Forum, and a volunteer on the Bar Association’s free legal services panel.


William J. O’Connor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #3

LILLIAN K. SING

My address is San Francisco Municipal Court,
400 Van Ness Ave.
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the San Francisco
Municipal Court
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: I am an incumbent judge, and
have been a judge since 1981. I am the first Asian-American
woman judge in the history of Northern California. In 1988, I
was awarded Trial Judge of the Year by San Francisco Trial
Lawyers Association, one of the highest awards a Bar Associa-
tion can bestow. Last year, I was unanimously elected as Munici-
pal Court’s Presiding Judge. As Presiding Judge, I implemented
the Pro Tem Judge Program, drastically reduced backlog in
civil/criminal cases, brought Trial Court Funding to San Fran-
cisco, spearheaded San Francisco’s first judicial forum “Access
To Justice” attended by 680 people. I served as a faculty member
with the California Center for Judicial Education/Research
which trains all new judges in California and am a faculty judge
with the National Institute for Trial Advocacy which trains trial
lawyers. In 1988 I lectured throughout China on the U.S.
Legal/Judicial System.

Join San Francisco judges led by Presiding Judges Choppelas,
and Marie-Victoire, Mayor Art Agnos, President Harry Britt,
and the entire 11 Board of Supervisors, Assembly Speaker Willie
Brown, Assemblyman John Burton, Senator Milton Marks, For-
mer Police Chiefs Nelder/Cahill, DA Arlo Smith, PD Jeff
Brown, Sheriff Michael Hennessy and retain me as judge.

JEROME A. DEFILIPPO

My address is 1534 38th Avenue
My occupation is Attorney at Law
My qualifications for office are: A third generation San Fran-
ciscan. I have practiced law in The City since 1973, served as
the Legal Officer of the San Francisco Police Department and a
Deputy City Attorney. I am committed to the impartial applica-
tion of our laws in all judicial proceedings. Having served twenty
years as a Police Officer attaining the position of Lieutenant, I
am well aware of the frustrations each of us feel by the impact
of crime in our City. If elected, I am committed to the imposition
of the maximum sentence allowed by law for persons convicted
of violent crimes or narcotic sales.

Partial list of sponsors follows:
Ann Alberigi, Catherine Archbold, Alfred Arnaud, Martin
Bastiani, Chief Thomas Cahill, Ann Carrick, Peter Cimarelli,
Hon. Antone Cincotta, Clement Collins, Jean DeFilippo, Cantor
Martin Feldman, Nancy Feldman, H. Welton Flynn, John
Fracchia, Carol Fujikawa, John Gallagher, Judith Gallen, Kath-
leen Gee, Dr. William Gee, Susanna Lee, Margaret Leong,
Maureen Mahoney, Carmelita Mathais, Phyliss Moylan, James
Pagano, Renzo Panelli, Timothy J. Riordan, Rollin Schrotth, Joan
Swendsen, Spiron Tenes, Paul Vigo, Rita Young

Jerome A. DeFilippo

Lillian K. Sing
Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against these measures. All arguments, "official" and paid, are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None of them has been checked for accuracy by this office or any other city official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

"Official Arguments"

There is one "official" argument for and one against each measure, and they are published at no cost. "Official" arguments are selected by the Registrar of Voters in accordance with the priorities set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code as summarized below:

For:
1. Person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee supporting the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Against:
1. For a referendum, person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee against the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Rebuttals

Authors of official arguments may each prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. As with official and paid arguments, rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Each rebuttal follows immediately after its corresponding official argument.

Paid Arguments

All paid arguments are accepted for publication upon (1) deposit of an amount equal to $50 plus $1.50 per word, (2) submission of a petition containing valid signatures of registered voters in lieu of the printing fee at the rate of two signatures for each dollar of the fee, or (3) a combination of a printing fee and signatures which together equal the number of signatures and/or amount of money required to qualify the argument for publication.

For each measure, paid arguments follow after the official arguments and rebuttals. All paid arguments supporting a measure are printed together followed by all paid arguments against that same measure. Paid arguments within each group (e.g. all paid arguments in favor of Proposition Z) are not printed in any particular order. Rather they are arranged so that each page is fully utilized.

There is one ballot measure for which paid arguments were not accepted. The School Facilities Safety Special Tax measure is being proposed under state law; only one argument for, one argument against, and respective rebuttals for this measure are allowed.

Again, arguments and rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked by this office or any other city official or agency.
PROPOSITION A

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded Indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City buildings were damaged by the October 17, 1989 earthquake and many may not survive another strong earthquake. Many City buildings contain asbestos and many are not accessible to disabled persons. Many City buildings do not meet current health, safety and building codes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $332,400,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This total would be reduced by the amount of grants the City receives from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the State of California for earthquake repair and hazard reduction. No more than $65,000,000 of bonds could be sold in any fiscal year.

This money would be used for safety improvements to some City buildings, including repairing earthquake damage, making the buildings better able to survive earthquakes, removing or reducing the danger of asbestos in these buildings, making them more accessible to the disabled and bringing them up to current codes.

The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds for not more than $332,400,000 to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue bonds to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that the approximate costs would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$332,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>$244,314,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$576,714,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bond authorization limits the issuance of bonds to no more than $65 million per year. Assuming a single sale on a 20 year basis at current interest rates with no reduction for possible FEMA or State funding, annual debt service on each $65 million increment would amount to $5,638,750, which amount is equivalent to one and forty-eight hundredths cents ($0.0148) in the current tax rate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 26, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A the earthquake repair and protection measure.

Proposition A provides $332.4 million to repair earthquake damaged city buildings and to seismically reinforce many of them so that they would not sustain as much damage (or worse) during a future earthquake. This improves public safety while it also protects the investment we are making in repairs.

Your "Yes on A" vote will provide for:

- Replacement of the broken and earthquake damaged water and sewer lines at the Zoo.
- Proposition A represents a prudent investment which would protect many irreplaceable public buildings from major damage or collapse in a future earthquake.
- In order to keep property taxes from rising more than 2-3¢ per $100 of assessed value, Proposition A will not allow more than $65 million in bonds to be sold in any one year. It further requires that any Federal or State earthquake relief money we receive to repair these buildings reduce the amount of bonds sold. This assures that local taxpayers will not be required to pay for repairs that can be made using Federal/State emergency relief assistance.
- Vote Yes on Proposition A to protect city buildings and increase public safety in a next major earthquake.

Submited by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition A
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition A

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

When future earthquakes strike, our libraries need to be safe. Proposition A will provide funds to help earthquake proof our library system. Vote YES on A.

This bond issue will help to ensure the seismic safety of the Palace of Fine Arts, home of the Exploratorium which is visited by over 600,000 people a year. Prop A represents a prudent investment to improve public safety and protect irreplaceable public buildings. We urge all citizens to vote “Yes” on Proposition A.

Replacement of the earthquake-damaged, underground, 50-year-old water, gas and sewer lines at the San Francisco Zoo is critically needed for the safety and well-being of the animals. It will significantly improve public services to the 1.2 million children and adults who visit annually. The Zoological Society will endeavor to raise funds to renovate and build new above-ground facilities to supplement the $26 million included in the bond issue for the Zoo. Help make the Zoo a true sanctuary.

David E. Anderson
Zoo Director
Phil Arnold
Assistant General Manager
Recreation & Park
William Brewster Ely IV
Headmaster, Town School
Mary Burns
General Manager
Recreation & Park
Margaret K. Burks
Executive Director, Zoological Society
Jack W. Castor
Animal Keeper Shop Steward, Local 858
Todd Cecil
Children’s Zoo Keeper
Sherrl Chiesa
President, Local 2
Robert Todd Cockburn
Executive Director, Clean Water Program
Rosemary Davidson
Urban School
Dolores A. Donovan
Animal Control & Welfare Commission

Keith G. Eickman
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Roy Eisenhardt
Director, California Academy of Sciences
Becky Evans
Conservation Activist
Norman Gershens
Director, Ecosystem Survival Plan
Arthur J. Goedewaagen
Board Member, SPEAK
John E. Hajernik Jr.
Professor Biology, SFSU
Roger Hoppes
Director, Children’s Zoo
Michael House
Assistant to the Mayor
David J. Howe
Animal Keeper
Mark Hurley
Animal Control & Welfare Commission
Norma J. Kristovich
Zoo Docent Council
Connie Lurie
Vice Chairman, Zoological Society Board

Michael Mellor, President
Friends of the San Francisco Public Library

Exploratorium
F. Van Kasper, Chairman
William K. Coblenz, Vice Chairman
C. Richard Kramlich, Vice Chairman
G. Sieven Burrill, Treasurer

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Zoological Society Board
Frances May McAteer
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Amy Meyer
People for GGNRA
Andrew Nash
President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Trent W. Orr
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Elisabeth D. Rieger
Zoo Volunteer
Fred A. Rodriguez
School Board Member
Carroll Soo-Hoo
Zoo Benefactor
Stephen V. R. Spaulding
Zoological Society Treasurer
James J. Walsh Jr.
Citizens Advisory Committee on Wastewater Management
Connie O’Connor
President, Recreation & Park Commission

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

We must rebuild and repair our infrastructure. The October 17 quake was a warning. More resources going to earthquake preparedness programs today will save lives in the future. Vote YES on A.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods Candidate for Supervisor

We urge everyone to vote Yes on Proposition A. The people of San Francisco have a $3.5 billion investment in public buildings. This bond issue will be used to fund repairs to many of our facilities damaged in last October's earthquake, including City Hall, General Hospital, neighborhood libraries, police stations and cultural buildings. It will also provide monies necessary to make life-safety improvements to other city buildings.

Your Yes Vote on Proposition A will protect lives and property in the event of another major earthquake at a very small cost to businesses and homeowners. Because bonds to finance repairs will be sold over 6 - 10 years, replacing older bond issues as they are paid-off, the result will be an almost unchanged tax rate. In fact, the City's independent budget analyst found that the tax bill for an average homeowner will increase by less than $5.00 a month.

Proposition A is a small price to pay to preserve our investment in the city's valuable public facilities. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

We ask that you join with us in Voting YES ON PROP. "A". Your "Yes on A" vote will provide funds to protect the two remaining Police Stations which are not yet earthquake safe or provided for in previous bond issues.

In an emergency we can do our jobs only if our own police facilities are earthquake resistant and if we can get to those places in the City which most need our services. That is why it is important to us that as many City buildings as possible are made earthquake resistant. The less damage and street obstruction that results from a future earthquake, the better we can get to these parts of the City where we are most needed. The safer the public buildings in the City are made, the better we will be able to serve the rest of the City if we ever have to face a major earthquake emergency.

For security vote "Yes on A".

Michael Keys
President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

The damage done by the October 17th earthquake to San Francisco's most important public buildings is considerable. To correct that damage and prepare for the future vitality of our City demands the kind of response represented by Proposition A. This proposition carefully earmarks funds to upgrade buildings such as City Hall, the War Memorial Opera House, and the Department of Public Health offices which are treasures that can never be replaced or reproduced. They not only need to be repaired, but strengthened structurally and improved, to meet today's building codes. The Federal Government will pick up some of the damage, but much more will be needed if these vital components of our City's daily life are to be improved and made ready for the next major quake. Proposition A requests a large sum, but this is a time when we as a City have to agree to such a request. We strongly urge your support of Proposition A.

American Institute of Architects/San Francisco Chapter

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

We ask you to join us in voting “Yes on A”.

The primary purpose of Prop “A” is to protect lives and public buildings from the effects of the next earthquake. As San Franciscans we all share the responsibility of having to do all we can to avoid the loss of life, the suffering and the huge costs which another, perhaps stronger or longer quake would bring. Thus we see Proposition “A” as a necessary, prudent investment in all our future.

We have a special reason to support “Prop A” and to ask you to vote YES ON “A” as well. That special reason is the fact that 20 of the buildings which will be repaired or strengthened against future earthquakes if Prop “A” passes will also be made fully accessible to the disabled. We want our City’s buildings to be repaired, to be made safe and to be made accessible to all San Franciscans.

Vote “Yes on A”.

Kathy Uhl, Executive Director,
Independent Living Resource Center
Michael L. Comini, Executive Director,
Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition “A”.

Many city buildings were damaged in the October 17 earthquake. If these buildings are repaired and strengthened the Fire Department will be much safer when responding to future emergencies.

Please help the Fire Department do its job safely and effectively by voting “Yes” on Proposition “A”.

James D. Jefferson, President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn, Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bretz, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Soulis, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Frederick F. Postel, Chief of Department

We urgently request that you vote “Yes on A”.

The War Memorial complex of buildings, dedicated to San Francisco’s veterans, are one of our city’s treasures, irreplaceable architecturally and economically. They are central to our history and we owe it to ourselves to make sure they are made as fully earthquake-resistant as possible.

The October 17 earthquake was a warning which we must heed. Proposition “A” is a prudent and necessary response. It will protect our treasured buildings and, even more importantly, it will protect the lives of those who use them and the memories of those whose lives they commemorate.

Harold F. Jackson, Chairman, American Legion War Memorial Commission
Claude M. Jarman, Jr., Vice-President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Mark Ryser, Executive Director, Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage

Save lives.
Support earthquake safety.
Vote YES on Propositions A and B.
Also vote YES on Proposition N. Limit San Francisco Supervisors to two four-year terms.

Terence Faulkner
Republican State Assembly Candidate
San Francisco Republican Party Chairman (1987-89)

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Candidate
Past San Francisco Democratic Party Secretary
Max Woods
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic County Central Committeewoman

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for your safety. Let us learn from the October 17th earthquake. 15 seconds of moderate shaking resulted in the need for $32 million in repairs to city buildings in the Civic Center alone. We need to be better prepared. We need to reduce known safety hazards.

Please, vote YES on Proposition A.

Ken Dowlin, City Librarian
Steve Coulter, Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson, Library Commissioner
Lonni Chin, Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil, Library Commissioner
Dennis Normandy, Library Commissioner
Roselyne Swig, Library Commissioner

Help the City of San Francisco and the Zoo rebuild. The animals will benefit, too! Vote YES on A.

Susanne Barthell,
Zoo Advisory Committee member,
Zoo Volunteer

Sophie Papageorge,
Zoologist

Jorge L. Garcia, D.V.M.
Zoo Medicine Specialist

John J. Alcaraz,
Retired Zookeeper
Roni Joan Howard,
Educator

David J. Howe
Animalkeeper
Terrence J. Moyles
Linda Caratti
Animalkeeper
Anthony Sharp
Animalkeeper
Martin E. Dias
A.K.A. Big Bison, Animalkeeper
Jack W. Castor
Lion House, Animalkeeper
Sandra Keller
Director, Citizens for a Better Zoo

Proposition A will help restore structural safety to the San Francisco County Jails in San Bruno, which were built in 1934 and are badly in need of repair. This is the oldest operating jail in California and sits near the San Andreas fault.

For the safety of City employees and county jail inmates, please vote YES on Proposition A.

Michael Hennessy
San Francisco County Sheriff
Deputy Albert Waters, President
San Francisco Deputy Sheriff’s Association

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION A

This bond issue is iffy. It should have been presented to the voters as two separate bond issues.

One for $75 million — earthquake repairs to be partly refunded by F.E.M.A. for our present estimated damages. Another for

$257.4 million to take care of our needed capital improvements so neglected by this and past administrations.

Vote NO and get one issue back on the November ballot.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION PROPOSITION A

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1990, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, TO PAY FOR THE COST OF PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION, ASBESTOS ABATEMENT, PROVIDING ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED, ALL RELATED TO PUBLIC SAFETY TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING RELATED ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT FOR THE FOREGOING PURPOSE; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT NO MORE THAN $65,000,000 OF SAID BONDED INDEBTEDNESS SHALL BE INCURRED IN A SINGLE FISCAL YEAR AND PROVIDED, FURTHER, THAT THE AUTHORIZATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $332,400,000 WILL BE REDUCED BY THE AMOUNT OF THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEMA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND THE CONTROLLER TO MONITOR THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEMA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION AND TO TAKE ANY APPROPRIATE ACTION SO THAT THE BONDS ISSUED WILL NOT DUPLICATE FEMA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; FINDING THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF THE ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 5th day of June, 1990, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the herein-after described municipal improvements in the amount and for the purposes stated:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, to pay for the cost of public safety improvements to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled, all related to public safety to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including related acquisition, construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purpose; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the actual post-audit receipt of Falk or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, Resolution No. 88-90, $332,400,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

The estimated cost of as set forth in said resolution are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. Authorizing and directing the Chief Administrative Officer and the Controller to monitor the issuance of the bonds and the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction and involving in proper bonds and the officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 31, 1990.

Section 4. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear appropriate action so that the separate stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided,
however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word “YES” on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word “NO” on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special election, each voter to vote for any said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word “YES” to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word “NO” to the right of said proposition.

Section 7. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as “serials,” and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 12 per centum per annum, payable semiannually, provided, that interest for the first year after the date of any of said bonds may be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 8. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 9. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 10. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.
PROPOSITION B

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particular expenses relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1999; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269

NO 272

Analysis
by City Attorney

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Some School District buildings were damaged by the earthquake. Some District buildings do not meet present earthquake and fire standards.

The State Mallo-Roos law allows the Board of Education to submit to the voters a measure authorizing a special property tax to pay for repairs and other improvements to school buildings.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize a special property tax to pay for costs of repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety. Some of the money would also be used for deferred capital maintenance. The repairs and maintenance would be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis. Since no money would be borrowed, there would be no interest costs to pay.

The tax would last for 20 years. The tax on single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels could be no more than $46 for each of the first six years and no more than $32.20 for each of the last 14 years. The tax on other types of parcels could be no more than $23 for each dwelling unit for each of the first six years and $16.10 for each dwelling unit for each of the last 14 years. Dwelling units occupied by persons 65 years of age or older would be eligible for an exemption from this tax. The measure would also set an annual appropriations limit of $12 million.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to authorize this property tax to pay for repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety and you want to authorize this annual appropriations limit.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to authorize this tax.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed special tax levy be approved, in my opinion, it would increase revenues for the San Francisco Unified School District, net of estimated senior citizen exemptions, by approximately $8 million for the first 6 years and $5.6 million per year for the next 14 years, based on the current assessment roll of the City and County. The approximately $127.2 million generated over a 20 year period by this special tax levy would be restricted for use by the District for the repair, restoration, replacement, seismic upgrading and capital maintenance of School District facilities."

How "B" Got on the Ballot

On February 13, the Board of Education voted 5-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Board members voted as follows:


NO: Leland Yee.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When the earthquake struck last fall, our school buildings suffered. Sustaining major damage and at special risk in the future are our buildings that were not earthquake proofed in the 1970's. In that category are our child care centers serving our youngest students. Also, in the fall of 1988 the City Fire Marshall inspected our schools and reported that the majority of our school buildings do not meet fire safety standards. Our 63,000 students and the community groups that meet at our schools in the evenings and on weekends must have buildings that can withstand earthquakes, and meet fire safety standards.

Proposition B will authorize a tax to provide for: repairing earthquake damage at 131 sites including the reconstruction of John O'Connell High School, seismic improvement of nine Children's Centers, correction of fire code and safety violations at 97 sites and seismic improvement of John Swett, Jean Parker and Bessie Carmichael Elementary Schools and Parkside Curriculum Center. In addition, there will be funds for deferred capital maintenance.

Two years ago the citizens of this City voted to support major repairs for our school buildings. Now we must protect that investment by repairing the present earthquake damage and seeing that all our schools can withstand future earthquakes, be as safe as possible in case of fire and be well maintained into the next century.

Civic organizations who have joined in supporting Proposition B include: San Francisco League of Women Voters, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SF/PTA, Parents' Lobby, San Francisco Labor Council, United Educators of San Francisco, and Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth.

Submitted by Superintendent Ramon C. Cortines, San Francisco Unified School District, and Fred Rodriguez, President, Board of Education.
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California
February 13, 1990
(For Board Meeting February 13, 1990)


REQUESTED ACTION:
WHEREAS, the Board of Education (the "Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "District"), did, on January 9, 1990, adopt its Resolution of Intention (the "Resolution") to form Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "Community Facilities District"), and levy a special tax therein, pursuant to Chapter 2.5 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 53311) of the California Government Code, commonly known as the "Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982," as amended, (the "Act"); and

WHEREAS, a copy of the Resolution (which sets forth a description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, the name of the Community Facilities District and the types of facilities proposed to be financed by the District (the "Facilities")), providing that, except where funds are otherwise available, a special tax sufficient to pay for all Facilities and the financing thereof (to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all non exempt real property in the Community Facilities District) is proposed to be levied within the proposed Community Facilities District specifying the rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the proposed Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, and setting a hearing thereon, is on file with the Clerk of this Board and is incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, notice of said hearing was duly published as required by law, as evidenced by the affidavit of publication on file with the Clerk of this Board; and

WHEREAS, on February 13, 1990 this Board held the noticed public hearing as required by law relative to the proposed formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, prior to the noticed public hearing a report (the "Report") containing a description of the Facilities and an estimate of the cost of providing the Facilities, including the estimated fair and reasonable cost thereof, was filed with this Board as a part of the record of said hearing; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing all persons desiring to be heard on all matters pertaining to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution, including all interested persons or taxpayers for or against the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent of the Community Facilities District, or the furnishing of specific types of public facilities, were heard and considered, and a full and fair hearing was held thereon; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing evidence was presented to this Board on the matters before it, and this Board at the conclusion of the hearing was fully advised as to all matters relating to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, written protests against the establishment of the District, the furnishing of specified type or types of facilities within the Community Facilities District as listed in the Report, or the levying of the special tax have not been filed with the Clerk of this Board by fifty percent (50%) or more of the registered voters, or six registered voters, whichever is more, residing within the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District, or the owners of one-half (1/2) or more of the area of land in the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District and not exempt from this special tax;

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District, in regular session assembled on February 13, 1990, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE, DETERMINE AND ORDER as follows:

Section 1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.

Section 2. Written protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, or the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are insufficient in number and in amount under the Act, and this Board hereby further orders and determines that all protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are hereby overruled.

Section 3. As proposed in the Resolution, a community facilities district is hereby established pursuant to the Act, designated "Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District."

Section 4. The map and legal description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, filed with the Clerk of this Board on January 24, 1990, are hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the boundaries of the Community Facilities District.

Section 5. The facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District, set forth in Exhibit "B" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, shall be the facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District.

Section 6. As provided in Exhibit "B", it is the intention of this Board, subject to the approval of the qualified electors of the Community Facilities District, to levy a special tax sufficient to acquire, construct and improve the facilities including administrative expenses to be incurred by the District and the Community Facilities District in connection therewith; said tax to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all non exempt real property in the Community Facilities District.

The rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax, in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, is described in Exhibit "A" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.

Section 7. The description of the proposed voting procedure, as set forth in the Resolution, is hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the voting procedure to be used in these proceedings.

Section 8. The special tax has not been proclaimed by majority protest pursuant to Section 53234 of the Act.

Section 9. The facilities to be funded from the special tax are identified in Exhibit "B" hereto.

Section 10. In accordance with Section 53340.1 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, this Board shall designate the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District as the office, department or bureau which will be responsible for annually preparing the current roll of special tax levy obligations by assessor's parcel number on non exempt property within the District and which will be responsible for estimating future special tax levies pursuant to Section 53340.1 of the Act.

The name, address, and telephone number of the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District, and the person responsible for administering the District, is as follows:

Director of Fiscal Services
Fiscal Services Department
San Francisco Unified School District
135 Van Ness Avenue, Room 215
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 241-6480

Section 11. In accordance with Section 53328.3 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the

(Continued on next page)
consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, the Clerk of this Board shall record the notice of special tax lien provided for in Section 31145 of the Streets and Highways Code. Upon recordation of the notice of special tax lien pursuant to Section 31145 of the Streets and Highways Code, a continuing lien to secure each levy of the special tax shall attach to all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District, and this lien shall continue in force and effect until the special tax obligation is permanently satisfied and the lien cancelled in accordance with law or until collection of the tax by this Board ceases.

Section 12. A boundary map of the Community Facilities District has been recorded pursuant to Sections 3111 and 3131 of the Streets and Highways Code at Book 39, Page 182-183 in the Book of Maps of Assessment and Community Facilities Districts in the Office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 13. All prior proceedings taken with respect to the establishment of the District were valid and in conformity with the requirements of the Act.

Section 14. In accordance with Section 53325.7 of the Act, the annual appropriations limit of the District, as defined by subdivision (b) of Section 8 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution, is hereby preliminarily established in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year, and said annual appropriations limit shall be submitted to the voters of the District as hereafter provided. The proposition establishing said appropriations limit shall become effective if approved by the qualified electors voting thereon and shall be adjusted in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 53325.7 of the Act.

Section 15. The Board hereby calls an election and submits the question of levying the special tax, and the establishment of the annual appropriations limit for the District in connection therewith, to the qualified electors within the District, at an election to be held on Tuesday, June 5, 1990, all in accordance with and subject to the Act, the terms of which shall be applicable to such election.

Section 16. The Board hereby further directs that the election at which the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith is submitted to the qualified electors within the District shall be consolidated and shall be combined in one ballot proposition, all as provided by the Act; and the Board further directs that notice of the consolidated election on the combined proposition of authorizing the levy of the special tax and of establishing an appropriations limit be published as required by law.

Section 17. If two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax are cast in favor of levying the tax, as determined by this Board after the canvass of the returns of such consolidated election, the Board may levy the special tax within the territory of the District in the amount and for the purposes as specified in this resolution. The special tax may be levied only at the rate and may be apportioned only in the manner specified in this resolution, subject to the Act, except that the special tax may be levied at a lower rate.

Section 18. The Clerk of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution, a certified map of the boundaries of the Community Facilities District, a sufficient description to allow the election official to determine the boundaries of the District, and the assessor's parcel numbers for the land within the District to the Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco within three business days after the adoption of this resolution.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 13th day of February, 1990.

President of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District

ATTEST:
Clerk of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District

Recommended by:
Ramon C. Cortines
Superintendent of Schools

EXHIBIT A
RANGE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT BASIS OF SPECIAL TAX LEVY

The annual special tax shall be levied on each separate parcel within Community Facilities District No. 90-1, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco County, California ("CFD 90-1") as shown on the San Francisco County Assessor's records, subject to the maximum rates specified below, as established by the Board of Education ("Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District ("District").

DETERMINATION OF PARCELS SUBJECT TO SPECIAL TAX

The records of the County Assessor of San Francisco County shall be used to determine the parcels subject to the special tax. The basis for determining the parcels will be the Secured Property Tax Roll. The land use code contained in the Secured Property Tax Roll, in combination with records maintained by the Assessor of the number of dwelling units on each residential parcel in CFD 90-1, will be the basis for assigning the appropriate tax rate to each parcel. If the District determines that the records maintained by the Assessor are incorrect with respect to one or more parcels, the District will assign the appropriate land use code and dwelling unit count based on its review of the property. All special taxes shall be based on parcels established in the County Assessor's records as of March 1 of each year and all land use categories shall be based on building permits and other relevant development approvals granted by the City and County of San Francisco or any successor jurisdiction as of June 1 of each year.

Using the records of the County Assessor, the District shall prepare a list of the parcels subject to the tax. The District shall establish the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.

1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which, supported publicly-owned and non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that lease/hold/possessor interests shall be taxed.

2. From the parcels remaining identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor's data, and the District's review of building permits issued, and other changes in development status:
   a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
   b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
   c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
   d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on that parcel will be classified based on the uses that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.
3. The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:
   a. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $52.20 per parcel.
   b. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CFD 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CFD 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B (Continued)

ministration of the parcels subject to the tax and their special tax assignments.

SENIOR CITIZEN EXEMPTION

A property owner may apply for a Senior Citizen Exemption which would provide an exemption from the special tax for the applicable tax year on dwelling units occupied by senior citizens, if the following conditions are met:

1. The applicant must show evidence that the dwelling unit is owned or rented by a citizen who is at least 65 years of age.

2. The applicant must show evidence of ownership of the property subject to the Exemption.

3. The Senior Citizen Exemption must be applied for annually.

4. If the applicant is a landlord, then he or she must certify that the entire tax exemption will be reflected only in the rent for the exempted dwelling unit(s).

EXHIBIT B

COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 — Description of Facilities to be financed:

(i) Repair, restoration, and/or replacement of District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), to the extent that (A) such repair, restoration, or replacement is outside the scope of work approved by federal and state agencies for assistance from such agencies; (B) costs incurred in such repair, restoration, or replacement are ineligible for federal or state assistance; or (C) insufficient federal or state funds are appropriated, obligated, or approved to pay for repair, restoration, or replacement which would otherwise be eligible for federal or state assistance. Pending receipt by the District of disaster assistance from federal and/or state agencies, the Community Facilities District may advance funds to the District to pay costs eligible for federal or state disaster assistance; provided that upon receipt by the District of federal or state disaster assistance relating to such costs, the District shall promptly reimburse the Community Facilities District for any such advances.

(ii) Seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other District facilities.

(iii) Correction of fire safety violations of District facilities.

(iv) Deferred capital maintenance of District facilities. Incidental expenses, including the cost of planning and designing the Facilities and the cost of environmental evaluations thereof; all costs associated with the creation of the proposed Community Facilities District, the determination of the amount of and collection of taxes, the payment of taxes, and costs otherwise incurred in order to carry out the authorized purposes of the Community Facilities District; and any other expenses incidental to the construction, completion, and inspection of the Facilities and permitted under the Act.
BOUNDARIES OF SPECIAL TAX DISTRICT

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THIS ___ DAY OF ___.

RAMON C. CORTEZ, CLERK OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE MAP SHOWING PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, WAS APPROVED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AT A REGULAR MEETING THEREOF, HELD ON THE 9TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1990, BY ITS RESOLUTION NO. 90-0281.

RAMON C. CORTEZ, CLERK OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

FILED THIS ___ DAY OF ___ 1990, AT THE HOUR OF ___ O'CLOCK ___ M. IN BOOK ___ OF MAPS OF ASSESSMENT AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICTS AT PAGE ___ IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER IN THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

BRUCE JAMISON
COUNTY RECORDER
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE: TITLE 3 DIVISION 1 CHAPTER 2 ARTICLE 2, 23128 — SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY LIMITS

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER, BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN MATEO IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN, ON THE EXTENSION OF NORTHERN LINE OF T3S OF MOUNT DIABLO BASE; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE PACIFIC COAST, TO ITS POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE WESTERLY EXTENSION OF THE LOW-WATER LINE ON THE NORTHERN SIDE OF THE ENTRANCE TO SAN FRANCISCO BAY, BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MARIN AND NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE EASTERLY, THROUGH POINT BONITA AND POINT CAVALLO, TO THE MOST SOUTHEASTERN POINT OF ANGEL ISLAND, ALL ON THE LINE OF MARIN; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERN LINE OF MARIN, TO THE NORTHWEST POINT OF GOLDEN ROCK (ALSO KNOW AS RED ROCK), BEING A COMMON CORNER OF MARIN, CONTRA COSTA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE SOUTH-EAST FOUR AND ONE-HALF STATUTE MILES TO A POINT ESTABLISHED AS THE CORNER COMMON TO CONTRA COSTA, ALAMEDA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE SOUTHERLY, ON THE WESTERN LINE OF ALAMEDA COUNTY TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF T3S, RAW, M.D.B. & M., THENCE WESTERLY ON THE TOWNSHIP LINES AND AN EXTENSION THEREOF TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING. THE ISLANDS KNOW AS THE FARRALONIES (FARRALLONA) ARE A PART OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY.

PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO STATE OF CALIFORNIA

KCA ENGINEERS, INC.
CONSULTING CIVIL ENGINEERS

JANUARY 1990
Equipment Lease Financing

PROPOSITION C

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to
specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of
equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that
the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types
of lease financing?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City obtains computers,
telephone systems and other equipment by paying for
it all at once or by leasing it until it is paid for, which is
called "lease financing." The City may not enter into
long-term leases for financing equipment unless (1)
the voters approve it, or (2) the lease requires the
Board of Supervisors to approve the payments each
year. When the Board of Supervisors must approve
the lease payments each year, interest rates are
higher than when the lease payments are not subject
to annual approval. Also, interest rates charged by
for-profit companies are generally higher than interest
rates charged by non-profit corporations.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amend-
ment. Under Proposition C, the Board of Supervisors,
without voter approval, could authorize the lease fi-
nancing of equipment without the lease payments
being subject to annual approval. A non-profit corpo-
ration would be created to buy the equipment and
would issue tax-exempt debt to pay for it. The City
would lease the equipment from the non-profit until it
was paid for. The total principal of the debt issued by
the non-profit corporation could not be more than $20
million in the first year. This limit on the outstanding
principal would increase five percent each year. The
Board could approve this type of lease financing only
if the Controller certified that the interest cost to the
City would be lower than under other types of lease
financing.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to
allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type
of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want
to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type
of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

Controller’s Statement on “C”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the
following statement on the fiscal impact of Propo-
sition C:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be
adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself,
affoct the cost of government. However, as a
product of its possible future application, costs
could be increased or decreased in presently
indeterminate but probably not substantial
amounts."

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on
the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Angela Alioto, Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez,
Terence Hallinan, Thomas Hsieh, Willie Kennedy, Bill
Maher, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, and Doris
Ward.

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would allow the City to lease finance needed equipment at the lowest possible interest rates. The City would establish a non-profit corporation, which would buy equipment approved by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors and lease it to City departments.

The charter currently requires the voters to approve lease financing if done through non-profit corporations. Financing through a non-profit is the less expensive method because interest rates are tax-exempt. The City has had to occasionally use the more expensive method because it is not always possible to delay purchasing critical equipment until an election is held.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Saves the City money by allowing current and future leases for equipment to be financed at lower interest rates (currently 6% to 7%) than must now be used with private corporations (ranging 9% to 16%).
By simply refinancing existing leases, the City could save over $500,000.
Additional money could be saved on any future leases.
Gives the City the option to pay cash for equipment or to finance it expeditiously at a low cost to the City.
Allows quicker replacement of inefficient and outdated equipment, which will reduce maintenance costs, decrease downtime, and increase productivity for equipment which has outlived its economic useful life.
Provides restrictions to insure prudent use of this financing mechanism.
Requires the Controller to certify that the lease is the least costly financing method.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition C
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition C

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

7.309 Voter Approval of Lease Financing
(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purposes of this section, “lease financing” occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.
(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:
   (1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or
   (2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or
   (3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.

Remember to VOTE on Election Day, Tuesday June 5, 1990.
Your polling place is open from 7:00 in the morning to 8:00 in the evening.
Recycling is not only easier than you might think, it’s a simple way you can do your part for environmental conservation—and feel good about it, too.

All you need is an ordinary brown paper bag.

Each time you set up your kitchen garbage, place an extra brown bag or two out for recycling. Then every day just drop your newspaper into a recycling bag—a week’s worth of papers fits perfectly (and your newspapers will stop piling up on the floor!).

When you’re finished with an aluminum soda or beer can simply pop it in a separate bag. The same goes for bottles: just put them in a bag, labels and all. Then when you’re on the way to the supermarket or heading out for the day, drop off the bags at a Recycling Center near you. Or, you can tie your newspaper with string and the garbage company will collect it free of charge.

That’s it. When you think about it, isn’t recycling almost as easy as not recycling?

And it really is the right thing to do.

For a free Recycling Guide and a list of Recycling Centers near you, call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL
554-6193
PROPOSITION D

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no special City fund to pay for neighborhood beautification projects or graffiti clean-up. Money can be spent for this purpose only when the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors approve it in the City’s budget.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is an ordinance that would create a “Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund” (“the Fund”) to pay for cleaning up graffiti on public buildings and beautifying the neighborhood.

The Chief Administrative Officer would manage the Fund. Businesses could pay up to one percent of their payroll or business taxes into the Fund. Grants or money donated for graffiti clean-up would be deposited in the Fund. The goal of the ordinance is to produce for the Fund $1,000,000 each year, adjusted annually for inflation. The Controller would change the percentage of taxes businesses could pay into the Fund to produce $1,000,000 in the fund each fiscal year.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this fund.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

“Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, General Fund revenues could decrease by as much as $1.4 million in fiscal 1990 and as much as $1 million per year, adjusted for inflation, thereafter.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker.
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D asks the voters to make the revitalization of our neighborhoods and the wiping out of graffiti a top city priority without raising taxes.

Proposition D will permit those employers currently eligible in San Francisco to earmark up to 1% of their payroll or gross receipts tax bill to establish The Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

The fund will be used to award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city. The Budget Analyst has estimated that approximately one million dollars would be available every year.

Proposition D creates a unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers to keep our city attractive. It will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting and graffiti clean-up.

Also, Proposition D will fund public information and education campaigns to combat litter, and instill in our youth the old-fashioned virtue of respect for public and private property.

The fund created by Proposition D will be administered by the Chief Administrative Officer with public input from environmental organizations and neighborhood committees.

Proposition D was authored by Supervisor Jim Gonzalez and has been submitted to the voters with the support of the Sierra Club, San Francisco Beautiful, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

According to their ballot argument, the Board of Supervisors wants to create a "unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers" to reduce graffiti. What’s stopping them from doing that now?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

The supervisors also say they want to provide "seed money" for planting trees and improving street lighting. Why, haven’t they placed items in the city budget to do so?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

In their rebuttal argument, the supervisors claim that "many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle." Whose fault is that, if not their own?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

Finally, the supervisors have the temerity to state: "With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark" funds for graffiti. What would be "fair" is if San Francisco businesses paid lower taxes. But no one should be "earmarking" tax dollars except elected representatives of the people!

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

There’s no question that graffiti is a serious problem demanding serious solutions. But what good is it to divert $1,000,000 a year from other city programs? That’s robbing Peter to pay Paul! It’s bad government!

Why do we need Proposition D? We don’t.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

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

I know something about graffiti.
I wrote the city ordinances prohibiting the sale of spray paint and large, felt-tip pens to minors. I also authored the state law to allow police officers greater latitude in arresting juveniles who deface public transit vehicles. This year, I'm pursuing a bill to revoke for one year the driver's license of any person convicted of graffiti vandalism.

Proposition D is not about graffiti or "neighborhood beautification". It's about diverting millions from the city's General Fund. It's about depriving existing city programs of critically needed revenue. Proposition D is a financial shell game.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Proposition D would allow any city business to designate up to 1% of its payroll tax check for deposit in a special fund. According to the supervisors' Budget Analyst, Proposition D could divert up to $1,440,260 from the General Fund in the program's first year.

Thereafter, annual diversions would approximate $1,000,000, plus inflation.

That's over $1,000,000 per year which cannot be spent on police services, fire protection, libraries, and public health.

As you can plainly see from my legislative record, I'm no soft touch when it comes to graffiti prevention and clean-up. But Proposition D is the wrong approach. "Special funds" and "segregated accounts" have no place in our city budget.

Graffiti programs deserve adequate city funding, and the Board of Supervisors and Mayor should move promptly to appropriate such funds in the next regular budgetary cycle.

The voters, meanwhile, should move promptly to reject Proposition D on June 5th!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We need a city plan that invests in the quality of our neighborhoods . . . Now. It's obvious laws banning the sale of spray paint and felt pens have done nothing to stop the sprawl of graffiti or create a climate of cooperation between city officials and neighborhood groups to find real solutions.

Proposition D is about beautifying our neighborhoods consistently. Proposition D is about wiping out graffiti permanently. With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark a mere one-hundredth to be poured back into the neighborhoods.

Out of a greater than two billion dollar annual budget, the city can afford a guaranteed million dollars to help keep our city beautiful, clean, and graffiti-free. Year in and year out, many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle. Proposition D will provide a solid foundation for the revitalization of our neighborhoods, which no one can tamper with and that requires no new taxes.

Over the last few years, individual Supervisors have spent many weekends planting trees and removing graffiti with neighborhood groups. Working with groups such as SF ALIVE, San Francisco Conservation Corps, 24th Street Revitalization Committee and the West Portal Merchants Association to make our neighborhoods shine has taught us one thing . . . neighborhood environmentalists and city departments working together as partners will be a winning combination for San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

When City Hall and neighborhood organizations work together, problems can be solved. Vote YES on D.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

There is a reason that the San Francisco Beautiful, the Sierra Club and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, along with dozens of neighborhood groups support placing PROPOSITION D on the ballot.

San Franciscans are united in wanting to preserve and enhance our city’s attractiveness and keep San Francisco one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

Our Supervisors put PROPOSITION D on the ballot for your approval because they realize that a more attractive city starts with people like you and me and our neighbors who truly care about San Francisco.

YES ON PROPOSITION D creates a working partnership between our neighborhoods and city government;

YES ON PROPOSITION D means a more beautiful city and enhancement of your neighborhood and mine;

YES ON PROPOSITION D accomplishes this with NO NEW TAXES, allowing large employers to earmark up to 1% of their current payroll tax for beautification and graffiti cleanup;

YES ON PROPOSITION D pays for neighborhood-generated projects, giving residents a say in how these reserved funds are spent;

YES ON PROPOSITION D is the first step to guaranteeing more beautiful and attractive neighborhoods.

Join your neighbors, business owners and environmentalists by voting YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Al Pross, Chair
COMMITTEE FOR BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBORHOODS

The quality of life in our neighborhoods will truly become a top city priority with the passage of Proposition D.

• Proposition D will provide over a million dollars a year from the business community to stop neighborhood decay (through a voluntary checkoff on their payroll or gross receipts tax bill).

• Proposition D will award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city.

• Proposition D will provide the necessary seed money for caring

neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting, and graffiti clean-up.

• Proposition D will fund an educational campaign to teach our youngsters a new respect for public and private property.

Let’s protect our city’s special livability. Let’s foster civic pride.

Let’s invest in the long term health of San Francisco’s residential neighborhoods. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Supervisor Jim Gonzales

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

Graffiti is a blight on the beauty of San Francisco. We strongly encourage the continued generosity of grants and donations to eradicate this problem. However, during the current deficit-ridden period, it is irresponsible for the City to direct at least $1,000,000 a year from the General Fund for this purpose.

The San Francisco Republican Party urges you to vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkeley
William E. Grayson

Anna M. Guth
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”

Why add more government to your taxes.

$1 million per year to be funded from Payroll taxes which has a sunset clause to expire in 1990.

Then who pays the tab? You do.

If the police would assert their powers and nab the violators, instead of the City offering to pay to clean up their “works of art” this ordinance would not be necessary.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Marguerite Warren

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

AN ORDINANCE, ADDING SECTIONS 10.98 AND 10.98-1 TO THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO ESTABLISH A NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND AND SPECIFYING THE PURPOSES WHEREOF AND AMENDING PART III, SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, BY ADDING ARTICLE 12B-1 THERETO, TO PROVIDE THAT ANY BUSINESS WHICH OWES A PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX OR BUSINESS TAX MAY ELECT TO DESIGNATE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE TAX FOR DEPOSIT IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND.

NOTE: All sections are new.

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Sections 10.98 and 10.98-1 thereto, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.98. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND; FINDINGS AND INTENT.

(a) Findings.
1. The proliferation of graffiti on public buildings and other public property has created a blight which offends both citizens of and visitors to San Francisco. The removal of such graffiti will enhance the beauty of the city in which we live and will encourage others to visit and to relocate here. Removal will thus both reflect and renew our civic pride and contribute to our economic viability. Providing a source of funds for the promotion of neighborhood beautification projects will support the efforts of local residents and businesses to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and the local economy, and assist in reducing the amount of graffiti in San Francisco.

(b) Statement of Intent.
1. The Board of Supervisors wishes to address the above concerns by establishing a neighborhood beautification and graffiti clean-up fund which will promote neighborhood beautification projects, including projects designed to improve the environmental quality of neighborhoods, and to decline the number of graffiti on public property.

SEC. 10.98-1. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND; ESTABLISHMENT; ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS; DUTIES.

(a) Establishment of Fund. There is hereby established a special fund for the purpose of receiving all donations of money which may be collected by the City and County of San Francisco for the purposes enumerated in Section 10.98(b). Monies deposited in the fund shall only be expended for the purposes enumerated therein, provided that such expenditures shall include reimbursement to City and County departments for expenses incurred in the administration of the fund. The special fund shall be known and designated as the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

(b) Acceptance of Gifts. Monies, donations, and other funds collected by the City and County of San Francisco for the purposes enumerated in Section 10.98(b) shall be deposited into said special fund.

(c) Duties of the Chief Administrative Officer. The Chief Administrative Officer shall pre-arrange such rules and regulations as he or she may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Section and Section 10.98, and any rules and regulations, the Chief Administrative Officer shall provide a thirty (30) day public comment period by providing published notice in an official newspaper of general circulation in the City of the intent to issue or amend the rules and regulations. Such rules and regulations shall be approved by the Board of Supervisors. Such rules and regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the qualifications of applicants and factors to be considered in the award of grants to fund programs to help remove graffiti and promote neighborhood beautification projects, including preference for the following projects: youth programs and innovation projects that are neighborhood generated, and projects designed to benefit areas of San Francisco that are economically disadvantaged.

The Chief Administrative Officer shall submit a semi-annual report to the Board of Supervisors setting forth an accounting of the amounts disbursed and the uses for which said funds were made.

(d) Budgetary and Fiscal Provisions of the Charter. The monies in this fund are subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter and may be expended only when authorized by appropriation ordinance of the Board of Supervisors.

(e) Interest. Interest earned from the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund shall become part of the principal thereof, and shall not be expended for any purpose other than that for which said fund is established.

(f) Accumulation of Monies in Fund. The balance remaining in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Section 6.306 and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said fund for the purposes recited herein.

Section 2. Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code is hereby amended by adding Article 12B-1 therefor, to read as follows:

ART. 12B-1

NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND TAX

OPTION
SEC. 1030. Initial Option. Commencing in tax year 1990, any business, as defined in Section 1002.1 of this Code, that is subject to the Payroll Expense Tax or the Business Tax may elect to designate up to one per cent (1%) of its tax liability for deposit in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

SEC. 1031. Amount of Fund Annually. It is the intent of the voters of the City and County of San Francisco that one million dollars ($1,000,000.00), derived from tax proceeds designated by the taxpayers pursuant to Section 1031, shall be deposited annually into the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund. The Controller shall annually adjust this figure for inflation to reflect changes in the most recently available U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose Metropolitan Area, or its successor index.

SEC. 1032. Subsequent Option. For each tax year after 1990, the Controller shall determine the amount of fund revenues actually generated in the prior year, including the interest thereon and the balance, if any, remaining at the close of the tax year. On the basis of the prior year's experience of taxpayer contributions and total revenues generated by the payroll expense and business taxes, the Controller shall calculate a percentage ceiling of total tax liability which taxpayers may designate for deposit in the fund for the following tax year. The Controller shall set the percentage ceiling so that the revenues produced thereby are most likely to generate a total of one million dollars (adjusted for inflation) in the fund for the forthcoming tax year. The Controller shall transmit his or her calculation to the Board of Supervisors, which shall adopt a new tax designation ceiling, if necessary, in advance of the tax year to enable the Tax Collector to perform his or her collection duties.

SEC. 1033. Severability. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective. In addition, the voters declare their intention that should any portion of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof thereafter be declared unconstitutional or invalid in whole or in part, such invalidity shall have no effect upon the continued validity of the Payroll Expense Tax and Business Tax.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PROPOSITION F
Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Fire Commission has the authority to decide the number and staffing of fire companies and the number and location of fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors may change the number of firefighters. The Fire Commission may close or move fire stations or reduce the number of fire companies if it decides they are no longer needed. A fire company typically consists of a fire engine or other emergency vehicle and the firefighters needed to operate it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would specify a minimum number of fire stations and fire companies and minimum levels of staffing for those fire companies. Proposition F would increase the number of firefighters assigned to some types of fire companies. This means that the number of firefighters on duty at all times would increase from 297 to 322. Where necessary, Proposition F’s minimum level of staffing would be met by firefighters working overtime. Overtime pay for firefighters is one and one-half times their normal salary.

Proposition F would limit the power of the Fire Commission, Mayor and Board of Supervisors to set the number of fire stations and staffing levels.

Before closing any fire station or reducing the number of fire companies or units required by Proposition F, the measure would require (1) a recommendation by the Fire Chief; (2) approval by the Fire Commission, after public hearings; (3) approval by the Board of Supervisors; and (4) approval by the voters.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current salary rates and staffing levels of the Fire Department, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $4.9 million per year.”

How “F” Got on the Ballot

On March 2, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition F to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,485* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 21 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 56,364 of the signatures submitted were valid, 15,879 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WHAT IS PROP F?

PROPOSITION F IS A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WILL ESTABLISH A MINIMUM LEVEL OF FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS FOR SAN FRANCISCO. IT GIVES THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE FIRE CHIEF THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MANAGE THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITIZENS.

SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT BECAUSE IT WILL:

1. GUARANTEE THAT THE PRESENT 41 FIRE STATIONS STAY OPEN
2. GUARANTEE FULLY-STAFFED FIRE TRUCKS AT ALL TIMES
3. GUARANTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BEFORE ANY FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED
4. GUARANTEE THAT YOUR FIREBOAT WILL BE STAFFED WITH A FIREFIGHTING CREW OF TWO THE 7.1 QUAKE OF OCTOBER 17 WARNED US AGAIN — WE MUST BE PREPARED!

ITEM A — MAYOR AGNOS CUT THE FIRE DEPART-

MENT ON-DUTY STAFFING BY 19 PERSONS A DAY IN 1989.

PROP F RESTORES THOSE CUTS.


ITEM C — PROP F DOES NOT REQUIRE "GUARANTEED OVERTIME" AND, IN FACT, BY JULY 1992 NO OVERTIME WILL BE NEEDED FOR THE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS OF PROP F.

(Overtime is now caused by large numbers of vacant positions. New hiring will eliminate all vacancies and overtime by July 1992. Prop F will safeguard this full-staffing.)

PROP F IS A COMMON SENSE MEASURE TO GIVE ADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION TO ALL CITIZENS.

VOTE YES ON F!

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F;
COMMITTEE FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTH-
QUAKE PREPAREDNESS
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

It is clear that Proposition F is not a Fire Safety Issue. It is clearly an issue to guarantee overtime.

1. This Mayor and Board of Supervisors have never closed a single fire station and have no intention to close firehouses.
2. Most major cities in America considers five firefighters per truck to be fully-staffed. More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire.
3. Proposition F will not restore cuts in firefighters. We are mandated by law to provide 90 new firefighters this year. Proposition F only guarantees overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day, $3.5 million per year.

Our firefighters do a tough job! But we compensate them well! We need new equipment — not more overtime. Following the earthquake, a fire truck had to be taken from the fire museum to fight fires. Let's not waste money which could be used for new firefighting equipment.

San Francisco voters rejected a similar proposal in 1987 and it should be rejected again in 1990.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.
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OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will waste millions of your tax dollars. Just look at the facts.

Fact: Proposition F does not hire new firefighters. The Federal Consent Decree already sets hiring standards — 90 new firefighters will be hired this year without Prop. F.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that Assistant Chiefs and Battalion Chiefs will continue to have chauffeurs.

Fact: Proposition F is not needed to save fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors have no intention of closing any fire stations.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that 18 current firefighters will get daily time-and-a-half overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day . . . or more than $3.5 million extra per year.

Fact: Proposition F is not a fire safety issue. Virtually every major American city deploys five or fewer firefighters on fire trucks. A sixth firefighter is featherbedding, not firefighting.

More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire. That’s enough people to raise ladders, ventilate rooftops and carry out lifesaving tasks.

FACT: Our firefighters do a tough job. But they are well compensated already and do not need additional guaranteed overtime . . . especially when there are so many other pressing needs in San Francisco.

FACT: Firefighters in San Francisco are currently paid $300 more per month than the average salaries of firefighters in the four largest California cities. But the other firefighters work 15 percent more hours than San Francisco.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters already receive 23 percent more vacation, sick and holiday leave than other city workers. A recent study by the Controller shows that increased overtime results in increased sick leave and disability.

Study the facts and you’ll agree. Proposition F is nothing more than $7 million per year in unnecessary guaranteed overtime.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

FACT: PROP F does:
• Guarantee that the 90 new firefighters cannot later be eliminated by politicians.
• Require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people before cutbacks can be made to the minimum staffing.
FACT: The Mayor DID cut back Fire Department staffing in August 1989 from 315 to 296.
FACT: Assistant and Battalion Chiefs DO NOT have “chauffeurs.” They DO have an operations and communications assistant.
FACT: Prop F IS needed to guarantee public review and input before any fire station can be closed.
FACT: SIX fire stations have been closed by the Mayor’s office since 1972 without any public review.
FACT: Prop F DOES guarantee that the 19 on-duty firefighters cut by the Mayor in 1989 will be restored. When sufficient new firefighters are hired, NO OVERTIME will be required.
FACT: PROP F IS A FIRE SAFETY ISSUE!
FACT: San Francisco firefighters ARE REQUIRED to work overtime because previous policies of politicians allowed large numbers of vacant positions to occur.
FACT: San Francisco firefighters DO NOT get a paid health plan for dependents, nor do they get longevity pay or other benefits enjoyed by firefighters in the four largest California cities.
FACT: ALL city employees, including firefighters, receive EXACTLY THE SAME vacation, sick and holiday leave. This is a city Charter requirement.

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

I STRONGLY SUPPORT PROP F!
Prop F will benefit all the people of San Francisco. Over 71,000 voters from every part of the City signed the petition to put Prop F on the ballot. They expressed enthusiastic support for a stronger Fire Department.

The City is becoming increasingly built-up, causing greater congestion. This means that fire hazards are increasing and adequate fire protection will be even more important to us than ever.

The October 17th earthquake was an urgent reminder of how fragile our city is and how important our Fire Department is to all of us.

When you, the people, call for help, whether it is for a medical emergency, a rescue, or fire, the firefighters come.

PROF F MAKES SENSE FOR ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!
It allows you to participate in fire safety decisions that affect your neighborhood.

Our neighborhoods are the “heart” of San Francisco. OUR FAMILIES, HOMES, CHURCHES, FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS NEED SATISFACTORY FIRE PROTECTION.

PROF F WILL MAKE SAN FRANCISCO A SAFER PLACE TO LIVE IN.

VOTE YES ON F!

Bill Maher, Member
Board of Supervisors

I STRONGLY SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
They provide vital services to our citizens. Last year, our firefighters answered a record-breaking 58,000 alarms and saved thousands of lives. The greatest number of calls came from the Tenderloin, the Inner Mission, the Fillmore, Civic Center/Hayes Valley, Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley. I WANT TO BE SURE YOU GET THE HELP YOU NEED — WHEN YOU NEED IT!

Over the past 20 years, unlike other city departments, Fire Department staffing has been slashed by 40%! THREE FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT AGREE THAT THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY ARE TOO FEW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS. THEY AGREE THAT NO MORE FIREHOUSES SHOULD BE CLOSED.

We NEED Proposition F. It will:
• Put firefighters back on the ladder trucks
• Put firefighters back on our fireboat
• Bring daily staffing up to an adequate level
• Guarantee that any proposed closings of fire companies will be subject to a public review and vote by the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people
• Guarantee the SFFD the funding it needs

THE COST OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT IS ONLY 2 CENTS A DAY FOR EACH OF US! That 2 cents could easily save a life — maybe yours, or that of a loved one. PROP. F WILL BENEFIT ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

I STRONGLY SUPPORT IMPROVED FIRE PROTECTION IN SAN FRANCISCO!

I SHARE THE CONCERNS OF THE 71,000 VOTERS WHO PUT THIS PROPOSITION ON THE BALLOT. Fire Department daily staffing has been forced so low that our safety is threatened. WE MUST KEEP OUR FIREHOUSES OPEN AND FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED.

In addition to fighting fires, our firefighters perform many services for our elderly, disabled and low income families that no one else does. FIREFIGHTERS RESPONDED TO OVER 26,000 EMERGENCIES LAST YEAR, INCLUDING 26,000 MEDICAL CALLS.

We depend on our firefighters to protect our families, homes, and businesses. Our narrow streets, steep hills and rows of wood frame buildings make firefighting very difficult. SAN FRANCISCO HAS SPECIAL FIREFIGHTING AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL NEEDS! We are different from other California cities with their wide streets, flat terrain and detached buildings!

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING FOR PROPOSITION F. THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL BENEFIT ALL OUR CITIZENS.

WENDY NELDER, Member
Board of Supervisors

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

STOP REDUCTIONS IN CITY FIRE PROTECTION! VOTE YES ON F!

Over 71,000 San Francisco voters from every neighborhood, ethnic group and economic level joined to put PROPOSITION F on this ballot. They are concerned because politicians have reduced daily staffing to a dangerous all-time low while emergency calls reached an all-time high of 58,000 last year. People want their neighborhood firehouses to stay open and their fire engines, aerial ladder trucks and fireboat fully staffed to meet their emergency needs. They want a Charter amendment to take politics out of fire safety decisions.

Remember October 17th! We learned that we need a strong Fire Department to fight fires, perform rescues and coordinate civilian volunteers. When both bridges are down, we need a strong SFFD!

THIS IS A COMMON SENSE PROPOSITION — IT IS SUPPORTED BY 3 FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT!

Join your friends and neighbors! VOTE YES ON F!

John L. Molinari
Former member of the Board of Supervisors

ONLY YOU CAN STOP FURTHER DANGEROUS CUTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

Over the years, the San Francisco Fire Department has assisted hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans in time of great personal need. The people understand how important the SFFD is in their lives, and OVER 71,000 OF THEM SIGNED THE PETITION TO PLACE PROPOSITION F ON THE BALLOT. The citizens want to be heard!

SFFD EMERGENCY RESPONSES ARE INCREASING DRAMATICALLY EVERY YEAR! Fiscal year totals have gone from 28,000 in 1970 to over 58,000 in 1989, while politicians have slashed daily on-duty staffing from 482, when I was Fire Chief, to today’s all-time low of 296. Department resources are being stretched thinner and thinner despite greater and greater needs. THIS DANGEROUS TREND MUST BE STOPPED!

The Department must be able to meet the complex and highly varied needs of today’s San Francisco. These include fighting structural fires, providing medical assistance, performing cliff and water rescues, responding to BART and MUNI fires and accidents, controlling hazardous materials emergencies, assisting victims of industrial accidents, and responding to many other emergency needs.

Many seniors, low income families and handicapped people rely on the SFFD to help them. THE PERSONAL ATTENTION THAT THE SFFD PROVIDES CAN NEVER BE CONVERTED TO SELF-SERVICE OR AUTOMATED! Firefighters, not machines, put out fires, perform rescues and meet all the other emergency needs of our city. You need these firefighters! THE NEXT CALL MAY BE YOURS!

The need for Fire Department services crosses all social, ethnic and economic strata. We can all get behind this quality of life issue. Proposition F will strengthen your Fire Department and take politics out of fire safety.

William F. Murray
Chief of Department, SFFD, Retired

VOTE YES ON PROP F!

It takes teamwork to put out a fire. Without it, lives and property can be lost. Without it, firefighters can pay a hard price, for their lives, when in danger, may depend on having a buddy to lend a hand or go for help. As much a part of their job as hose, ladders, and water is that firefighters work in pairs when possible. It can be critical where dense smoke obscures vision or — as so many San Francisco neighborhoods well know — when trying to maneuver on a steeply pitched roof.

Current staffing of aerial ladder trucks leaves one firefighter without a buddy, the team short one vital hand. Proposition F will restore the balance that a fire — and time-tested system needs.

It also will mean two firefighters ready to move out with the fireboat when it has a job to do. Because they weren’t readily available, the fireboat was delayed in pumping bay water to put out the disastrous Marina fire after last October’s earthquake.

That’s why I’m voting “Yes” on Prop F and am urging all San Franciscans to do the same.

Edward J. Phipps
Chief of Department, SFFD (Retired)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I OWE MY LIFE TO THE QUICK AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS STATIONED AT MY LOCAL FIREHOUSE

Over 26,000 San Franciscans received emergency medical assistance last year by the SFFD. Many lives were saved because firefighters were on the scene in 3 minutes of less. The neighborhood firehouse is an essential part of San Francisco's complex fire protection system.

The October 17th earthquake and the great Marina fire showed us how vital it is to have our Fire Department maintained at an adequate level. There were no firefighters on board the Fireboat Phoenix when it arrived in the Marina, and for over 1 1/2 hours firefighting and search and rescue operations were hindered by a lack of firefighters, as well as by a lack of water. UNDERSTAFFING CAN CAUSE FIRE DEATHS.

Proposition F will answer these critical needs by restoring funds for adequate staffing of fire companies, including the fireboat, and it will require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission and Board of Supervisors before any further cutbacks in fire protection can be made.

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING YES ON F!

John Barbagelata

PENNY-POWER! LOOK —
HOW CAN YOU BUY SOMETHING PRICELESS FOR ONLY PENNIES A DAY?

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F!
FOR ONLY 2 CENTS PER DAY, YOU WILL:
  • KEEP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIREHOUSE OPEN
  • KEEP FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED
  • KEEP YOUR FIREBOAT IN SERVICE AND STAFFED WITH FIREFIGHTERS
  • GUARANTEE THAT NO FIREHOUSES OR FIRE COMPANIES WILL BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT
  • REMOVE POLITICS FROM FIRE SAFETY
THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL COST EACH OF SAN FRANCISCO'S 732,000 RESIDENTS JUST PENNIES A DAY:

YEAR 1 — COST $5.3 MILLION = 2 CENTS PER DAY!
YEAR 2 — COST $2.8 MILLION = 1 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 3 — COST $0.8 MILLION = 1/2 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 4 — NO ADDITIONAL COST!

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE POLICY YOU WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY.
DON'T MISS THE CHANCE!

W.F. O'Keefe, Sr.
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

WE STRONGLY SUPPORT PROPOSITION F!
No one worries more about costs than working people. For their hard-earned dollars, breadwinners demand value in return.

Value is what Proposition F is all about. It restores adequate staffing of engine and ladder truck companies, staffs the fireboat, and assures that you and I will have a voice in any proposed closing of a fire company or firehouse.

Proposition F is an insurance policy that is clearly a benefit to all San Franciscans. And, there is no question that the benefits greatly exceed the cost — to each of us, just 2 cents a day for the first year, 1 cent a day for the second year, and no cost thereafter.

Without adequate fire protection, San Francisco has too much to lose.

VOTE YES ON F!

Walter L. Johnson
San Francisco Labor Council

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

SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
THEY PROVIDE ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL SERVICES FOR OUR CITIZENS, AND NO ONE ELSE CAN DO THEIR JOB! We have 500 high rise buildings, BART and MUNI tunnels, and large business, school and hospital complexes where firefighting requires many firefighters.
On October 17, we were lucky! It was just a warning.
THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY IS TOO LOW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR

DISASTER NEEDS!
Let’s all get behind Proposition F! It will assure stability in Department funding, guarantee adequate staffing for our firehouses and apparatus, and permit long-range planning and improvements. Our firefighters need your vote!

James A. Hood
Chairman
San Franciscans for Fire Safety

VOTE YES ON F!
SAN FRANCISCO IS A FRAGILE CITY. OVER 90% OF ALL STRUCTURES ARE OF WOOD FRAME CONSTRUCTION. YOUR HOMES ARE BUILT IN SOLID BLOCKS OF WOODEN BUILDINGS. THIS SITUATION PRESENTS THE POSSIBILITY OF A DISASTEROUS FIRE OR CONFLAGRATION OCCURRING, ESPECIALLY FOLLOWING AN EARTHQUAKE.
THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS THE LIFELINE FOR ALL OF US WHO LIVE IN THIS CITY. THE EARTHQUAKE ON OCTOBER 17TH AND THE GREAT FIRE IN THE MARINA SHOW HOW IMPORTANT THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS TO SAN FRANCISCO.

POLITICIANS ARE USING SHRILL RHETORIC AND OTHER OFFENSIVE TACTICS IN AN ATTEMPT TO MISLEAD THE PUBLIC AS TO WHAT THE REAL MEANING OF PROP F IS. DON'T BE MISLED! PROP F PROVIDES THREE MAIN POINTS:

- ESTABLISHES THE PRESENT 41 NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS AS A MINIMUM STANDARD
- PUTS A FIREFIGHTING CREW ON THE FIREBOAT
- REQUIRES PUBLIC HEARINGS AND APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE CITIZENS BEFORE A FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED.

These are common sense measures that provide a minimum level of public safety for our families and city.
Please join me, and the 70,000 other San Franciscans who signed the petitions to put Prop F on the ballot, and vote yes on ‘F!’

FRANK T. BLACKBURN
ASSISTANT FIRE CHIEF

VOTE YES ON F!
Fire protection is vital for our families and businesses.
Prop F will stabilize protection and prevent further cuts in the Fire Department.
Protect our city. Vote Yes on F.

Robt. E. Donohue
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
Charles D. Cresci
Deputy Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Charles H. Lee
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)

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

DON'T TAKE YOUR FIREFIGHTERS FOR GRANTED!
San Francisco firefighters answered a record 58,000 calls for help last year. Of these, 26,000 were for medical emergencies. Heart attacks, auto accidents, building collapses, childbirths were just a few. BUT EVERY YEAR THERE ARE FEWER AND FEWER FIREFIGHTERS TO HELP YOU! In 1970 there were 482 firefighters on duty each day — in 1990 there are only 296! Six firehouses and 12 fire companies have been closed.

FIRE SAFETY DECISIONS MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE HANDS OF POLITICIANS! Only a Charter amendment will assure that your Fire Department is adequately staffed to meet San Francisco's special needs — now and in the future. FOR JUST 2 CENTS A DAY, WE CAN KEEP OUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS OPEN AND OUR FIRE APPARATUS ADEQUATELY STAFFED.

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE WE WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON'T MISS THE CHANCE! VOTE YES ON F!

Walter G. Jebe
John J. Figone
Caesar A. Churchwell
Alessandro Baccari
Virgil Caselli
Marsha Garland
Tom Creedon
Ed Farrah
Michael Salerno

NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS
Pride, trust, reliance. They're all wrapped up in a San Francisco institution. The neighborhood fire station turns out to be more — it's a rock, an anchor, a point of reference in people's lives.

City residents have said so loud and clear in endorsing Proposition F. Besides setting a minimum number of firefighters to be on duty each day, the June ballot measure guarantees a public hearing in the area concerned and a vote of the people, if needed, before any fire station may be closed.

Seventy thousand people petitioned to put F on the ballot. Their reasons all had a common core. It's not THE fire station but OUR fire station, they said — a place to expect and get help in a fire or medical emergency, a place the local community can turn to and rely on if the earth shakes, buildings fall, and other resources break down.

Neighborhoods and fire stations. The one requires the other, San Franciscans say.

John W. Flaherty
Mark L. Kaplan
Robert L. Barisone
Elvera Jane Barisone
William A. Roberts Jr.
Maureen Porter
William Porter Jr.
Homer G. Miles
Dorothy L. Miles
Peter C. Gardner
Joan M. Gardner
John Daly
Lucia R. Flaherty
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T BE MISLED BY MAYOR AGNOS!
PROP F IS A LIFE AND DEATH ISSUE!
FIRE, INSURANCE AND EARTHQUAKE EXPERTS AGREE: SAN FRANCISCO FACES THE HIGHEST RISK OF CONFLAGRATION OF ANY CITY IN THE UNITED STATES!
FIRE RISK IS HIGHER THAN IN 1906!
SAN FRANCISCO'S FIRE PROTECTION NEEDS ARE DICTATED BY THE NATURE OF OUR CITY, with its:
• Blocks and blocks of adjoining wood frame buildings
• Steep hills
• Narrow streets
• Traffic congestion
• Network of overhead electrical, trolley and telephone lines
• Prevailing winds
• 500 high rise buildings
• High density residential areas
• Large population of seniors and low-income families
• High vulnerability to severe earthquake damage
• Isolation from outside help in time of disaster
SAN FRANCISCO IS IN TROUBLE BECAUSE THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY. Former SF Fire Chief Emmet Condon in his book "Denial of Disaster":
"THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT IS BELOW THE DAILY MANNING LEVEL THAT ANY EXPERIENCED CHIEF OFFICER KNOWS IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SERVICE TO THE CITY." Condon continues:
"I WOULD AGREE THAT THE HAZARD OF FIRE TO THE CITY AFTER A SIMILAR DISASTER TODAY IS MUCH GREATER THAN IN 1906." And,
"SYNTHETIC MATERIALS HAVE GREATLY INCREASED THE FIRE RISK IN MODERN BUILDINGS AND WILL MAGNIFY THE FIRE PROBLEM IN THE MULTIPLE FIRES THAT WILL BREAK OUT AFTER A SERIOUS EARTHQUAKE."
At least 400 of the city's 500 high rise buildings do not have modern life-safety systems! HIGH RISE FIRES CAUSE A HUGE DRAIN ON FIRE DEPARTMENT RESOURCES.
PROP F IS STRONGLY SUPPORTED BY INDIVIDUALS; CITIZEN, BUSINESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS; FIRE SAFETY EXPERTS, AND A BROAD SPECTRUM OF KNOWLEDGEABLE CIVIC LEADERS.
There is no significant opposition to Prop F.
PROTECT YOURSELF, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR FRIENDS — YOU HAVE A LOT TO LOSE! VOTE YES ON F!

GERRY LONG
Concerned Citizen

WHY VOTE YES ON F? WHY A CHARTER AMENDMENT?
City politicians have been consistently unresponsive to your fire safety concerns. It is the duty of the City to provide its citizens with adequate fire protection and earthquake preparedness. Instead, Fire Department staffing has been cut to a dangerous level.
The politicians say, "Trust us!"
We can see that this has not worked, and a Charter provision is necessary. Your emergency needs are too vital to be left vulnerable to political games.
You hear the sirens every day — BUT HAVE YOU COUNTED

THE FIREFIGHTERS? Fewer firefighters means greatly reduced firefighting capacity. FIRE DEPARTMENT STAFFING IS NOW AT AN ALL-TIME LOW AND CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO FALL FURTHER!
WE NEED A STRONG FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

John Flaherty
Battalion Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Past President, S.F. Fire Chiefs Assn.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

HIGH RISE BUILDINGS AND BART AND MUNI UNDERGROUND FACILITIES MAKE SPECIAL FIRE PROTECTION DEMANDS

Today, San Francisco has over 500 high rise buildings. Fires in these buildings require many firefighters because equipment must be carried by hand to the fire — often up many flights of stairs. In 1988 in Los Angeles, a fire on three floors of a high rise building required 383 firefighters to bring it under control. In San Francisco, our entire on-duty force would be required, leaving the rest of the city completely unprotected. Mutual aid from neighboring communities would be totally inadequate to cover our needs.

BART and MUNI underground facilities present special fire and rescue problems. Large numbers of firefighters are required to fight these fires and perform rescue and evacuation operations.

In July 1989, Mayor Agnos forced reductions in truck company staffing — the key players in rescue and ventilation operations. Now these aerial ladder teams can no longer function properly.

Building ventilation is delayed, greatly increasing the risk of deadly backdrafts.

The Department’s daily staffing has fallen to 296 firefighters, the lowest in history, while fire, medical and other emergencies are higher than ever. Proposition F will bring SFFD staffing up to 320. This is critically needed to meet these ever-increasing demands.

In the past, some Fire Chiefs have thought that you could safely relocate or close a firehouse, but I now recognize that this is dangerous. The SFFD can now get to most emergencies within 3 minutes, but if we lose a firehouse we lose that prompt response. With our rows of wood buildings, our large population of elderly citizens, we must get there quickly.

The SFFD is your lifeline. Protect it! I strongly urge all citizens to vote YES on F!

James P. Olson, President
San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

Any firefighter responsible for any racist act or statement on duty, after due process, should be disciplined. Repeat occurrences must result in severe penalties.

Expensive overtime can be largely eliminated by adding more firefighters.

Differences between the union and the mayor should be resolved through good faith negotiations, not through the election process. Maintaining high morale is the only way to insure efficiency.

The neighborhood service cuts need to be restored.

Vote YES on F.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Becoming a victim in another major earthquake or runaway fire in one of San Francisco’s densely populated neighborhoods continues to be a hazard for all of us.

Nonetheless, because the Firefighters Union did not endorse him, Mayor Agnos has seen fit to reduce the staffing levels of the Fire Department in any twenty-four hour period from 315 to 296. The San Francisco Republican Party believes these cuts are penny-wise, pound-foolish, and politically motivated.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. DO NOT let the Mayor’s political vendetta jeopardize public safety.

William E. Grayson
Anna M. Guth
Tina H. Frank
Christopher L. Bowman
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Burkley

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

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition F. This proposition, if passed, will require twenty-five extra fire fighters to be hired each day - five of these fire fighters will have no specific functions - their daily assignment will be at the discretion of the Chief of Department. It will also require that daily truck staffing be increased from five to six persons and the fireboat staffing be increased by another two fire fighters daily. These increases are unnecessary and are not required - fire suppression units are now staffed to provide effective and efficient fire service for San Francisco.

Proposition F will take management control and responsibility away from the Chief of Department by requiring organizational changes to be approved by the voters at a regular election. This would not allow the Chief, through the Fire Commission, to respond to the changing demands placed on the Fire Department. Fire protection decisions can’t wait until an election. To provide for and maintain the most cost effective and efficient fire department, I urge you to vote NO on Proposition F.

Frederick F. Postel
Chief of Department

Overtime pay is bleeding the Fire Department’s budget dry!
Over 92 percent of the budget goes for personnel costs. In 1988-89 uniformed personnel were paid salaries totaling $3,567,000 plus mandatory fringe benefits of $3,543,000 and still another $118,933,000 for overtime!
Proposition F would increase that bleeding by creating new positions not necessary for the safety of San Franciscans despite the scare statements made by the firefighters’ union.

Proposition F would cost $4,900,000 in overtime thereby siphoning away money needed to make major improvements!

We already have excellent protection but we want to upgrade it by developing a comprehensive earthquake program, by improving our response to emergency medical calls (over 4 1/2 times the number of fires) and by purchasing more modern fire equipment.

During the October quake 522 off-duty firefighters reported back immediately yet there were not enough engines and trucks for them; in fact, one old piece had to be taken out of the Fire Museum to help fight the Marina District fire.

Our firefighters work nine days out of 31 in shifts of approximately 24 hours on and 48 off.

Many are “double-dippers” holding down well paid outside jobs such as contractors, lawyers, plumbers and electricians. They still put in overtime because the Charter provides for such generous pay.

Overtime pay for a firefighter is $585 per shift, for a Captain $776 and for an Assistant Chief $1077! Last year the average firefighter’s cost to the City was $90,000, including salary, fringe benefits and overtime.

Do not pay out more money just for overtime.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

James Jefferson
President, Fire Commission
Frank Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted Soulis
Commissioner, Fire Commission
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Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

San Francisco has the finest fire protection in California. Now is not the time to jeopardize it with Proposition F. Proposition F is an ill-advised and wasteful measure.

First, it would wrest management of the Fire Department away from the Fire Commission and the Chief, where management properly and historically belongs.

Management of the Fire Department should remain accountable to the citizens of San Francisco, through its appointed Fire Commission. This principle is violated when rigid language is placed in the Charter.

Second, Proposition F would unnecessarily increase the Fire Department’s budget by approximately $4.9 million a year.

The San Francisco Fire Department already has staffing levels on its fire engines and aerial ladder trucks that are equal to the best in California.

To overstaff the engines and trucks would be counterproductive as well as wasteful, especially in a time of limited resources and ever-increasing demands for City services.

Let life and death decisions of fire protection in San Francisco remain in the control of the Fire Commission and the Chief.

Let the buck stop where it has always stopped — with the Fire Commission and the Chief. And let San Francisco's first-rate fire protection continue.

We can't afford to play around with fire, or with Proposition F. A similar Proposition was defeated in November, 1987.

Vote NO on this Proposition in 1990.

Vote NO on Proposition F.

James D. Jefferson
President, Fire Commission

Frank A. Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission

Henry E. Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Sharon L. Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Ted N. Soulis
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Vote No on Proposition F.

Proposition F has little to do with fire protection and earthquake preparedness and a lot to do with unnecessary Fire Department staffing.

Vote No on Proposition F. Don't tie the hands of the Chief and Fire Commission, preventing them from managing the department and our tax dollars. Proposition F will take $6 million a year from health services, libraries, homeless programs and other vital city services. Why? Because Proposition F will require the city to pay more overtime to firefighters who already receive higher salaries than those in Los Angeles, San Jose, Long Beach or San Diego.

Employment of unnecessary personnel is called "featherbedding." Proposition F is just that — at a cost of $6 million.

San Francisco has the best fire protection services in the country. We already pay more per person for that service than any other city in California.

Stop a $6 million raid on the City Treasury. Vote No on Proposition F.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Like all San Franciscans, we want a safe and healthy city. But Proposition F could jeopardize our safety and health.

By spending more than $7 million on unnecessary overtime, Proposition F will take money away from other critically needed services like fire equipment, police protection, health care and children's programs.

The annual fire department budget is already $150 million. Firefighters are already getting a pay raise of almost 10%. That's more than most city workers — and most of us.

San Francisco already has more firefighters per thousand residents than any other major Western city.

Yet San Francisco has fewer fire and emergency alarms than other cities. In 1986, San Francisco had 78,000 emergency calls. Oakland had 95,000.

We appreciate the job that our firefighters do. But we cannot support this multi-million dollar attempt to win back overtime for just 18 firefighters per day.

Susan J. Bierman
Agar Jaicks
Mauri Schwartz
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Sunset Democratic Club
Margaret Brodkin, Director Coleman Advocates for Children
Carole Migden, chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

I respect and admire the work done by San Francisco's firefighters.

It's a dangerous job.

That's why they're paid more than firefighters in any other major city in California, even though our firefighters work 15 percent fewer hours.

But today our average cost per firefighter has hit $96,000 per year.

We have been reducing this amount — and improving fire service at the same time — by hiring more new firefighters and reducing costly overtime payments.

That overtime runs as much as $585 per day for a fourth-year firefighter, and up to $1077 per day at the higher ranks.

When they argue for Proposition F, the union avoids mentioning this fact. They raise a false alarm about closing down firehouses, when in reality we are adding new firefighters as quickly as we can train them.

Ninety new firefighters are being hired this year alone. We have full classes in the Fire Academy for the first time in years.

Prop F asks you, the voters, to put an unnecessary sixth firefighter back on every fire truck, in order to give current firefighters millions in guaranteed overtime.

There's no need for it. Even a one-alarm fire in San Francisco draws 30 firefighters in response.

It's easy, when you think about the heroic work firefighters do, to justify giving them whatever they ask for.

I made the same mistake myself three years ago, before I was mayor. As a State Assemblyman and a strong union supporter, I lent my name to a measure that was similar to Proposition F.

But no group, however much we appreciate their work, is entitled to millions of taxpayer dollars a year in guaranteed, unnecessary overtime — especially when they are trying to feather their own nests by keeping out women and minorities.

With all the pressing needs facing our city, we can't afford to give away $7 million and get nothing in return. Please vote No on Proposition F.

Mayor Art Agnos
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TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

The Proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

NEW CHARTER SECTION: 3.548:
MINIMUM LEVELS OF FIRE PROTECTION FOR THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Notwithstanding any other section of this Charter, the minimum levels of fire protection for the City and County of San Francisco shall be specified as follows:

A. The MINIMUM level of Fire Protection for the City and County of San Francisco, in fire suppression, effective July 1, 1990, except as specified in Section C shall be as follows:

1. Engine Companies: 41
   Truck Companies: 18
   Rescue Companies: 2
   Fireboat Companies: 1
   Battalion Districts: 10
   Divisions: 3
   Service Units: 1
   Bureau of Equipment: 2
   High Pressure System
   Tank (staffed): 1
   (Jones St. Tank) (At Chief's Discretion) 5

2. Fire station: The minimum number of stations shall be 41, at locations listed on the SFFD Station Directory for July 1, 1987.

B. MINIMUM daily staffing of Fire Companies and other Units:

1. Engine Companies: 1 Officer and 3 Firefighters
2. Truck Companies: 1 Officer and 5 Firefighters
3. Rescue Company: 1 Officer and 3 Firefighters
4. Fireboat Company: 1 Officer, 1 Pilot, 1 Marine Engineer and 2 Firefighters
5. Service Units: 1 Firefighter
6. Bureau of Equipment: 2 Firefighters

7. Battalion District: 1 Battalion Chief, 1 Chief's Aide, 1 Assistant Chief, 1 Chief's Aide, 1 qualified person to operate gates, valves and communications equipment of the High Pressure System.

Required minimum staffing shall be maintained on a constant basis, 24 hours per day. Sufficient personnel and positions shall be authorized and funded to maintain MINIMUM required staffing levels established in this section. When assigned personnel are not available, then staffing shall be maintained by working of overtime.

C. CLOSURE AND RELOCATION OF FIRE STATIONS, DEACTIVATION OF FIRE COMPANIES OR OF UNITS REQUIRED BY THIS SECTION:

1. Fire Stations, Fire Companies or other Units required by this section may be closed or deactivated only when each of the following procedures is completed:

   a. It is recommended by the Chief of Department and approved for consideration by the Fire Commission.

   b. The Fire Commission shall hold at least two public hearings on the matter so that affected citizens may appear to express their views.

   c. At least one of the public hearings shall be held in the neighborhood of the Station, Company, or Unit to be closed or deactivated. Such meeting to be held at a time and place most suitable for maximum public attendance.

   d. Except as provided by this section, other facilities or units may be closed or deactivated by majority of the five members of the Fire Commission upon recommendation by the Chief of Department.

   e. Upon conclusion of public hearings and approval by a majority of the five members of the Fire Commission for the closure or deactivation of a Company or Unit, the Fire Commission shall forward its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors within 30 calendar days.

   f. Upon receipt of the Fire Commission recommendation, the Board of Supervisors may hold public hearings on the matter and they may approve or disapprove of the recommendation of the Fire Commission for closure or deactivation of a Station, Company or Unit. Such approval or disapproval shall be by majority vote of the Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors approves of the Fire Commission recommendation, then they shall direct the Clerk of the Board to have the matter put on the ballot of the next regular election for final determination by the voters of the City and County.

D. DEFINITIONS — EQUIPMENT

1. ENGINE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying hose and a pump to pump water of at least 1,500 gallons per minute.

2. TRUCK COMPANY: A tractor-trailer vehicle carrying ladders and rescue equipment with a 100-foot aerial ladder or equivalent device to reach upper floors of buildings.

3. RESCUE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying rescue equipment capable of heavy rescue and diving equipment for underwater rescue.

4. FIRE BOAT COMPANY: A boat equipped with pumps, hose, monitor nozzles and able to navigate San Francisco Bay for firefighting and rescue duty along the shorelines of the City and County.

5. SERVICE UNIT: A vehicle carrying spare supply of air and equipment for self-contained breathing apparatus and resuscitators.

6. HIGH PRESSURE SYSTEM PUMP STATION: A facility capable of pumping at least 10,000 gallons per minute from San Francisco Bay or other water source into the mains of the high pressure water system.

7. BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT: A vehicle capable of carrying equipment for emergency repairs or towing of fire apparatus under emergency conditions.
Former Supervisor Health Benefits

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost? YES 288 NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Health Service System provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Supervisors may not continue to receive health insurance from the Health Service System after they leave the Board of Supervisors.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Board of Supervisors could allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G will allow former Supervisors to buy health insurance coverage from the City’s Health Service system, when they leave office. THERE WILL BE NO COST TO THE CITY.

The Health Service System now provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Proposition G simply allows former Supervisors to BUY continued health coverage in the City’s Health Plan, at their own expense.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition G
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "G"
Former supervisors are either those who have decided not to run; or those the electorate voted out of office. Even as it claims they will pay their own health plan benefits, why continue to have them in the system.

Cut bait.
Vote NO.

Marguerie Warren
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.425 Persons Covered

Each plan may make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system by the dependents of members, retired city and county employees, temporary city and county employees, such other dependents of deceased and retired city and county employees as the board of supervisors may authorize by ordinance, teachers and other employees of the San Francisco Unified School District retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees of the city and county and resigned teachers and employees of the school district whose resignations occur after June 15, 1955, and within 30 days immediately prior to the date on which, but for their resignations, they would have become retired members of the said retirement system, on whose relinquishment of retirement allowances as permitted by the charter occurs after such date and resigned employees of the San Francisco Unified School District not otherwise included. A resigned employee or teacher is one whose employment has terminated other than by retirement, discharge or death or who has relinquished retirement allowances. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system to the aforementioned resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District is to enable them, subject to the health service board's exercise of its power, to participate in the benefits of the system after transferring to the State Teachers' Retirement System from the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for participation in the benefits of the system by the aforementioned resigned employees of the city and county and other resigned employees of San Francisco Unified School District is to permit the health service board to have power to treat them the same as it treats resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District.

As used in this section, and for the purpose of this section, the terms "city and county employees" and "employees of the city and county" shall include officers and employees of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco.

The board of supervisors may also provide by ordinance for the continuation in any plan by former supervisors who agree to and do pay the full cost of such benefit.

Moved since you last voted? Then you must re-register. Phone 554-4375.
PROPOSITION H
Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?

YES 290
NO 292

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers belong to the City's Retirement System. Under the charter, the Board of Supervisors may contract with the State's Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) to allow certain safety employees to be members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, if there is no additional cost to the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, if there would be no additional cost to the City.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want these employees to continue to be covered by the City's Retirement System.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This Charter Amendment would provide for safety retirement for eighteen civilian Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers employed by the San Francisco Fire Department, at no additional cost to the City.

Fire Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers are classified by the State of California as safety personnel and properly belong in a safety retirement program that is not offered by the City’s Retirement System for non-uniformed employees. Instead, the City contracts with the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) for its public safety officers who are not police officers or firefighters.

Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers, along with their counterparts in the uniformed firefighter ranks, provide the professional expertise necessary for the City’s fire prevention program. Proposition H provides a retirement plan for this small group of civilians equivalent to the retirement plan for their uniformed firefighter counterparts, at no additional cost to the City.

Voters approved similar measures in recent years that provided for safety requirement for probation officers, investigator groups and various other safety personnel.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition H
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.506-2 Miscellaneous Safety Employees

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the board of supervisors or the community college board shall have the power to contract with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System of the State of California to provide that the probation officers, airport police officers, district attorney and public defender investigators, coroner investigators, juvenile court counselors, and institutional police, fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers who are not members of the Section 8.508 plans, shall be members of the public employees' retirement system, and the board of supervisors, the community college board and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such contract.

The power to contract created herein shall be limited to a contract with no net increase in cost to the city and county or the community college district.

Any person who shall become a member of the public employees' retirement system pursuant to such contract shall have the right to be a member of the health service system and the health board shall make provision for the participation in the benefits of the health service system by such persons.

Out of town on June 5, 1990? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
Nearly 70,000 homes in the southern and eastern parts of the City have curbside recycling. By 1991, every resident will have curbside collection service.

Until curbside reaches your neighborhood, you can recycle at our many community recycling centers.

For a free Recycling Starter Kit and information on where to recycle call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL
554-6193
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

PROPOSITION I

Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?

YES 293

NO 295

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the State Retirement System are allowed to work for the San Francisco Unified School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. Retired San Francisco teachers in the City Retirement system are not allowed to do so.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow retired teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. While they are consultants they would not make retirement contributions or earn additional retirement credits.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, costs could increase, the amount of which, being dependent upon the dollar amount and the number of personal service contracts executed, cannot be determined, but should not be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Jim Gonzalez and Richard Hongisto.
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is necessary to correct an inequity that exists between teachers in the State Teachers’ Retirement System and those in the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System. Teachers in the state system can retire up to three years early and supplement their reduced retirement income by serving as consultants to the school district developing curriculum, orienting new teachers, substituting for absent teachers, tutoring students, etc. The Charter denies the right to the four hundred teachers in the city retirement system to continue serving students and schools in these ways. Proposition I would correct this inequity by extending the same right to teachers in the city retirement system.

Proposition I will save taxpayers’ money by encouraging teachers at the top of the salary scale to retire early. New hires at the low end of the salary scale will earn little more than half as much as those at the top.

Proposition I will also improve education in San Francisco schools by continuing to take advantage of the experience and expertise of retired teachers. It will also help to solve the shortage of qualified substitute teacher.

Vote YES on Proposition I for equity, economy, and educational excellence.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition I
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition I
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will bring equity and fairness to retired teachers, save the taxpayers money and improve the educational system in San Francisco.

Assemblyman Willie Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John Burton
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Jim Gonzalez
San Francisco Democratic Party
Fred Rodriguez, President of the Board of Education

United Educators of San Francisco, Joan-Marie Shelley
Judy Dellamonica
Joanne Miller, vice-president of the San Francisco Board of Education
Thomas Ammiano
Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council
Larry Martin, Transport Workers of America
Robert Barnes
James Wachob
Jose Medina
Harry G. Britt, President of the Board of Supervisors

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I
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8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the charter on January 1, 1949, and persons who become miscellaneous officers and employees after January 1, 1949, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, except as otherwise provided in this section.

(a) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

"Retirement allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workers' compensation laws of the State of California, shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the retirement board, which would have been earned by the member had he worked, throughout the period under consideration, the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police department as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under Section 8.507 of this charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in Section 8.500 of this charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in Section 3.670 of the charter.

"Charters" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural; and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(b) Any member who completes at least 20 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 50 years, or at least 10 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 60 years, shall be entitled to retirement.

Subsection (g) hereof, may retire at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after reaching the age of 60 years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of two percent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of 65 years, if the allowance available to such member, pursuant to the provisions of Subsection (f) of this section, shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this Subsection (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this Subsection (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said Subsection (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of 60 years, after rendering 20 years or more of such service and having attained the age of 50 years, computed under Subsection (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under Subsection (g):
TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued)

vasion 5.14 of this charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $100 per month upon retirement after 30 years of service and after attaining the age of 60 years, and provided further that as to any member within 15 years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of 60, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $100 per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied on full-time service and compensation in the calculations of retirement allowances.

(c) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least 10 years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, as computed as provided in Subsection (g) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in Subsection (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds 40 percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age 60, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed 40 percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earnable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one year immediately preceding his retirement. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied as full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

(d) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

(e) If a member shall die, before retirement, (1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection:

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of 12 months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(2) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired from service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, with such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under Subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) shall be paid in lump sum as follows:

(A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such mem-

ber, to such spouse.

(B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election, but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 years, may make the election herein provided before benefit has been paid under this Subsection (c), for and on behalf of such children; and in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this Subsection (c), any allowance payable under this Subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

(f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least 10 years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed $1,000, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service

(Continued on next page)
(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation paid to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to 7 1/2 percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(c) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of Subsection (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members, and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this Subsection (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), Subsection (h), shall not be less than any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement, and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year, and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this Subdivision (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(i) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said Subsection (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(j) Except as otherwise provided in Section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such person receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(l) Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsections (b), (c), (f), and (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and

(Continued on page 92)
PROPOSITION J
Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?

YES 296
NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Human Rights Commission was created by an ordinance. Under that ordinance, the Human Rights Commission has 15 members.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment that would make the existing Human Rights Commission a charter commission; it would reduce the number of members from 15 to 11.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you want to reduce its size to 11 members.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you do not want to reduce its size to 11 members.

Controller’s Statement on "J"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government in an amount not to exceed $4,200."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Thomas Hsieh.
Human Rights Commission

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Let us make human rights a fundamental part of the fabric of San Francisco.
San Francisco is the birthplace of the United Nations and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, our Human Rights Commission is not even a part of our constitution — the Charter. Proposition J will make the Human Rights Commission a charter commission. Proposition J will take the position of the Human Rights Commission out of politics and ensures its place in the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.
Please vote in favor of Proposition J to recognize the importance of human rights to San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition J
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition J
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department and a candidate for Municipal Court Judge I urge you to vote for Ballot Measure J.

The Human Rights Commission has been a positive voice for 25 years. Thousands of San Franciscans have directly benefited from the Commission’s efforts. Its mandate will be greatly strengthened by extending Charter status through this measure. Please join me and vote yes on J!

James Harrigan
For Municipal Court

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “J”
We have a Human Rights Commission NOW, appointed by the Mayor. A new one in the charter would have the same appointing officer. We don’t need a confirmation of said committee. It will not take it out of politics. No reason for this. Just another layer of government — for what. Vote no on “J”.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: This entire section is new.
PART TWENTY-FOUR: HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
3.699-5 Commission; Composition
A human rights commission is hereby established. The human rights commission shall consist of eleven members broadly representative of the general public to be appointed by the mayor. Three of the members who are first appointed shall be designated to serve for terms of one year, three for two years, three for three years and two for four years from the date of their appointments. Thereafter, members shall be appointed as aforesaid for a term of office of four years, except that all of the vacancies occurring during a term shall be filled for the unexpired term. Members of said commission shall be compensated for each commission or committee meeting actually attended by said members in an amount as may be established and amended, from time to time, by ordinance of the board of supervisors, but not less than $50 per meeting provided, however, that no member shall be paid for attending more than two commission or committee meetings in any one calendar month.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued from page 88)

County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system, an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount annually received by him in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
8.584-10 Limitation on Employment During Retirement
(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.584 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.
(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.
(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.
(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.584, he shall re-enter membership under Section 8.584 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.584. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.
(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for service or disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 60 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he held the position which he held at the time of his retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he held the position from which he was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
Seven Member Commissions

PROPOSITION K
Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?

YES 298
NO 299

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department, Fire Department, Social Services Department, Port of San Francisco, Public Utilities Commission, Board of Permit Appeals, Civil Service Commission, Airports Commission and Parking and Traffic Department are managed by a board or commission. Each of these boards and commissions has five members appointed by the Mayor.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K is a charter amendment that would increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the size of these boards and commissions to stay the same.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $18,800 annually beginning January, 1991."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh, Bill Maher, and Wendy Nelder.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K expands the opportunity for San Francisco’s varied communities to participate in City government. Proposition K increases, from five to seven, the membership of the Board of Permit Appeals and seven City commissions: Police, Fire, Social Services, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports, and Parking and Traffic. It also includes the Port Commission, subject to amendment of state law to authorize such an increase.

Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities. Only five members of these crucial commissions is insufficient to address the diversity of concerns in our City; seven members will provide greater representation and greater leadership from a variety of communities. The expansion of the size of these commissions enhances the possibility for all San Franciscans to be part of decision-making and policy-making processes at every level.

The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions. Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor, but instead of the many under-represented voices in San Francisco.

Proposition K would make these commissions representative of the interests of more San Franciscans, while maintaining the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants. San Franciscans want accessible, responsive, and active commissioners. We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns, and Proposition K is a method for achieving these goals.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

You need a decoder ring to read the Supervisors’ argument in favor of creating 18 new commissioner slots. Here’s what the Board says, and here’s what they really mean.

The Board means: “Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities.”

The Board means: All you interest groups out there, it’s time to get yours.

The Board says: “The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions.”

The Board means: With 18 more political appointments, a mayor won’t offend as many supporters by passing them over for city jobs.

The Board says: “Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor.”

The Board means: Adding 18 new city commissioners isn’t really a boon to the incumbent mayor — unless he’s re-elected.

The Board says: “Proposition K would . . . maintain the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants.”

The Board means: Increasing commission memberships by 40% isn’t that big a deal.

The Board says: “We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns.”

The Board means: A fair hearing before city commissions isn’t enough; we want guaranteed results!

Let’s stop speaking in code and talk plainly. Proposition K is based on the notion that people should be treated as groups — not individuals — in the political process. That’s offensive, and so is Proposition K.

Please vote NO on K!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is a textbook example of what's wrong with contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K deems us because it lumps city residents into groups, rather than respecting their rights as individuals.

Proposition K divides us because it stresses what such interest groups (the polite euphemism is "communities") disagree about, rather than what all San Franciscans share in common.

Proposition K debases us because it is premised on a "quota system" for city boards and commissions. There shouldn't be "white seats" or "black seats", "gay seats" or "straight seats" on city commissions. There should be but two qualifications for service as a city commissioner: San Francisco residency and individual ability!

Vote NO on Proposition K!

San Francisco is indeed a polyglot and richly diverse community. City residents come from all corners of the country and the globe. Their political opinions range from radical to reactionary and all points in between.

It's impossible for each point of view, each ethnic group, each political persuasion, each neighborhood to be represented on city commissions. Increasing the membership on those bodies from five to seven persons is like buying a bigger umbrella in a hurricane. It won't make a bit of difference.

It is possible, however, for city commissioners from all walks of life to represent views and interests other than their own. It happens all the time in countless actions by city boards and agencies. And if we want to encourage consensus and better understanding among San Francisco's many "communities", we must resist attempts — such as Proposition K — to make the labels we all wear easier to read.

Three years ago, Mayor Agnos campaigned on the slogan, "One City, One Future". The supporters of Proposition K have failed to heed those words.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The opponents of Proposition K are clearly on the wrong page of the textbook of contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K values us because it gives city residents greater ability to be heard, individually and as a community.

Proposition K unites us because it reinforces what we all share in common: respect for democracy. If, as the opposition claims, the ability to have more access to representation is divisive, democratic ideals such as checks and balances must therefore also be divisive and undesirable.

Proposition K elevates us because it originates from that respect for democracy. This does not limit or allocate, but reasonably expands available seats on the commissions. Proposition K effectively dilutes the influence of special interests in favor of more broad-based views.

San Francisco is an extremely diverse city and that diversity should be reasonably represented. Democracy requires the opportunity for representation of all points of view. Good government demands that the number of appointed officials be limited so that debate can be functional. Proposition K addresses these two needs: increased citizen participation, and reasonable size to facilitate getting work done.

If you take the opposition's argument — that it is not meaningful to have representatives from different neighborhoods, ethnicities, political persuasions — to its logical extreme, you could have one member commissions achieving a consensus at the price of democracy.

Proposition K is good government, since it integrates the multiplicity of voices into a united future for the residents of San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition K!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

We need to create an open, democratic, and participatory local government.
This measure will encourage more participation.
Vote YES on K.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Individuals and community groups strongly support K. Increasing the membership on these bodies expands the opportunity to participate for all San Franciscans.
Vote YES on K!

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Robert McCarthy
Ruth Picon
President, Latino Democratic Club

Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead, Pres.
Bernal Heights Community Foundation

Jake McGoldrick
Arnie Scher
Natalie Berg
Sodonia Wilson,
San Francisco Board of Education

Alma Jackson
Margaret Brady
Reverend Amos Brown
Yori Wada

Mayor Art Agnos
Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John L. Burton
State Senator Milton Marks
Fr. James Goode
Carole Migden
Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Robert Barnes
Political Action Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Catherine Baccari
Bob Dockendorff
Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

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

Vote No on Proposition K.
Proposition K unnecessarily tinkers with our commission system for managing city departments.
Many of the most important city functions — police and fire services, libraries and health care — are governed by five-member city commissions. Proposition K would increase the size of these commissions to seven members. The Planning Commission would be expanded to nine members.
For what reason? The supporters say that the commissions cannot reflect our diverse community unless we allow the mayor to appoint more commissioners. They miss the point of the commission system.
Commissioners are not advisors or members of a community-wide study panel. They are managers. They set city policy, recommend hundreds of millions of dollars in spending, and hire and fire key departmental personnel.
Preserve our system of citizen management. Don’t make city commissions debating societies.
Vote No on Proposition K.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Are not seven Deputy Mayors at the rate of $94,000 a year a sufficient number of political plums for the Mayor? Does he really need eighteen more commissioners to achieve good government in San Francisco?
Do not give the Mayor additional tools to promote his re-election efforts. The San Francisco Republican Party urges voters to Vote No on Proposition K.

San Francisco Republican Party
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Anna M. Guith

William E. Grayson
Honor H. Bulkley
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Brian Mavrogeorge
Ronald G. Kershaw
Sam T. Harper
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

No sound arguments have been presented which support the need for Proposition K. Enlarging Boards and Commissions would increase city costs without improving productivity. Indeed, extra members may impede efficiency and result in protracted proceedings.
Don’t give the Mayor additional opportunities for patronage. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw

Brian Mavrogeorge
Paul Kavouksarian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence
Martin Keller

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K
PROPOSITION K WILL ADD TO BUREAUCRACY
Proposition K will hinder quick and fair response to citizen concerns. Larger commissions do not mean better commissions; on the contrary, they mean a less efficient, more cumbersome process.
PROPOSITION K WILL NOT MAKE COMMISSIONS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INTERESTS OF SAN FRANCISCO
Present commissions serve a diverse San Francisco by appointment of individuals who reflect and possess sensitivity, respect for different backgrounds and points of views.

Sharon Bretz
Susann L. Danielson
Jean Kalil
Victor Makras
Esther Marks
Beverly Prior

Larger commissions and larger support bureaucracy are not the answer to better representation. The answer is less political patronage and more appointments based on experience and knowledge. This proposal only makes government more cumbersome and less effective.

... Vote NO on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Proposition K is not about democracy. It is about patronage. It is about creating many new commission positions to hand out as political plums. To whom? For what? And why should the taxpayers be forced to pay for it?

No one, not even the author, Supervisor Ward, claims that it will improve the efficiency of the government, yet it will certainly add to the costs. The true costs will include trips, staff time, expenses, etc., with no discernible benefit to the public.

This measure will lead to longer meetings, more arguments, divisiveness and politics while providing less management oversight.

Proposition K is an insider's game. They gain and the voters pay. It is a costly bad idea and should be soundly rejected by the voters.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Bill Maher

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "K"
If qualified commissioners were appointed who understood they represented ALL of San Francisco this charter amendment would not be necessary.
There are nine commissions listed for additional members — 18 more appointments. Just another avenue for political appointments.

Vote No on Proposition "K".

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

PART FOUR: POLICE DEPARTMENT
3.350 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, a police force, an office of citizen complaints and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of five members who shall be elected by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission to seven members, shall continue to hold their respective positions, subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972. Appointments to fill any non-civil service rank or position above the rank of captain as may be created hereunder shall be made by the board of supervisors in their discretion. The police commissioner may in their discretion designate the rank or ranks from which appointments to such vacant non-civil service positions may be made. The police department shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The police commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

PART FIVE: FIRE DEPARTMENT
3.540 Fire Department

The fire department shall be under the management of a fire commission, consisting of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years of 1945, 1948, and 1950 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The chief of department shall have the power to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for fire-fighting purposes.

The commissioners shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the fire department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the police commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to exceed the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-2 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter.

Positions of officers and employees of the fire department legally authorized shall continue, and the incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall continue as the officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments, and except as in this charter otherwise provided.

PART EIGHT: SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
3.570 Composition of Department; Commission

There is hereby established a social services department. This department shall consist of a social services commission of five seven members, a director of social services, and such employees and assistants as may be necessary to carry out the work and functions of said department.

The members of the social services commission shall be appointed thereto by the mayor and shall be selected for their respective positions on the basis of their interest in and understanding of the problems of public welfare. The members of said commission shall serve without compensation and no person shall be eligible to serve on said commission while holding a salaried public office, position or employment.

The term of office of the members of the said commission, subject to the provisions hereof relative to removal and the terms of the first mem-

(Continued on next page)
bers of the commission, shall be four years.

The mayor shall appoint five seven members to said social services commission, one member to be appointed for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1938; one for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1939; one for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1940, and two for terms to expire on the 15th day of January, 1941; and two for terms to expire on the 15th day of January, 1996; and upon the expiration of the terms of each of said members of said commission so appointed, the mayor shall fill the vacancies for which reason of the expiration of said term by the appointment of a member to said commission for a term of four years. Vacancies occurring in the membership of said commission shall be filled by an appointment to be made by the mayor for the unexpired term of said person in whose place said appointment is made; and when the term of any member of said commission shall expire, then said appointment shall be made for the full period of four years from the date of the expiration of the term. All vacancies shall be filled within 30 days of the occurrence thereof.

Members of the commission shall be subject to removal from office by the mayor for cause, but only upon written charges made and signed by the mayor, copy of said charges to be served upon the offending commissioner; and said charges shall be heard by the mayor and on said hearing of said charges the said commissioner so charged shall have the opportunity to appear and be heard.

The commission shall be a policy-determining and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in Section 3,500 of the charter of this amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART NINE: PORT COMMISSION

3.580 Commission; Composition

The San Francisco Port Commission shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, their appointment being subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors. Each of said members shall serve for a term of four years. Vacancies on the commission shall be filled by the mayor for the unexpired portion of the term. Initial appointive members of the commission shall consist of the incumbent members of the San Francisco Port Authority, who shall serve as commissioners for a term corresponding to the unexpired portion of their tenure as members of the port authority. Subject to amendment of state law to authorize an increase in membership, the port commission shall consist of seven members. The two additional members shall be appointed by the mayor after the eighth day of January, 1992. The initial term of office not to exceed four years shall be fixed by the mayor to insure that the term of office for a majority of the commission shall not expire in the same year. In addition, the director of finance and secretary of agriculture and services, or their designated representatives, shall be ex-officio members of the commission. Persons appointed to the port commission shall be subject to recall, suspension and removal in the same manner as an elected official.

The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3.590 Commission; Composition

A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o'clock, on the 8th day of January, 1932, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of two other commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936.

The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992. On expiration of these and successive terms, the mayor shall appoint their successors for four years. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS

3.650 Board Composition

The mayor shall appoint five seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $8,000 $7,000 per year. One such term shall expire at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934 and 1935, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936, and two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1996, and upon these and successive expirations the mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

3.651 Functions, Powers and Duties

Any applicant for a permit or license who is denied such permit or license by the department authorized to issue same, or whose license or permit is ordered revoked by any department, or any person who deems that his interests or property or that the general public interest will be adversely affected as the result of operations authorized by or under any permit or license granted or issued by any department, may appeal to the board of permit appeals. Such board shall hear the applicant, the permit-holder, or other interested parties, as well as the head or representative of the department issuing or refusing to issue such license or permit, or ordering the revocation of same. After such hearing and such further investigation as the board may deem necessary, it may concur in the action of the department authorized to issue such license or permit, or, by the vote of four five members, may overrule the action of such department and order that the permit or license be granted, restored or refused.

The board of permit appeals shall have and exercise the following powers:

(a) To hear and determine appeals where it is alleged there is error or abuse of discretion in any order, requirement, decision or determination made by the zoning administrator in the enforcement of the provisions of any ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors creating zoning districts or regulating the use of property in the city and county.

(b) To hear and determine appeals from the rulings, decisions and determinations of the zoning administrator granting or denying applications for variances from any rule, regulation, restriction or requirement of the zoning or setback ordinances, or any section thereof. Upon the hearing of such appeals said board may affirm, change, or modify the ruling, decision or determination appealed from, or, in lieu thereof, make such other additional determination as it shall deem proper in the premises, subject to the same limitations as are placed upon the zoning administrator by this charter or by ordinance.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SEVENTEEN: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county.

The civil service commission shall consist of five seven members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the 1st day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and, provided further, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall be as follows; one shall expire on June 30, 1996 and one on June 30, 1998, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. No less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this

(Continued on page 128)
Commissioner Residency Requirement

PROPOSITION L
Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Candidates for elective office and members of charter boards and commissions must be San Francisco residents and electors. For other boards, commissions and advisory bodies, the law creating them may set residency requirements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L is a charter amendment that would require the members of all boards, commissions and advisory bodies to be San Francisco residents and electors.

This rule would not apply where a non-charter board, commission or advisory body requires a person with specific qualifications, and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found. Also, this rule would not apply to the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Fine Arts Museums, the Asian Arts Commission, the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission and the elected members of the San Francisco Retirement Board and Health Service Board.

Proposition L would delete the current requirement that candidates and members of charter boards and commissions be residents and electors for a certain length of time before assuming office, which courts have found unconstitutional.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

Controller’s Statement on “L”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “L”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh and Bill Maher.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

This charter amendment provides that all individuals serving on city boards and commissions and committees with few exceptions, must be citizens of voting age of San Francisco.

Members of boards and commissions and committees often have policy making and regulatory responsibilities. Clearly, San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco. With a population of 750,000 residents, surely we have enough qualified and talented San Franciscans who can get the job done.

This charter amendment offers the appointing officer with some flexibility. If a qualified candidate for a public post requiring specialized skills cannot be found in our city, then, following such a declaration, the appointing officer may search elsewhere.

Let's open up more opportunities for our residents to serve San Francisco. VOTE YES FOR THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERSHIP ON CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I was mistaken in one of my objections to Proposition L. Some years ago, a court decision invalidated the voter-adopted Charter requirement that a person be a San Francisco resident for five years before appointment to a city commission. I disagree strongly with that decision, for the reasons cited in my ballot argument appearing on the opposite page. The inoperative language remained in our Charter, however, and Proposition L disingenuously removes it — like pruning a dead branch from a tree.

But, there are still plenty of reasons to vote against Proposition L.

(1) Proposition L eliminates the requirement that a commissioner be an "elector" of San Francisco (a voter, meaning also a U.S. citizen) for at least one year. This Charter provision has not been altered by a court, but Proposition L would strike it from the books.

A person could move into town, register to vote, and be appointed that day to a city post.

(2) Proposition L exempts three city commissions — Health System, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board — from any residency requirement whatsoever.

(3) Proposition L would allow non-residents to serve on any board or commission created by the Board of Supervisors. In fact, Proposition L could even be interpreted to allow the appointment of non-citizens to such posts!

Don't be misled or confused. If you want San Franciscans to make decisions about San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition L!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

If you want San Francisco residents to serve on all city commissions established by the charter, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you think San Franciscans should serve on boards and committees created by the Board of Supervisors, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you favor city residents serving on the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees, vote NO on Proposition L.

The Board of Supervisors says “San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco.” I agree completely. Trouble is, Proposition L weakens the existing residency requirement in our City Charter.

Charter Section 8.100 states that no person “shall be appointed as a member of any board or commission unless he shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years.” Proposition L eliminates the five-year residency requirement! Proposition L also exempts from any residency requirement whatsoever members of the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees.

The idea behind the five-year residency rule is that city commissioners should have first-hand knowledge and personal experience of San Francisco’s people and neighborhoods, its problems and possibilities. City commissioners should not just rely on staff reports and statistical abstracts. Proposition L would destroy this sensible safeguard. Instead, a person could move into town and be appointed, that day, to a city post!

Finally, Proposition L purports to extend the Charter’s residency rules to advisory boards and committees established by the Board of Supervisors. But the residency requirement can be waived for a person “with specific experience, skills, or qualifications.” That’s a loophole big enough to drive a truck through!

San Franciscans should make decisions about San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition L.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for most advisory panels of the City.

Under Proposition L, panel members MUST be residents of San Francisco.

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for membership on the Health System Board, Retirement Board and War Memorial Board.

Under Proposition L, there is no change. Membership on the Health System Board and Retirement Board is by DIRECT ELECTION of city employees. The Health Fund and Retirement Fund are operated by and for city workers. Because employees are not required to live in the city, there are serious constitutional problems with denying a worker the right to be a candidate for trustee of a fund controlled by employees.

The way things are now, the courts have thrown out San Francisco’s five-year residency requirement. Reports the City Attorney:

“In the years since Charter Section 8.100 (residency rule) was originally adopted, the California courts have struck down all durational residency requirements applicable to candidates for elective or appointive office.”

Most Supervisors like the durational requirement. But even Supervisors cannot overrule the Supreme Court.

The bottom line: Proposition L does not cover everything. Just most things. It’s time San Franciscans were making the decisions about San Francisco. Proposition L is a major start in the right direction.

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE. YES ON PROPOSITION L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

San Franciscans deserve to be represented by commissioners who live within San Francisco, not by employees filling in for their ex-officio bosses. Vote for San Francisco commissions made of San Francisco voters.

... Vote Yes on Proposition L!

Harold M. Hoogadian
Small Business Owner

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Don't clutter the Charter with unnecessary provisions. Vote No on Proposition L.

Proposition L would require almost all commissions and advisory board members to be city residents. That makes sense — so much sense that, for most commissions, it is already the law.

This is one more example of a needless Charter amendment. If the Board of Supervisors wants to require members of any advisory body to be city residents, they can pass an ordinance to accomplish it.

Adding an unnecessary provision to a Charter that is already too long and complicated is not the answer. Vote No on Proposition L.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out-type.
8.100 Qualifications
(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she is a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for at least one year immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retirement system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.680, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.
Notwithstanding this requirement, in the case of boards, commissions or advisory bodies established by legislative act, the residency requirement may be waived by the appointing officer, or entity upon a finding that the board, commission or body requires the appointment of a person with specific experience, skills or qualifications and after exercising due diligence, an eligible and willing appointee residing within the city and county could not be located.
(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

---

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 7 through Tuesday, June 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease.
Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals
it's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be
TOXIC FREE 554-4333

HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR YOUR HOME'S TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday
8 am to 4 pm 554-4333

Commission Gender Composition

PROPOSITION M

Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by the Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex? YES 302 NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter requires some City boards and commissions, such as the Police and Fire Commissions, to have at least one woman member. However, the charter does not have a general policy on balancing the number of men and women on City boards and commissions.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a charter amendment that would create a City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex. This charter amendment does not apply to the Commission on the Status of Women.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex.

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

Controller's Statement on “M”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “M”

On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Bill Maher and Wendy Nelder.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The 1990s are here — but you would never know it by the few women serving on City boards and commissions. In fact, of ten major commissions — Police, Fire, Airports, Ports, Public Utilities, Parking Authority, Social Services, City Planning, Elections, Housing Authority — women hold just 18 percent of the seats. And only one woman serves as a president of these commissions.

Women do not fare much better on other key commissions. For instance, women hold just two seats on the seven-member Recreation and Park Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission. Three women serve on the eleven-member Small Business Advisory Commission.

Despite the enormous influence and regulatory controls most commissions have over the lives of all citizens, women’s voices and leadership on city panels do not equal their numbers in society.

These gloomy statistics aside, women have begun to make gains during the past two years. Women are now being regularly considered and appointed to boards and commissions. But, clearly, much more needs to be done.

Proposition M will emblazon into the Charter a policy goal of gender equality on all boards and commissions. This amendment, authored by Supervisor Richard Hongisto, is a simple measure of justice.

Only the Commission on the Status of Women is excluded from the provisions of this charter amendment, since its sole purpose is to serve as an advocacy forum for women.

Increasingly, communities and groups are instituting gender parity provisions in their constitutions with much success. For instance, the Democratic Party has dramatically brought about near gender equality of delegates to its national and state conventions.

Let's start the 1990s off with a renewed commitment to fairness and equality.

VOTE YES ON THE GENDER PARITY AMENDMENT.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition M
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition M
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M moves San Francisco into the 1990s. It is stunning to review the composition of our city boards and commissions and see just how few women are serving. Women comprise 18 percent of the seats on ten major commissions. This is an untold tragedy. Women have been making gains in recent time. We can do even better.

Proposition M is about fairness and equality. Iowa enacted a law in 1987 to require greater gender balance on all boards, commissions, committees, and councils.

Vote Yes for Gender Justice. Yes on Proposition M.

SF Chapter, National Organization for Women
Legal Advocates for Women
San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Creating political leadership opportunities for women will strengthen the public policy decision-making process.

Vote YES on M.

As a predominately lesbian and gay Republican volunteer organization we believe it is a travesty that after fifteen years of three liberal Democrat mayors only 38% of the city's Commissioners are women. This negligence has prompted the need to enact gender-parity. We support Proposition M.

In the future, the provisions of Proposition M should be amended to apply to the Commission on the Status of Women. Women and men must actively dialogue so that our city begins to address the concerns of all.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw
Paul Kavouksorian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulaney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence

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

Requirement that any commission be comprised of a certain number of persons of any gender is as inappropriate as requiring a certain number of persons who have red hair or blue eyes. Please vote to maintain the mayoral prerogative to appoint the best San Franciscans for the job.

... Vote NO on Proposition M!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Vote No on Proposition M.
Like Proposition L, but only more so, Proposition M does not belong in the City Charter.
The power to make appointments to boards and commissions rests with the Mayor. Proposition M would write into the Charter a non-binding policy statement urging the Mayor to fill not more than 50% plus one of any commission with members of the same sex.
The City Attorney advised the Board of Supervisors that the Constitution prohibits the city from adopting a quota for male and female appointments. Instead, the Board of Supervisors proposes to clutter up the Charter with a non-binding, legally unenforceable policy statement.
If the Board of Supervisors wants to send a message to the Mayor it should be done by resolution, not costly and unnecessary Charter amendments.
Vote No on Proposition M.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "M"
There is nothing in the charter NOW that prevents the Mayor or Board of Supervisors to appoint more women to achieve gender parity now.

Why now does it have to be written in concrete.
Vote NO on "M".

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Entire section is new.
3.503 Composition of Boards and Commissions.
It is the policy of the city and county, which shall be considered a goal when filling vacancies on boards or commissions appointed by the mayor, or otherwise provided by this charter, except for the Commission on the Status of Women, to achieve gender parity on these boards and commissions by limiting to a simple majority of board and commission membership the number of members who are of the same sex.

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 24.
MISSING SOMETHING IN YOUR LIFE?

If your life seems to be missing that special warmth that comes from having a pet, come and see us at the new San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department. We have a wide variety of dogs, cats and other animals available for adoption.

A waggly tail, a sweet meow or a gentle squeak - it'll make you glad to come home at night.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PROPOSITION N

Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?

YES 305
NO 307

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter does not limit the number of consecutive terms a person may serve on the Board of Supervisors. A full term on the Board of Supervisors is four years.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a charter amendment. Under Proposition N, no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors. After two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, a person must wait four years before serving again. Any person appointed to the Board of Supervisors to complete more than half a four-year term would be considered to have served one full term. A member of the Board of Supervisors who resigned with less than half a four-year term remaining would be considered to have served a full term. This charter amendment would go into effect July 1, 1990. Each Supervisor holding office on that date would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when his or her current term ends.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the charter so that no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors and you want to prohibit persons who served two consecutive four-year terms from serving on the Board of Supervisors again until four years after their second consecutive term in office.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to limit Supervisors to serving two consecutive terms.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On January 25, 1990, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition N to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,151* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 45,408 of the signatures submitted were valid, 5,257 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is a non-partisan, reasonable, fair and democratic measure to reform our government and improve the present city-wide system for electing supervisors. Neighborhood, civic leaders, current and former elected officials, community activists, business owners, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, unionists, and minorities all support Proposition N.

Limiting politicians' consecutive terms is not radical or extreme. In fact, it helps to prevent political corruption and power grabbing. More than 150 cities, towns and counties in the United States have laws limiting politicians terms. Governors in 30 states can only serve two terms. San Mateo county limits supervisors terms and for more than 30 years San Francisco’s mayors have been limited to two consecutive terms.

Proposition N is a very modest and reasonable proposal.

Proposition N does not recall or force any current member of the board from office. Proposition N allows supervisors whose terms expire in 1991 to serve until January 1995 if they are reelected. Supervisors whose terms end in 1993 may serve until 1997 if reelected. Former supervisors may run for office again after 4 years.

The current system favors incumbent politicians and denies experienced newcomers a fair chance to serve. Since 1973, only 3 newcomers have been elected to the city-wide board. 5 supervisors have already served 10 years. By 1995 most board members will have been in office 14 years or more.

We know that a lake or pond will stagnate unless its waters are replenished from time to time. So too will an elected body grow stale without a regular infusion of fresh faces and new ideas.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Richard Bodisco
Chairman, San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
Steve Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu
Harold Hoogastan
Joseph L. Powell
Raymond Chalker
Robert A. Reveles
Robert C. Sanchez
Joel Ventresca
Barry Lastra
Daniel Willson

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N backers have misrepresented the facts to get you to vote for N. Since just 1982 three non-incumbent supervisors have been independently elected to the Board. Proposition N is not true reform — it only tinkers with the citywide election process. It is not democratic — it takes power away from the people. It is not a solution — it's an additional problem.

Supervisors are elected to carry out the will of the people. When they fail to serve, they are unelected — by vote of the people. Appointed department heads, who are not supposed to have their own political agendas, are balanced only by the Mayor's and the Board’s overseeing eyes.

With the Mayor already limited to two terms, the Board must not consist only of rookies and lame ducks, or department heads can consolidate their power and bide their time, waiting until watchdog Supervisors are automatically thrown from office. Proposition N threatens accountability and increases the chances for bureaucratic corruption.

Uninformed actions are foolish actions — closely examine the facts, and you’ll agree that blindly forcing change is a bad plan. If Proposition N passes, nothing can stop department heads from installing power bases immune to voter inspection. Voters have the right to choose — this measure permanently limits that right.

PROTECT YOUR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Two years ago, San Francisco voted on Proposition O, a recall of the Board of Supervisors thinly disguised as a 'good government' initiative. San Franciscans saw through this scheme, and sent the measure down to defeat.

Last year, the same group attempted to offer a similar proposal to the voters, but failed to collect enough signatures to qualify it for the ballot.

Now they’re at it again.

They say that Supervisors have lost touch with the people of San Francisco, and should automatically be thrown from office after they’ve served two terms — but by bringing up this rejected issue again and again, they’re proving that THEY are the ones who are out of touch.

San Francisco doesn’t need a two-term limit. When supervisors stop working for the people, they stop getting elected. If Board members are prematurely removed, more power falls into the hands of civil servants and department heads, who are unaccountable to the voters. These unelected officials who already hold great power must be balanced by supervisors free to do their jobs, or citizens lose their representation.

The diversity of our City is one of our greatest strengths. San Franciscans have always individually evaluated our city’s varied issues, judging each on its specific merits. The Board of Supervisors is similarly diverse, and should also be evaluated selectively. Citizens should use the election process to tell their representatives when they’re not doing their jobs — not by acting blindly and installing an arbitrary time limit. San Franciscans are smart enough to tell the difference between voting an incompetent out of office and firing a valuable employee without cause.

Proposition N denies San Franciscans the right to vote for legislators of their choice, and that’s not fair.

Vote NO on Proposition N.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Let’s talk about what WE want City Hall to do for US, not the politicians.

Politicians will tell you anything to advance their political careers.

They won’t tell you the TRUTH about the Two Term Limit. The politicians say we failed to collect enough signatures last year to qualify for the ballot.

But here’s what their appointee, the city’s Chief Administrative Officer says:

“Last year’s Proposition removal was forced by an error, one which we admitted, apologized for and tried to repair . . .”

(Letter to Two Term Limit — Chairman — Richard Bodisco, dated February 7, 1990.)

We need new leadership in City Hall.

We have some hard and serious problems to solve in San Francisco and we can’t solve them with political rhetoric and name calling.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N removes experienced supervisors from the Board.

FACT:

Proposition N insures that San Francisco will always have 5 or 6 supervisors with seniority and experience on the Board.

Proposition N also gives experienced and concerned citizens an opportunity to serve without needing to become professional career politicians.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N will take away your right to vote for a legislator of your choice.

FACT:

Proposition N gives you more choices because it removes the current system which favors incumbent politicians.

The politicians have spoken too long for themselves.

It is time City Hall spoke for us.

Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Submitted by San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Richard Bodisco
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Vote YES on N.
SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

... Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Harold M. Hoogasan
Small Business Owner

The longer supervisors remain in office the more likely they become captives of special interests who bankroll their costly campaigns.

Entrenched incumbent politicians often end up working against the public interest, rather than for it.

Only two supervisors have been defeated at the polls since the end of 1980.

New faces, new ideas, new leaders, and new directions are needed at City Hall.

Vote YES on N.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

The Two-Term Limit is an idea whose time has come!
The United States Constitution limits the President to two terms in office. Similarly, the San Francisco Charter limits our Mayor to two terms.

Incumbent San Francisco Supervisors, however, continue to win re-elections year after year. This has made many of them less accountable to the voters.

Eight years is enough! Let's bring new people, new ideas, and new energy to our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Citizens for a Better San Francisco

It works for executive offices, let's put a limit on the terms of service for our supervisors. As Thomas Jefferson called it, "rotation in office". Let's have some healthy competition for these positions, let's take advantage of the many experienced people around who are willing to serve. Let's vote YES on Proposition N for reasonable reform.

John and Carol Maerske

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

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will ensure that we have a Board of Supervisors of concerned citizens, not career politicians.

For almost forty years, San Francisco has limited its Mayor to eight years in office. Many cities around the Bay Area, such as San Jose, Richmond, Mountain View and Redwood City, limit terms in office for their city councils. Yet we have had supervisors serve up to 16 years in office. Why? Because by raising large sums of money and using the power of incumbency, supervisors face little chance of defeat when running for re-election.

Proposition N will not remove any member of the Board of Supervisors from office. It is a fair proposal that allows each current supervisor to run for one more four year term. But in the future, each supervisor will be limited to eight years in office.

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will give the city fresh leadership on the Board of Supervisors. It will open up the city’s political processes, reversing the trend in recent years towards full-time professional politicians. Most importantly, it will mean that our elected representatives put the city’s needs and interests ahead of their desire for re-election.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

I’m supporting Proposition N because of my concern about the status of women and children in San Francisco.

As a long time supporter and treasurer of a shelter for battered women in the City, I have had the opportunity to closely observe how our City government works. I think there are more important things than politics.

San Francisco needs leaders in government who will show more compassion and concern about peoples’ lives as opposed to their reelection campaigns.

I don’t feel that every member of the Board of Supervisors is bad, but the two term limit will improve the current system and help our Supervisors do a better job for us.

That is why I am voting YES on Proposition N.

Millie Favetti

Over the past 20 years women have made enormous gains in electoral politics. The situation is far, far from ideal but some positive changes have taken place. Therefore, we think it is important to encourage and support the entry of women into elective politics.

We’re supporting Proposition N because it ensures that more women will have the opportunity to assume leadership roles in City government. The two year experiment with district elections produced more women supervisors than at any other time in San Francisco’s history.

The gains women have made could be easily lost under the current city-wide system. Proposition N will prevent the clock from being turned back because it allows newcomers a fair chance to compete without always having to run against entrenched incumbents.

Proposition N is equitable and fair to everyone.

Join us and vote YES on Proposition N.

Helen Dawson
Miriam Smith

As a small business owner and long time resident of San Francisco, I’m supporting Proposition N because it makes good sense for our City.

Limiting Supervisors’ terms will create a Board of Supervisors more accountable to the needs of San Franciscans. Under the current city-wide system, to many Supervisors see service on the Board as a career.

They worry more about keeping their seats than about doing the job they were elected to do. As a result, politics is all to often put ahead of the City welfare.

Lets get politics out of City Hall.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Zdenka Bodisco
Mike Salerno
Harold Hoogasian
Small Business Owners
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Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

We're supporting the Two Term Limit because San Francisco needs new political leadership. The Two Term Limit will open the "Door of Opportunity" for new candidates to serve on the Board of Supervisors.

The Two Term Limit will allow a new generation of civic leaders to represent our City. It is a fair and democratic way to reform the current system and to restore citizens' confidence in City Hall.

San Francisco's government should reflect the diversity of the people who live here. This is the meaning of a Democratic and free system. The Two Term Limit insures that new people with new ideas will have a fair chance to serve the City.

Don't be fooled by arguments of professional, career politicians. The Two Term Limit is good for our community and it is good for San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Steve M. Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu

WHY DIDN'T WE GET TO VOTE ON THE TWO-TERM LIMIT LAST YEAR?

Because Louise Renne found a legal loophole to get the measure thrown off the ballot after the Registrar of Voters had certified that it qualified for submission to the electorate.

Never mind that when Renne violated a number of election laws several years ago she got everyone to overlook the "technicality." But what do you expect?

This is the same Louise Renne who sued the Olympic Club because it had no female members conveniently "overlooking" the fact that her husband Paul belongs to the all-white, all-male San Francisco Golf Club. Say "No" to Renne's legal machinations! Vote "Yes" on "N."

Arlie Hale Smith
BART Director
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

WHAT ARE THEY AFRAID OF?

Why are the Supervisors and their contributors fighting the two-term limit so hard?

Why did City officials use a legal loophole to get this same measure thrown off the ballot last fall?

Are they afraid they won't be able to give away another city street worth $9 million to the Rockefeller's for free like they did in 1987?

Are they afraid that the people might vote to turn them out?

Clean up City Hall! Yes on N!

Arlie Hale Smith
BART Director
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic Senate Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman
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Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The Two-Term Limit is a reform whose time has come! At the Federal, State, and Local levels, political reformers agree that the powers of incumbency virtually preclude incumbents from being defeated at the polls, and that term limitation is the only way to ensure turnover in legislative bodies. Even Attorney General John Van de Kamp has proposed a twelve-year limit for State legislators.

Since the return to City-wide elections in 1980, only two incumbent Supervisors have been defeated at the polls. They were replaced by Wendy Nelder and Angela Alioto — the daughters of a former Police Chief and Mayor, respectively. Because of this trend, Supervisors have become burned-out, complacent, less accountable to the voters, and more beholden to the special interests who contributed to their re-election campaigns.

New blood is badly needed in any legislative body to keep it healthy and alive. Many non-incumbents have an agenda, new energy, and fresh approaches to governing. If they are allowed to be elected and they are competent, they should be able to translate their agenda into legislation in eight years and then move on to higher office. If they aren’t able to enact their agenda, either they are incompotent or their agenda is out-of-step with the sentiments of the City. In either case, there is no need for Supervisors to serve on the Board more than eight years.

Proposition N will remedy stagnation on our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on N.

Harold M. Hoogasian
Christopher L. Bowman

Proposition N would limit San Francisco supervisors to two consecutive terms of office, just like the mayor. It’s a modest reform that deserves your vote.

Proposition N would not force any incumbent out of office. All current supervisors could run for one more term after their present term expires. And after four years, they could run again and hold office for two more terms.

The President of the United States has been limited to two consecutive terms of office since 1951. The Mayor of San Francisco has been limited to two consecutive terms since 1953. San Mateo County

has a term limit for its board of supervisors. Proposition N is not a new or radical idea; it’s an overdue reform for a stagnant system.

The founders of our city charter envisioned supervisors as part-time citizen legislators, not full-time professional politicians. Proposition N respects and revives that tradition.

A bit of fresh air never hurt anybody — even two-term supervisors!

Please vote YES on Proposition N.

Senator Quentin Kopp

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

The current system of electing supervisors in San Francisco badly needs reform. But Proposition N is not the answer. The Board of Supervisors is not accountable to the people, largely because of the pernicious influence of large monetary contributions. A two-term limit would only exacerbate the problem. All supervisors would either be rookies or lame ducks, resulting in a tremendous shift of power to the bureaucracy, without lessening the powerful influence of money in campaigns.

What San Francisco needs is real campaign reform — limiting the ability of supervisors to vote on the pet projects of their major contributors, and district election of supervisors. Both would greatly reduce the enormous sums of money needed to run for office citywide.

Proposition N is a false promise of reform. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N!

Dennis Antenore
Robert Barnes
Ron Braithwaite
Supervisor Harry Britt
Gordon Chin
Brother Kelly Cullen
Catherine Dodd R.N.
Noah Griffin

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Geraldine M. Johnson
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leslie Katz
Tony Kilroy

Myra G. Kopf
Steven M. Krefling
William J. Brandy Moore
Jim Morales
Connie O’Connor
Ruth Picon
Mauri Schwartz
Yori Wada

Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead
Harold T. Yee
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943 and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and a public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, 11 members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected to a term of four years, from the commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the eighth day of January, 1981, shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on said date and the 11 persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said eighth day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms. Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the eighth day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the eighth day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor, or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

The effective date of this section as amended is July 1, 1990. All supervisors holding office on that date shall be deemed to have served one full four year term upon the expiration of their then current terms of office.
Hypodermic Syringes

PROPOSITION O
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?

YES 309
NO 310

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law regulates the sale, distribution and use of hypodermic syringes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

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

Controller’s Statement on “O”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

“Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “O” Got on the Ballot
On September 15, 1989 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,173 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,774 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.
Hypodermic Syringes

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

The connection between AIDS and unclean needles is unchallenged. Virtually every authority on the subject agrees that sharing needles increases the chances of contracting AIDS. San Francisco has an estimated 13,000 IV drug users, each of whom is at risk of contracting AIDS and spreading it to their sexual partners or their unborn children. Tens of thousands of people are being directly threatened with contracting AIDS because it is illegal to obtain clean, safe needles.

Some groups are trading clean needles with addicts for their dirty ones. This removes contaminated needles from circulation and can dramatically cut the infection rate among drug users and their partners. But these groups face up to a six months in jail and a $1,000 fine. One member of this group, who lost her mother to AIDS, contracted through a dirty needle, said, "I lost a parent to this because this bureaucracy sits around and talks while lots of people are dying." Dr. John Newmeyer of the Haight Ashbury Free Medical Clinics said, "People are dying because of our institution's resistance to AIDS risk reduction methods."

In an attempt to stop this disease from being spread to drug users and their partners AIDS prevention workers are risking legal persecution. Jerry DeJong, who works with substance abusers and is a member of the Mayor's Narcotic's Task Force, said "...with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what's sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives." But in a sane, free society it shouldn't be necessary to break the law to save lives. The only way this deadly policy can be changed is for the state legislature to change the law. These State laws should be repealed.

Pamela Williard Pickens
Secretary San Francisco Libertarian Party

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition O
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition O
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Dr. John Watters of the Urban Health Study says that, "The middle class have access to clean needles." Poor people can’t get clean needles, because they are illegal. Black and Latino IV drug users have a more difficult time finding clean needles and are thus more likely to be infected with AIDS. Because minorities are more likely to be infected with AIDS a higher proportion of their sexual partners or unborn children are being infected. AIDS is likely to become the leading cause of death in young Blacks and Latinos if things continue as they have. Legal clean needles will help save their lives.

Christina Groth

The San Francisco Department of Health estimates that there are 13,000 IV drug users in the city. If clean needles remain unavailable to them the AIDS infection rate can easily reach over 60%. If these 60% infect just two other people either through shared needles or sex, the total number of infected people can reach 23,400. San Francisco can’t afford the financial burden it is under today from AIDS cases. Prevention through clean and legal needles can save us millions of tax dollars without costing us a cent. Legal needles make financial sense.

Isaac Klein

The San Francisco Chronicle has reported on the use of needles for IV drug use in Scotland. The newspaper said that in Edinburgh police launched a crackdown on the availability of clean needles. Within 18 months of the crackdown 50% of all IV drug users were infected with AIDS. Soon their sexual partners and unborn babies were infected with the disease. But 30 miles away in Glasgow the police took no action against the availability of clean needles and only 4 to 7 percent of needle users were infected. Dr. Roy Robertson, Edinburgh’s leading authority on AIDS said, “Making needles available to addicts is not the only answer to the problem of AIDS among drug users but certainly, it has to be part of the solution.”

VOTE YES!

George Meyer

WHAT IS CANADA DOING RIGHT?

In Canada, fewer than 1% of AIDS cases are from needles! In the United States, about 50% of new cases now involve needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners and babies, (up from about 20-30% in the beginning of the epidemic).

What is Canada doing right?

The AIDS epidemic has hit here many times worse than there. Why?

In Canada, drug-users can buy sterile needles in drugstores.

GRASSROOTS
Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

SURGEON GENERAL KOOP ON CLEAN NEEDLES

"One of the strongest advocates of making needles legal is Surgeon General Koop who addressed that issue last November (1987):

"I'm asked about clean needles everywhere I go. I've always said the same thing. If clean needles will do anything to contain a part of the epidemic, we should not have any foolish inhibitions about so doing."

(S.F. Sentinel 1/22/88)

Wm. Schwartzman, M.D.

Clean needles cause no diseases.
Legal needles are clean needles.
Vote Yes.

William Schwartzman, MD

Does this initiative "condone drugs"?
If you vote Yes, that could be interpreted as condoning drugs.
But if you vote No, that could equally well be interpreted as condoning the spread of AIDS (and hepatitis, and many other diseases).

The present state law is like the "death penalty" — not just for drug abusers, but also their spouses, their babies, transfusion recipients and others. Who can "condone that"?

GRASSROOTS

The AIDS epidemic was caused by a combination of germs, working together to collapse the immune system.
N.Y.'s health department has concluded that the HIV epidemic already existed among New York addicts in the 1970's.
That epidemic existed only because New York has laws against addicts buying clean needles.

If we keep these deadly laws, no one can predict what future epidemics might result.

GRASSROOTS

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
ENCOURAGES STERILE NEEDLES

The National Academy of Sciences the country's most prestigious scientific organization in 1986, issued a major study titled "Confronting AIDS". Many lives could have been saved if California had promptly implemented the conclusion drawn by America's leading scientists:

"IT IS TIME TO BEGIN EXPERIMENTING WITH PUBLIC POLICIES TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF STERILE NEEDLES AND SYRINGES BY REMOVING LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS TO THEIR POSSESSION AND USE."

Wm. Schwartzman, MD
Wm. Steinsmith, MD

The issue is not "free needles".
Some of us believe that mass giveaways of clean needles is best.
Others of us believe it would be enough if doctors and pharmacies were allowed to sell needles, as with diabetes.
Legal needles are as cheap as ballpoint pens, so cheap that price would be no barrier.
This initiative takes no position on "free needles" programs, only for legalization — a prerequisite for either approach.

GRASSROOTS

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Under present California law, even doctors aren’t allowed to provide needles except for approved purposes. So far “stopping AIDS” is not an approved purpose.

Under “legalization”, needles are a medical question, not a police question. A doctor’s prescription could still be required, as with diabetes. Whatever controls are adopted, needles will be better controlled under legalization than they are now.

William Steinsmith, M.D.

Dr. Don Francis, an epidemiologist with the Centers for Disease Control said, “We can’t overstate the threat of AIDS among addicts in the minority population in the inner city.” Dr. Francis says that there is no evidence that legal, clean needles increase the use of drugs. The only thing stopping clean needles is the law. It’s time for Sacramento to repeal the law and save lives.

Will Wohler

According to the New York Times a new, rare virus known as HTLV-II is spreading through the IV drug community because of needle sharing. Spread in the same manner as AIDS, this virus “could cause leukemia or other serious diseases and may exact a rising toll in future years.” Surveys have found that 20% of addicts in New Orleans were infected and in San Francisco a preliminary survey of blood donors showed this new disease has a higher rate of incidence than the AIDS virus. Because it can take as long as 20 years to develop no one can know for sure how many people have been infected. Clean, legal needles will stop the transmission of this disease. VOTE YES!

John Whisman

Clean needles save the lives of innocent victims of AIDS. Not everyone who gets AIDS because people share needles is an addict. Some are small babies. The Centers for Disease Control says 314 babies were born in 1988 with AIDS because their mothers used infected needles. Dr. James Buehler of the CDC said “We need to do what we can to prevent the sharing of dirty needles. Sharing dirty equipment is the worst problem.” In California it is illegal to obtain clean needles so addicts share. Because they share, babies are born with AIDS. Save lives. Legalize needles. VOTE YES!

Mark Pickens

Illegal needles, which force IV drug users to share unclean needles, is now the cause of over one-third of all AIDS cases in the United States according to the federal government’s Centers for Disease Control. In 1988, 10,747 people contracted AIDS because of sharing unclean needles. Some of these people never used needles themselves. 226 were men who had sex with women who used needles, 623 were women who had sex with men who used unclean needles and 314 were unborn babies. Over 1,000 people who don’t use drugs were infected because clean needles are illegal. VOTE YES FOR LEGAL, CLEAN NEEDLES!

Pamela Williard Pickens

Proposition O was endorsed by the Central Committee of the Democratic Party of San Francisco on March 21, 1990. VOTE YES!

John Whisman

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

Clean, legal needles will save lives. Jerry DeJong of the Mayor's Narcotics Task Force said, "The bottom line is that this is not a moral or legal issue. Unfortunately with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what's sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives." Something is very wrong when its illegal to save lives; and that wrong must be corrected. Tell Sacramento that we want to legalize saving lives. We need clean, legal needles now!

Ron Dorsey

Illegal needles are the primary means of spreading AIDS to minority communities. Most of the IV drug users and their partners who have been infected with AIDS are Black or Latino. Most of the babies born with AIDS because of needle sharing by their mothers are also Black and Latino. Blacks and Latinos are now more likely than ever before to become infected with AIDS because clean needles are illegal. Legal, clean needles will slow down the infection rate and decrease the number of deaths in minority communities. Illegal needles hurt Blacks and Latinos more than they hurt others. Support legal needles.

Jim Peron

Prof. Ethan Nadelman, in the Washington Post, reported that "The governments of England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, the Netherlands and several other countries have actively attempted to limit the spread of AIDS by removing restrictions on the sale of syringes ..." Dr. Nadelman notes that there is growing evidence that legal needles do not increase the use of drugs but they do save lives.

George O'Brien

A former prosecutor of high-level drug dealers, Ben Clark, said in The Daily Recorder, a law newspaper, that legal restrictions on clean needles "have had the disastrous effect of forcing drug users to share syringes. Over half the addicts in New York State are infected with AIDS, and the rate of infection among intravenous drug users in Illinois is growing dramatically."

While some people may say addicts deserve to die, Clark notes, "... the issue is not simply whether society should sit back and watch addicts kill themselves off: AIDS transmitted by needles does not stay within the druggie population. Unborn children of AIDS-infected female users may become infected. The sex partners of persons with AIDS are exposed to the disease. Needle-sharing prostitutes interact with the drug-free heterosexual community on a daily basis." Clark says that clean, legal needles have never been proven to increase drug use but they do save lives. VOTE YES!

Sam Grove

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

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION O

There is no scientific evidence that unlimited and uncontrolled availability of hypodermic syringes/needles will stop the spread of AIDS. Proposition “O” would open the floodgates to the purchase and distribution of hypodermic syringes, without prescription, in drug stores, supermarkets and in the streets without medical supervision under the guise of stopping the spread of AIDS. Addicts will continue to commit crimes to pay for the dope since possession and sale of drugs, such as crack cocaine and heroin, will still be illegal.

Latest statistics show that over 80 percent of inmates in our already overcrowded jails are there for illegal drug offenses.

Who will protect the public against the careless disposition of these used needles by addicts?

Black communities in San Francisco are under siege from the sale of illegal drugs and the crime this produces. Approval of Proposition “O” by the voters permitting use of unprescribed legal needles and illegal drugs could leave the City open to millions of dollars in lawsuits for unsupervised use of a medical procedure by intravenous drug addicts from death and other causes.

WE URGE A “NO” VOTE ON PROPOSITION “O”. It should not be City policy to support the removal of all restrictions in the distribution, sale and use of hypodermic syringes.

Rev. Amos Brown
Hon. Naomi Gray
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Senator Quentin Kopp
Dr. Raye Richardson
Lulann McGriff
Dr. Julienne Malveaux
Melvin Miles

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
We, the people of the City and County of San Francisco, California, call upon the California State Legislature to eliminate all sanctions, criminal, regulatory, or civil, on the manufacture, use, sale or other distribution of hypodermic syringes. We do this to reduce the spread of AIDS and other diseases.

**TEXT OF PROPOSITION K (Continued from page 100)**

charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of $100.

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such a time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission after the regular daily working hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

This amendment shall become operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY: AIRPORTS COMMISSION
3.690 Commission; Composition

An airports commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on September 1, 1996. On the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

All rights, claims, actions, orders, obligations, proceedings and contracts relating to the airport department under the public utilities commission existing prior to the effective date of these amendments shall not be affected by the adoption thereof, and shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the airports commission.

This amendment shall be operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY-TWO: PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION
3.698 Commission — Composition

A parking and traffic commission and the department of parking and traffic are hereby established. The parking and traffic commission shall consist of five seven members. If not in conflict with state law, members of the parking and traffic commission shall serve ex-officio as members of the parking authority.

The term of each member shall be for four years; provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section shall, by lot classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided further, that terms of the two commissioners created by the amendment of June, 1990 shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 5th day of December, 1992; and on the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month. Any person may serve concurrently as a member of the San Francisco parking authority and the parking and traffic commission.
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IS GOING TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON ELECTION DAY A PROBLEM?

If you are unable to go to your polling place to vote on Election Day (Tuesday, June 5, 1990), you may vote by absentee ballot in one of two ways:

1. **Vote at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.** Starting on May 7 through June 5, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., you can vote in Room 158 at City Hall.

2. **Vote by mail.** Complete the application for an absentee ballot on the back cover. Tear or cut off the back cover, fold it in half with the address of the Registrar of Voters on the outside, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated, and mail the form.

Voters who have specified disabilities may apply to be a **permanent absentee voter.** Please refer to page 24.
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
158 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
MAILING ADDRESS

DO NOT REMOVE LABEL

BALLOT TYPE
R6 41
90

REPUBLICAN
16th Assembly District
5th Congressional District

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
1300's, 1500's,
2100's, 2700's

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside

(Do not cut or tear off)

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION
Must be received by the Registrar of Voters
no later than May 29, 1990
June 5, 1990 Consolidated Primary Election

FIRST NAME
MIDDLE INITIAL
LAST NAME

DATE OF BIRTH

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX OR MAIL DROP ADDRESS)
NUMBER AND STREET
CITY
ZIP CODE

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (if different from above)
P.O. BOX OR STREET
CITY
STATE
ZIP CODE

I HAVE NOT AND WILL NOT APPLY FOR AN ABSENTEE BALLOT BY ANY OTHER MEANS.

SIGNATURE (DO NOT PRINT)

DATE
DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER
EVENING PHONE NUMBER

I understand that voters with specified disabilities may qualify as Permanent Absent Voters. See page 24.

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
VOTE!

Polls are open
from 7 am to 8 pm
See the label on the back cover for
the location of your polling place.

San Francisco Voter
Information Pamphlet
& Sample Ballot

Prepared by the Office of the
Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:30 a.m. to about 9:00 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name  ________________________________________________________________

Address  ________________________________ Apt. #__________

Telephone No. (required)  ________________________________

Do you have an automobile?  yes □  no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any)  ________________________________

Signature  ________________________________
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 5, 1990 election. The Pamphlet includes:
1. a Sample Ballot (i.e., a copy of the ballot you see at your polling place or the one you receive when you vote) .......................................................... Page 5-21
2. the location of your polling place .................................................. (see label on the back cover)
3. application for absentee ballot ...................................................... back cover
4. definitions of words you need to know ............................................. 22
5. information for disabled voters; and application for permanent absentee voter status .................................................. 24
6. rights of voters ........................................................................... 25
7. statements from the candidates who are running for office ......................... 26-34
8. information about each proposition, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the proposition, and the legal text .................................................. 37-128
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

A 第一步
请将选票放入自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 1
USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

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

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2
BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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

C 第二步
请切记将选票插入时；票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

STEP 3
HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

D 第三步
请把带针之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4
AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del “Votomatic” y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOBERNADOR (Governor)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEFFREY T. GREENE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Hygienics Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD L. BULLOCK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun Show Producer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID M. WILLIAMS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman-Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE WILSON</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICEGOBERNADOR (Lieutenant Governor)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SEYMOUR</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIAN BERGESON</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>GORDON P. LEVY Deputy District Attorney Fiscal Asistente del Distrito</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>JOAN MILKE FLORES Los Angeles Councilwoman Concejal de Los Angeles</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>MATT FONG Business Attorney Abogado de Negocios</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>THOMAS W. HAYES Appointed State Treasurer Tesorero Estatal Nombrado</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
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<td>ANGELA “BAY” BUCHANAN Chief Financial Officer Funcionario Financiero Principal</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICAN PARTY</td>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</td>
<td>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>United States Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL DUPLISSEA</td>
<td>ALAN NICHOLS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAUDE W. PARRISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Executive, Controller / Ejecutivo de Negocios, Contralor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPUBLICAN PARTY</th>
<th>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL</td>
<td>HANS HANSSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>County Central Committeeman / Miembro del Comité Central del Condado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireman / Bombero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)  
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)  
本區無人候選為州衆議員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER L. BOWMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR BRUZZONE</td>
<td>Real Estate Advisor</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE YATES</td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td>Real Estate Manager</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPHEN DAVID MAYER</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRK MILLER</td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSE CHUNG</td>
<td>Radiologic Technologist</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX WOODS</td>
<td>Mass Transit Engineer</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUEL A. ROSALES</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent, Titular del Cargo Nombrado</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRIET ROSS</td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM T. HARPER</td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</td>
<td>初選 1990年6月5日</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALOTAS PARTIDARIAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTADO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MARK ISLER  
Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios  
退休教师，商人 |
| 132 |
| CAROL S. KOPPEL  
Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador  
退休法官，教育家 |
| 134 |
| SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ  
College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria  
学院院长 |
| 135 |
| BILL HONIG  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública  
州教育司 |
| 137 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDICIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ALEX SALDAMANDO  
Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal  
地方法院法官 |
| 141 |
| J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY  
Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal  
地方法院法官 |
| 143 |

| NONPARTISAN BALLOT | PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990 |
|-------------------|
| 初選 1990年6月5日 |
| JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3  
Superior Court Judge, Office #3  
高等法院法官，第三号法庭 |
| 選一人  
Vote for One |
| JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5  
Superior Court Judge, Office #5  
高等法院法官，第五号法庭 |
| 選一人  
Vote for One |
| JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15  
Superior Court Judge, Office #15  
高等法院法官，第十五号法庭 |
| 選一人  
Vote for One |

| NONPARTISAN BALLOT | PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990 |
|-------------------|
| 初選 1990年6月5日 |
| CARLOS BEA  
Incumbent / Titular del Cargo  
现任 |
| 147 |
| KAY TSENIN  
Attorney / Abogada  
律师 |
| 149 |
| JEROME T. BENSON  
Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior  
高等法院法官 |
| 153 |
| DONNA HITCHENS  
Attorney / Abogada  
律师 |
<p>| 155 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O'CONNOR</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5</td>
<td>ASFOR</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #7</td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #9</td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #11</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Housing and Homeless Bond Act of 1990</td>
<td>YES 185, NO 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Passenger Rail and Clean Air Bond Act of 1990</td>
<td>YES 189, NO 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Governor’s Review of Legislation, Legislative Deadlines, Legislative Constitutional Amendment</td>
<td>YES 192, NO 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Property Tax Exemption for Severely Disabled Persons, Legislative Constitutional Amendment</td>
<td>YES 195, NO 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Traffic Congestion Relief and Spending Limitation Act of 1990</td>
<td>YES 200, NO 203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
CUIDAD Y CONDAO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER VOTADAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 SI — ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDAS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por el valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de viviendas que incluya: (1) viviendas de emergencia y de necesidades especiales, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias y individuos beneficiados por viviendas de arriendo que tienen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados o trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

187 NO — ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDAS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por el valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el programa de viviendas. La propuesta se basa en el presupuesto del estado financiado por fondos de la lotería. Este acta no contiene ninguna referencia a la adquisición de viviendas o subsidios para la rehabilitación de viviendas. La propuesta solicita el voto de los electores en la medida 187 NO en contra de la propuesta 187 SI.

189 SI — ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDAS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por el valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el programa de viviendas. La propuesta se basa en el presupuesto del estado financiado por fondos de la lotería. Este acta no contiene ninguna referencia a la adquisición de viviendas o subsidios para la rehabilitación de viviendas. La propuesta solicita el voto de los electores en la medida 189 NO en contra de la propuesta 189 SI.

190 NO — ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDAS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por el valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el programa de viviendas. La propuesta se basa en el presupuesto del estado financiado por fondos de la lotería. Este acta no contiene ninguna referencia a la adquisición de viviendas o subsidios para la rehabilitación de viviendas. La propuesta solicita el voto de los electores en la medida 190 NO en contra de la propuesta 190 SI.

192 SI — REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL Gobernador. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Esta acta propone revisar la legislación existente, incluyendo la de los tribunales, para garantizar que la revisión legislativa propuesta cumple con las leyes en vigor y que sea efectiva en su ejecución.

193 NO — REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL Gobernador. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Esta acta propone revisar la legislación existente, incluyendo la de los tribunales, para garantizar que la revisión legislativa propuesta cumple con las leyes en vigor y que sea efectiva en su ejecución.

195 SI — EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. Esta acta propone exonerar del impuesto a la propiedad a las personas severamente incapacitadas, incluyendo a aquellos que puedan ser calificados como discapacitados. La propuesta se basa en el presupuesto del estado financiado por fondos de la lotería.

197 NO — EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. Esta acta propone exonerar del impuesto a la propiedad a las personas severamente incapacitadas, incluyendo a aquellos que puedan ser calificados como discapacitados. La propuesta se basa en el presupuesto del estado financiado por fondos de la lotería.

199 SI — ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDAS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por el valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el programa de viviendas. La propuesta se basa en el presupuesto del estado financiado por fondos de la lotería. Este acta no contiene ninguna referencia a la adquisición de viviendas o subsidios para la rehabilitación de viviendas. La propuesta solicita el voto de los electores en la medida 199 NO en contra de la propuesta 199 SI.

200 SI — ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDAS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por el valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el programa de viviendas. La propuesta se basa en el presupuesto del estado financiado por fondos de la lotería. Este acta no contiene ninguna referencia a la adquisición de viviendas o subsidios para la rehabilitación de viviendas. La propuesta solicita el voto de los electores en la medida 200 SI en favor de la propuesta 200 NO.

203 NO — ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDAS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por el valor de mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el programa de viviendas. La propuesta se basa en el presupuesto del estado financiado por fondos de la lotería. Este acta no contiene ninguna referencia a la adquisición de viviendas o subsidios para la rehabilitación de viviendas. La propuesta solicita el voto de los electores en la medida 203 NO en contra de la propuesta 203 SI.

N 51, N 52 & N 53
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES 211</td>
<td>NO 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226</td>
<td>NO 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230</td>
<td>NO 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crear una Comisión para que supervise la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Obrarán las misas se evaluasen a honorarios de servicio. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependerían de los salarios de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la detección de los servidores y por poner en vigencia el régimen.


ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefina y expanda la defensa de "asesinato del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Costos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia de asesinatos en primer grado.

DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los delitos cometidos por la Constitución federal; elección de cuatro estatutos. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de esta medida. La medida afecta significativamente en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se puede en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber sobreimpuesto impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza el emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,000,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.5 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir áreas. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $16 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cítrico y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que le Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

COPIA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL.

112 113 114 115 116 117

N.51, N.52 & N.53
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

118
LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.

YES 236 ➔
NO 238 ➔

119
REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STATUTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.

YES 240 ➔
NO 242 ➔

120
NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.

YES 243 ➔
NO 245 ➔

121
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.

YES 248 ➔
NO 250 ➔

122
EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.

YES 254 ➔
NO 256 ➔

123
1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 258 ➔
NO 259 ➔
| N 51, N 52 & N 53 | 17-1N |

| N 51, N 52 & N 53 | 17-1N |

| 236 SI | 负成 |
| 238 NO | 反对 |
| 240 SI | 负成 |
| 242 NO | 反对 |
| 243 SI | 负成 |
| 245 NO | 反对 |
| 248 SI | 负成 |
| 250 NO | 反对 |
| 254 SI | 负成 |
| 256 NO | 反对 |
| 258 SI | 负成 |
| 259 NO | 反对 |

| 118 |
| 119 |
| 120 |
| 121 |
| 122 |
| 123 |

| ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción. |
| 1990年新监狱建筑的公债法案，此法案将发行公债450,000,000 以提供资金来建造新监狱，改善目前州监狱，青少年管教所过度拥挤的情况。 |

| ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos a la Universidad de California, los 28 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los colegios superiores de la comunidad en California, el Colegio de Leyes “Hastings”, la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por los Consejos Administrativos de dicha universidad. |
| 1990年6 月的高等教育建筑物公债法案。此法案将发行公债$450,000,000 以提供资金来建造公共高等教育机构的建筑物，包括以下：加州大学，州立大学的28个分校，州社区大学的71个，哈斯汀斯（Hastings）法律学院，州海事研究院和州立大学董事会于1990年7月11日所批准的其州立大学建筑物。此法案所批准资金的使用，将包括但不限于教学、实验、图书馆、兴趣或办公等建筑物或设施的改善。其他健康的或安全的设备。 |

| ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiciones a prueba de sismos, reparación, renovación y mejoras en edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos. |
| 1990年防震安全设施及公共建筑重建公债法案。此法案将发行公债$300,000,000 以提供资金来建造、改善防震安全设施、修补、替换及改善那些因受地震损害而变危险的州及市政府建筑。 |

| ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejoras de escuelas públicas. |
| 1990年学校建筑物公债法案。此法案将发行公债$800,000,000 以提供资金来建造或改善公校的建筑物。 |
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263
NO 265

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990, and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269
NO 272

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277
NO 278

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

WITHDRAWN

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 284
NO 285
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---

**263 SI**

**265 NO**

---

**269 SI**

**272 NO**

---

**277 SI**

**278 NO**

---

**280 SI**

**281 NO**

---

**ELIMINADA**

---

**284 SI**

**285 NO**

---

**NOTA**

- **263 SI**: Sostener un Plan de Seguridad Pública de $332,400,000 durante 1990, garantizando el mantenimiento de la seguridad pública.
- **265 NO**: Rechazar el Plan de Seguridad Pública de $332,400,000.
- **269 SI**: Aprobar un Plan de Seguridad Pública de $332,400,000.
- **272 NO**: Rechazar un Plan de Seguridad Pública de $332,400,000.
- **277 SI**: Aprobar un Plan de Seguridad Pública de $332,400,000.
- **278 NO**: Rechazar un Plan de Seguridad Pública de $332,400,000.
- **280 SI**: Aprobar un Plan de Seguridad Pública de $332,400,000.
- **281 NO**: Rechazar un Plan de Seguridad Pública de $332,400,000.

---

**C**

**D**

**E**

**F**

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290</td>
<td>NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293</td>
<td>NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298</td>
<td>NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305</td>
<td>NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309</td>
<td>NO 310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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288 SI 贊成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?

290 SI 贊成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contractos con el sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para los contribuyentes de la ciudad?

292 NO 反對

293 SI 贊成
¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad de San Francisco sean miembros de los Distritos Escolares Unificados de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?

295 NO 反對

296 SI 贊成
¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?

297 NO 反對

298 SI 贊成
¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y del Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a seis miembros?

299 NO 反對

300 SI 贊成
¿Será un requisito que los miembros de las comisiones y los comisionados de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que sean elegidos para los miembros de otras comisiones, corregimientos y comisarías de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no resulte en un conflicto de interés con otros en cargos que cumplan con otras responsabilidades, en los cuellos de ser requerida una persona con experiencia, sensibilidad o habilidades especiales y no pueda seleccionarse algún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?

301 NO 反對

302 SI 贊成
¿Se fomentará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de residentes del mismo sexo?

304 NO 反對

305 SI 贊成
¿Se prohibirá que algún preste servicio durante más de dos periodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando las Supervisores que están en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1999 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un periodo completo de cuatro años cuando termine su periodo actual?

307 NO 反對

309 SI 贊成
¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?

310 NO 反對
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ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — If you do not wish to go to your polling place to vote, you may vote by mail or by going to the Registrar’s Office in City Hall in person. This is called absentee voting.

BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest.


CHARTER BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (PROPOSITION J, K, L) — Boards and commissions created by the Charter, either directly or indirectly.

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

DEFERRED CAPITAL MAINTENANCE (PROPOSITION B) — Major building repair projects that have been postponed.

ELECTOR (PROPOSITION L) — A person who is eligible to register to vote.

FINANCE (PROPOSITION C) — Various ways to pay for something over time. This may include raising money or offering something in trade.

FISCAL YEAR (PROPOSITION A, D) — The twelve months from July 1 to June 30 make up a fiscal year. The City budgets revenues and expenses on a fiscal year basis.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INITIATIVE (PROPOSITION F, O) — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE (PROPOSITION D, J) — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters. For such a law to be passed by the Board of Supervisors, a majority, (or in some cases, three-fourths) of the Supervisors must vote to approve the law at two consecutive meetings.

OUTSTANDING PRINCIPAL (PROPOSITION A, C) — The actual amount of borrowed money, not yet paid back. Principal does not include interest charges.

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A person who has turned in the required papers and signatures with the Registrar of Voters to run for an office as a write-in candidate. The name of this person will not be on the ballot. Voters who want to vote for this person can do so by writing the name of the person on the inside of the grey envelope given with the ballot.

SPECIAL PROPERTY TAX [MELLO-ROOS DISTRICT] (PROPOSITION B) — A flat tax on a parcel of land, which is not based on the property’s value. The special tax would be in addition to current property taxes. This tax requires a two-thirds majority vote.

STAFFING LEVEL (PROPOSITION F) — The number of employees on duty at any one time.

TAX EXEMPT DEBT (PROPOSITION C) — Money borrowed by the City which is paid back with interest. The lenders are not taxed on the money earned from these loans.

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now," "The Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters' rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, and Molly Wood

Board of Supervisors appointees: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gillham, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
APPLICATION TO BE A PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

The physically disabled may apply to be permanent absentee voters. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, you will automatically receive an absentee ballot every election until you move or re-register.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the form below and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158, City Hall, San Francisco, 94102. Each time you move or re-register to vote, you must apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases you do not need to re-apply.

I hereby apply for “Permanent Absentee Voter” status in San Francisco by reason of:

___ Lost use of one or more limbs. ___ Lost use of both hands.

___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g. cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair).

___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease.

___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities.

___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

___ PLEASE SEE EXPLANATORY LETTER ATTACHED.

Name

FIRST  MIDDLE  LAST

Residence Address

# STREET  APT. #

Mailing Address

# STREET  CITY  ZIP CODE

(if different than residence address given above)

I declare under penalty of Perjury that the above is true and correct:

Date __________ Signature __________________________

(Return only this page; do not return the whole book)
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens over 18 years old who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 8, 1990.

Q — I moved before May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 8 and June 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — If you are registered as a member of a political party you may choose a candidate for:
   Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Member-State Board of Equalization (District 2), Member-State Assembly, State Senator if you live in Senate District 8, United States Representative, and members of the County Central Committee.
   Non-partisan offices are:
   Superintendent of Public Instruction, Superior Court Judge, Municipal Court Judge, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 5, 1990. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let us know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help you.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don’t know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to my polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 5 by:
   • going to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall from May 7 through June 5, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday; or
   • mailing in a request for an absentee ballot. You may send in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. The application must be received by the Registrar of Voters before May 29, 1990.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include:
   • your home address
   • the address to which you want the ballot mailed
   • your printed name and your signature.
   Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSessor
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is paid $98,670 a year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLic DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is paid $102,882 a year.
The Public Defender represents the following persons unable to pay for their own lawyer: 1) persons accused of crimes, 2) juveniles in legal actions, and 3) persons in mental health hearings.
Candidates for Assessor

PAUL E. SCHWENGER

My address is 16 Ord Court, Apt. #4
My occupation is Deputy Assessor
My age is 53
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan, Mission High School graduate, and San Francisco State University graduate. I have been a Deputy Assessor for San Francisco for the past 22 years. I have been awarded the SRPA, Senior Real Property Designation, which is one of the highest awards for professional appraisers. My 22 years of experience will enable me to effectively represent homeowners' and renters' concerns before State Legislative Committees. I will analyze property values to make sure business pays its fair share and I will oversee the operations of the Assessor's office in an experienced and professional manner.

Paul E. Schwenger

The sponsors for Paul E. Schwenger are:

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: With 28 years of public service, I am the only candidate with real management experience.
As Sheriff of San Francisco, I managed 399 employees; as Police Chief, 2,500; as New York Prison Commissioner, 13,000.
While this would be the largest managerial responsibility faced by the other candidates, it would be my smallest.
I want to be your assessor so I can make it a model agency. I know government and real estate. I am dedicated to public service and to lower taxes for you.
Mayor Agnos agrees I am the rational choice.
I would appreciate your vote.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Attorney/Supervisor
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have absolutely no ownership or income interests in real property which create any conflict of interest as Assessor.

As attorney for 25 years, Supervisor for three terms, and past President of the Board, I have a proven record of unique, practical accomplishments.

Just as I've fought for reduced local government spending, I'll work for new statewide lower assessment formulas with the same energy that created the nationally copied No-Smoking Ordinance; the Police Fingerprint Computer which reduced our crime rate; laws allowing earthquake victims to quickly replace damaged buildings.

My goal is to achieve fair, reduced property assessments.

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred S. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Chief of Police.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St. #20D, Attorney-Legislator.
Nancy Pelosi, 2640 Broadway, Member of Congress.
John Burton, 712 Vermont, Assemblyman.
Jim Gonzalez, 642 Edinburgh, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th Street, Community College Board.
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired City Treasurer.
Sam Duca, 16 Wawona St., Assessor.
John J. Lo Schiavo, 650 Parker Avenue, President - USF.
David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., University Professor, UCSF.
Sofie Hoffman, 2825 Lake St., Chairman, Salvation Army, Advisory Bd. Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave. #4, Teachers’ Union President.
Collin P. Quock, 140 Casitas Avenue, Physician.
Richard Rodriguez, 37 Brentwood Ave., Vice President Teamsters.
Sam Jordan, 4006 3rd St., Cater.
Alfred D. Trigueiro, 1956 Stockton St., Police Officers Association Official.
Lawrence B. Martin, 401 Garfield Street, International Representative, Transport Workers Union.
John Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist.
Louis G. Spadaro, 1177 California St. #315, President, Bay Area Sports Hall of Fame.
Mary Frances Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Businesswoman.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Assistant to Speaker.
John J. Moylan, 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader.

RONALD G. KERSHAW

My address is 3533 21st Street
My occupation is Real Estate Portfolio Manager
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are: B.S. Accounting, Brigham Young University 1975
MBA Real Estate, Golden Gate University 1986
Eleven years experience in all aspects of property management, appraisals, renovation and property sales
Currently responsible for supervising a real estate portfolio of $150,000,000
Past President SF Chapter, Institute of Internal Auditors
Currently, President, Log Cabin Club of San Francisco
San Francisco homeowner and resident since 1975.
San Francisco needs a fiscal conservative who is the only qualified candidate to become the City’s new Assessor.

The sponsors for Ronald G. Kershaw are:

Theresa L. Claassen, 1940 Broadway, Retired Social Worker. James Fang, 170 Gellert Drive, Journalist.
Wade Francis, 2436 15th Ave., Lawyer. William E. Grayson, 95 Sea Cliff, Attorney.
James L. Howard, 839 41st Ave., Child Welfare Supervisor.
Ronald G. Kershaw, 3533 21st Street, Real Estate Portfolio Manager.
Leonard J. Lacayo, 925 Persia Ave., Consultant.
Tung K. Lee, 1312 California, President, Chinese Times Newspaper.
Christina I. Mack, 2963 23rd Ave., Accountant.
Nancy A. Nichols, 1032 Broadway, Archaeologist.
George H. Pfau, Jr., 2298 Vallejo St., Stockbroker.
Emily G. Pike, 1800 Broadway, Retired.
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Owner, Andre’s TV.
Helen Skripkin, 347 14th Avenue, Retired.

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender represents people in trouble who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. The responsibility must be performed ethically, competently, and efficiently. During three terms in office, with the help of a superb staff of men and women, that duty has been fulfilled with compassion, dignity, and with the highest professional standards of the American legal system.

In the next term, I pledge to continue to carry out the special trust of this office: to guarantee that everyone in this City has the full benefit of our Constitution and is treated with fairness and with justice.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:


Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #3

ALEX SALDAMANDO

My address is 700 Arkansas Street
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: In my 11 years presiding as a Municipal Court Judge, I have worked to protect the citizens of San Francisco. I have delivered justice swiftly and firmly, in a fair and impartial manner. As a Superior Court Judge, I would bring the same approach to felony criminal cases and complex civil disputes. I am currently President of the California Judges Foundation. My background includes experience as a prosecutor and a public interest lawyer. A graduate of the University of California (Berkeley) and Hastings College of Law, I live with my wife and two children on Potrero Hill.

My sponsors include: Judge Ira Brown, Jr.; Judge John Dearman; Judge Isabella Grant; Judge Ed Stern; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Lillian Sing; Former Judge Charles Renfrew; Mayor Art Agnos; Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein; Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi; Assemblyman Willie Brown; Assemblyman John Burton; Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Harry Britt; Supervisor Jim Gonzalez; Supervisor Terence Hallinan; Supervisor Willie Kennedy; School Board Member Rosario Anaya; School Board Member Libby Denebeim; School Board Member Fred Rodriguez; Commissioner Paul Melbostad; Larry Mazzaola, President, Local 38; Thelma Shelley, Director, Performing Arts Center; Benny Yee; Stan Smith, Building Trades Council; and Police Commissioner John Keker.

Alex Saldamando

J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY

My address is 340 Magellan
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a Municipal Court Judge since 1974, native Californian, resident San Francisco since 1937; attended local schools, N.D.V., St. Ignatius, USF and USF School of Law; married Patricia M. Berti, admitted State Bar 1960, devoted thirty years to public service; adjunct Professor of Law, USF; participant, member and/or lecturer for many organizations — Salesian Boys Club, 44 years — Municipal Court Speakers Bureau — California Judges Association — California Center for Judicial Education and Research — San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project; Supervising Judge, Preliminary Courts, Presiding Judge, Assistant Presiding Judge, Court Administrative Committee member eight years; honored by: San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Irish-Israeli-Italian Society, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, Lawyers Club, USF School of Law and USF Law Society for outstanding community service.


J. Dominique Olcomendy

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #5

KAY TSENIN

My address is 637 Steiner Street
My occupation is Attorney and Counselor at Law
My age is 43 years
My qualifications for office are: B.A., San Francisco State University (Dean’s List), graduate, University of San Francisco School of Law. Attorney for sixteen years specializing in civil litigation. Pro-Tem Municipal Court Judge in San Francisco for five years.

Born in China, moved to San Francisco as a child, graduate of George Washington High School.

Broad Community service includes founding of environmental law societies while in law school, Vice President for Legal Affairs for California National Organization for Women (NOW), Board Member for the Russian American Credit Union and San Francisco Trial Lawyers and Board Advisor for the Legal Advocates for Women. Vice-President, Alamo Square Neighborhood Association.

Strong commitment to equal justice for all without prejudice or bias. The following San Franciscans support me because they feel that the Superior Court needs a judge with my background, legal expertise and perspective on the law:

Sheriff Mike Hennessey, Supervisor Harry Britt, Dr. Leland Yee, Attorney Paul Melbostad, Jean Harris, Calvin Welch, Attorney Sue Hestor, Attorney Mary C. Dunlap, Roberto Esteves, Bob Ross, Matthew Rothschild, Pat Norman, Jonathan Bulkley, Susan P. Kennedy, Adrian Bermudez, Lawrence Brinkin, John H. Cushner, Attorney Anne Kiruerek, Eugene Kiruerek, N. Arden Danekas, Laura E. McBride, Donna Yutzy, Gale Armstrong.

Kay Tsenin

CARLOS BEA

My address is 2727 Pierce Street
My occupation is Judge Superior Court #5
My qualifications for office are: I am a Superior Court Judge in San Francisco and author of articles in several professional journals, such as California Trial Lawyers and Defense Research Institute’s. Am recognized by the State Bar for pro bono work with members of the Hispanic Community. Have served two terms as a member of the Board of Visitors, Stanford Law School. Was a panelist and lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar. Was an adjunct professor, Hastings College of Law and Stanford Law School. I graduated from Stanford Law School and have been an attorney in San Francisco since 1959.

Sponsors include: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Ollie Marie-Victoire, all the judges of the Superior Court, Angela Alioto, Ernest Chuck Ayala, Willie Brown, Jr., John Burton, Jim Gonzalez, Quentin Kopp, H. Jesse Amelle, James Herman, Mary Noel Pepys, Robert McDonnell, G. Joseph Bertain, Edward McFetridge, Zeppelin Wong, Paul Renne, Leo Murphy, Jr., Gina Moscione, James Brosnahan, Barbara Caulfield, Robert Morales, Paul Haerle, Michael Hardeman, Howard Nemecrovski, Edwin Heafey, Jr., Larry Mazolla, Vincent Friia, Putnam Livermore, William Coblentz.

Carlos Bea

Kay Tsenin

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DONNA HITCHENS

My address is 468 30th Street
My occupation is attorney
My age is 42 years
My qualifications for office are: Over the past thirteen years, I have represented clients in San Francisco courts, taught law to San Francisco students and served on the Boards of Directors of private and public agencies designed to further the cause of justice in our city.

My experience as a mediator, counselor and advocate demonstrates my willingness to pursue alternative dispute resolutions. Judicial leadership and integrity are standards that the community should demand. My record attests to my ability to meet those standards.

• J.D. UC Berkeley 1977
• Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates, a public interest firm specializing in sex discrimination cases. 1978 – 1984
• Co-founder, Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom
• Staff Counsel, ACLU. 1984 – 85
• Partner, Hitchens & Brenner. Small Business, non-profit corporations, civil rights and family law. Presently
• Former chair, San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women.
• Member, Board of Directors, Pacific Primary PreSchool. SUPPORT: Assemblymember John Burton; Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisors Nancy Walker, Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, and Terence Hallinan; Judge Lillian Sing, Judge Mary Morgan, and Judge Herbert Donaldson; Commissioners Jim Jefferson, Adrian Bermudez, Jr., James Morales, Paul Melbostad, Richard Grosboll, and Leni Marin; Hon. Libby Denebeim; Hon. Leland Yee; Carol Migden; Will Leong; Catherine Dodd, R.N.; Jeff Mori, and Mauri Schwartz

Donna Hitchens

JEROME T. BENSON

My address is 187 Robinhood Drive
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the Superior Court
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are:
• 23 years public service in the courtroom protecting victims, litigants and the community.
• 7 years as Chief of the Criminal Division in the District Attorney’s Office including:
  • 65 felony jury trial prosecutions for murder, rape, child abuse, drugs, white-collar fraud.
• Stanford Law School graduate 1964.
• Chairman, State Bar of California Subcommittee on Jury Instructions (Criminal).
• Member, Project Safer California.
• Fair and equal application of the law without regard to race, sex, or economic status.
• I am a native San Franciscan and homeowner living with my wife and two daughters near Miraloma Park.
• My judicial office is dedicated to fair rulings, hard work, human sensitivity, and legal equality.

CITYWIDE SUPPORT:
State Senator Quentin Kopp; Justice Harry Low; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Public Defender Jeff Brown; Sheriff Michael Hennessy; Former Chief of Police Alfred Nelder.

SUPERVISORS:
Angela Alioto, Tom Hsieh, Wendy Nelder;

JUDGES:
John Ertola, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Ina Gunmant, Paul Alvarado, Isabella Grant;

LABOR:
Mike Hardeman, Stan Smith, Kevin Ryan;

ATTORNEYS AND COMMUNITY:
William Coblentz; Harold Dobbs; Charles Breyer; Airport Commission President Morris Bernstein; Wayne Friday; Benny Yee; Louis Giraudo; Doris Thomas; Christopher Bowman; Haddie Redd; Elizabeth Aguilar-Tarchi; Ron Huberman;

Jerome T. Benson

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

JAMES HARRIGAN

My address is 494 Mangels St.
My occupation is Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department.
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I live in Glen Park with my wife, Serena Lee, and our three children.
I received my law degree with academic awards and Law Review distinction in 1975 from Golden Gate University, San Francisco.
I have completed more than 80 jury and court trials in Municipal and Superior Court, representing thousands of citizens and victims of crime in civil and criminal cases in private practice, as a public defender, and as Legal Counsel to the Sheriff.
My expertise includes: employment law, labor relations, criminal, landlord/tenant, and constitutional law. As Counsel to the Sheriff, I resolve the legal affairs of a major law enforcement agency. My work brings me before the civil and criminal justice system each day.

"James Harrigan is by far the best qualified candidate. No other candidate has his broad range of experience: public service and private practice; law enforcement and defense law; extensive courtroom experience and administrative expertise. I strongly urge your vote for James Harrigan."

— Sheriff Michael Hennessey

I have not listed my sponsors. I firmly believe the voter’s decision should be based on one’s qualifications and experience — not on political connections.
I pledge equal application of the law. I ask for your support.
Thank you.

James Harrigan

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Ave.
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My qualifications for office are: What I am in life, I owe to my family and to an excellent education: M.A., counseling, Stanford University; B.A., psychology, University of San Francisco; Juris Doctorate, Hastings College of Law. I began practicing law in 1982 and have been an assistant district attorney since 1983: with experience in criminal prosecution and family law enforcing child support. I have served 10 years on the College Board; my colleagues elected me president three terms because of my firm but fair judgment. My duties include equitably settling conflicts, grievances and contracts. In my years of public service, compassion, integrity and common sense have always guided my decisions; and as a judge that will continue to be the case.
My supporters:
Justice Harry Low
Judges: Isabella Grant, Lenard Louie, David Garcia, Larry Kay, Mary Morgan, Bill Mallen, Herbert Donaldson.
District Attorney: Arlo Smith
Public Defender: Jeff Brown
Senators: Milton Marks, Quentin Kopp
Attorneys: Charlie Clifford, Harriet Ross, William Coblentz,
Cedric Chao, Roberta Achtenberg
BART Director: Mike Bernick
Commissioners: Rosario Anaya, Tim Wolfred, Chuck Ayala,
Naomi Gray.
Supervisors: Thomas Hsieh, Angela Alioto
Walter Johnson; Alex Esclamado; Reverend Amos Brown;
Carole Migden;
UC Regent Yori Wada.

Julie Tang

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: I'm honored that MAYOR ART AGNOS and 8 PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION — who know my courtroom experience and qualifications in civil and criminal law — endorse me.

As a lawyer in private practice 18 years, mother of 2 children, married 19 years, I care about the strength and integrity of San Francisco's courts.

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred community trust — not a consolation prize for a restless politician. A lawyer lacking courtroom experience is unqualified to be judge.

In HUNDREDS of court appearances and trials, as chair of the Bar Association Criminal Justice Advisory Council, as a San Francisco Delinquency Prevention Commissioner, and as a Hastings Law School teacher, I have demonstrated a longstanding commitment to professional excellence.

Community and law enforcement leaders who acknowledge my legal service and endorse me:

SPEAKER Willie Brown
SUPERVISORS Nancy Walker, Bill Maher, Harry Britt, Terence Hallinan
JUDGES Dorothy vonBeroldingen, John Dearman, Edward Stern
COURT COMMISSIONER George Colbert
SENATOR Milton Marks
SCHOOL BOARD JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Libby Danebeim, Myra Kopf
POLICE COMMISSIONER John Keker
FIRE COMMISSIONER Sharon Bretz
SHERIFF LIEUTENANT Connie O'Connor
POLICE OFFICERS VICE PRESIDENT Paul Chignol
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY Charles Wood
BUSINESSMAN Mel Swig
PUC COMMISSIONER Rodel Rodis

Ellen Chaitin

WILLIAM J. O'CONNOR

My address is 3615 Buchanan St. #206
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: I am the most qualified candidate for this office. I have had judicial experience, serving as Municipal Court judge pro tem for over five years, and have been commended by the Presiding Judge for the quality of my service. I have been a journeyman lawyer for 15 years, with both criminal and civil experience, and have done over 30 jury trials.

With Amnesty International and Church representatives, I have been an International Trial Observer.

I have been a Board Member of the Elizabeth Frye Center and the Irish Forum, and a volunteer on the Bar Association's free legal services panel.


William J. O'Connor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #3

LILLIAN K. SING

My address is San Francisco Municipal Court,
400 Van Ness Ave.
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the San Francisco
Municipal Court
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: I am an incumbent judge, and
have been a judge since 1981. I am the first Asian-American
woman judge in the history of Northern California. In 1988, I
was awarded Trial Judge of the Year by San Francisco Trial
Lawyers Association, one of the highest awards a Bar Associa-
tion can bestow. Last year, I was unanimously elected as Muni-
cipal Court's Presiding Judge. As Presiding Judge, I implemented
the Pro Tem Judge Program, drastically reduced backlog in
civil/criminal cases, brought Trial Court Funding to San Fran-
cisco, spearheaded San Francisco's first judicial forum "Access
To Justice" attended by 680 people. I served as a faculty member
with the California Center for Judicial Education/Research
which trains all new judges in California and am a faculty judge
with the National Institute for Trial Advocacy which trains trial
lawyers. In 1988 I lectured throughout China on the U.S.
Legal/Judicial System.

Join San Francisco judges led by Presiding Judges Choppelas,
and Marie-Victoire, Mayor Art Agnos, President Harry Britt,
and the entire 11 Board of Supervisors, Assembly Speaker Willie
Brown, Assemblyman John Burton, Senator Milton Marks, For-
mer Police Chiefs Nelder/Cahill, DA Arlo Smith, PD Jeff
Brown, Sheriff Michael Hennessey and retain me as judge.

Lillian K. Sing

JEROME A. DEFILIPPO

My address is 1534 38th Avenue
My occupation is Attorney at Law
My qualifications for office are: A third generation San Fran-
ciscan. I have practiced law in The City since 1973, served as
the Legal Officer of the San Francisco Police Department and a
Deputy City Attorney. I am committed to the impartial application
of our laws in all judicial proceedings. Having served twenty
years as a Police Officer attaining the position of Lieutenant, I
am well aware of the frustrations each of us feel by the impact
of crime in our City. If elected, I am committed to the imposition
of the maximum sentence allowed by law for persons convicted
of violent crimes or narcotic sales.

Partial list of sponsors follows:
Ann Alberigi, Catherine Archbold, Alfred Arnaud, Martin
Bastiani, Chief Thomas Cahill, Ann Carrick, Peter Cimarelli,
Hon. Antone Cincotta, Clement Collins, Jean DeFilippo, Cantor
Martin Feldman, Nancy Feldman, H. Welton Flynn, John
Fracchia, Carol Fujioka, John Gallagher, Judith Gallien, Kath-
leen Gee, Dr. William Gee, Susanna Lee, Margaret Leong,
Maureen Mahoney, Carmelita Mathais, Phyllis Moylan, James
Pagano, Renzo Panelli, Timothy J. Riordan, Rollin Schroth, Joan
Swensden, Spiron Tentes, Paul Vigo, Rita Young

Jerome A. DeFilippo

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against these measures. All arguments, “official” and paid, are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None of them has been checked for accuracy by this office or any other city official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Official Arguments”

There is one “official” argument for and one against each measure, and they are published at no cost. “Official” arguments are selected by the Registrar of Voters in accordance with the priorities set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code as summarized below:

For:

1. Person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee supporting the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Against:

1. For a referendum, person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee against the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Rebuttals

Authors of official arguments may each prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. As with official and paid arguments, rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Each rebuttal follows immediately after its corresponding official argument.

Paid Arguments

All paid arguments are accepted for publication upon (1) deposit of an amount equal to $50 plus $1.50 per word, (2) submission of a petition containing valid signatures of registered voters in lieu of the printing fee at the rate of two signatures for each dollar of the fee, or (3) a combination of a printing fee and signatures which together equal the number of signatures and/or amount of money required to qualify the argument for publication.

For each measure, paid arguments follow after the official arguments and rebuttals. All paid arguments supporting a measure are printed together followed by all paid arguments against that same measure. Paid arguments within each group (e.g. all paid arguments in favor of Proposition 2) are not printed in any particular order. Rather they are arranged so that each page is fully utilized.

There is one ballot measure for which paid arguments were not accepted. The School Facilities Safety Special Tax measure is being proposed under state law; only one argument for, one argument against, and respective rebuttals for this measure are allowed.

Again, arguments and rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked by this office or any other city official or agency.
PROPOSITION A

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263
NO 265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City buildings were damaged by the October 17, 1989 earthquake and many may not survive another strong earthquake. Many City buildings contain asbestos and many are not accessible to disabled persons. Many City buildings do not meet current health, safety and building codes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $332,400,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This total would be reduced by the amount of grants the City receives from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the State of California for earthquake repair and hazard reduction. No more than $65,000,000 of bonds could be sold in any fiscal year.

This money would be used to pay for safety improvements to some City buildings, including repairing earthquake damage, making the buildings better able to survive earthquakes, removing or reducing the danger of asbestos in these buildings, making them more accessible to the disabled and bringing them up to current codes.

The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds for not more than $332,400,000 to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue bonds to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that the approximate costs would be as follows:

- Bond redemption: $332,400,000
- Bond interest: 244,314,000
- Debt service requirement: $576,714,000

The bond authorization limits the issuance of bonds to no more than $65 million per year. Assuming a single sale on a 20 year basis at current interest rates with no reduction for possible FEMA or State funding, annual debt service on each $65 million increment would amount to $5,638,750, which amount is equivalent to one and forty-eight hundredths cents ($0.0148) in the current tax rate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 26, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A the earthquake repair and protection measure.

Proposition A provides $332.4 million to repair earthquake damaged city buildings and to seismically reinforce many of them so that they would not sustain as much damage (or worse) during a future earthquake. This improves public safety while it also protects the investment we are making in repairs.

Your "Yes on A" vote will provide for:
- Repairs of earthquake damage, asbestos removal and handicapped accessibility work in over 200 earthquake damaged city buildings.
- Seismic strengthening of the Civic Center complex including City Hall, the Veterans Building, Opera House, Department of Public Health and Civic Auditorium.
- Seismic strengthening for the Palace of Fine Arts/Exploratorium, nine additional branch libraries, two additional police stations, two jails and the services building at San Francisco General Hospital.
- Replacement of the broken and earthquake damaged water and sewer lines at the Zoo.
- Proposition A represents a prudent investment which would protect many irreplaceable public buildings from major damage or collapse in a future earthquake.

In order to keep property taxes from rising more than 2-3¢ per $100 of assessed value, Proposition A will not allow more than $65 million in bonds to be sold in any one year. It further requires that any Federal or State earthquake relief money we receive to repair these buildings reduce the amount of bonds sold. This assures that local taxpayers will not be required to pay for repairs that can be made using Federal/State emergency relief assistance.

Vote Yes on Proposition A to protect city buildings and increase public safety in a next major earthquake.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition A
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition A
Public Safety Improvement Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

When future earthquakes strike, our libraries need to be safe. Proposition A will provide funds to help earthquake proof our library system.
Vote YES on A.

Michael Mellor, President
Friends of the San Francisco Public Library

This bond issue will help to ensure the seismic safety of the Palace of Fine Arts, home of the Exploratorium which is visited by over 600,000 people a year. Prop A represents a prudent investment to improve public safety and protect irreplaceable public buildings. We urge all citizens to vote “Yes” on Proposition A.

Exploratorium
F. Van Kasper, Chairman
William K. Coblenz, Vice Chairman
C. Richard Kramlich, Vice Chairman
G. Steven Burrill, Treasurer

Replacement of the earthquake-damaged, underground, 50-year-old water, gas and sewer lines at the San Francisco Zoo is critically needed for the safety and well-being of the animals. It will significantly improve public services to the 1.2 million children and adults who visit annually. The Zoological Society will endeavor to raise funds to renovate and build new above-ground facilities to supplement the $26 million included in the bond issue for the Zoo. Help make the Zoo a true sanctuary.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Zoological Society Board
Frances May McAteer
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Amy Meyer
People for GGNRA
Andrew Nash
President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Treni W. Orr
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Elizabeth D. Rieger
Zoo Volunteer
Fred A. Rodriguez
School Board Member
Carroll Soo-Hoo
Zoo Benefactor
Stephen V. R. Spaulding
Zoological Society Treasurer
James J. Walsh Jr.
Citizens Advisory Committee on Wastewater Management
Connie O’Connor
President, Recreation & Park Commission

David E. Anderson
Zoo Director
Phil Arnold
Assistant General Manager
Recreation & Park
William Brewster Ely IV
Headmaster, Town School
Mary Burns
General Manager
Recreation & Park
Margaret K. Burks
Executive Director, Zoological Society
Jack W. Castor
Animal Keeper Shop Steward,
Local 858
Todd Cecil
Children’s Zoo Keeper
Sherri Chiesa
President, Local 2
Robert Todd Cockburn
Executive Director, Clean Water Program
Rosemary Davidson
Urban School
Dolores A. Donovan
Animal Control & Welfare Commission
Keith G. Eickman
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Roy Eisenhardt
Director, California Academy of Sciences
Becky Evans
Conservation Activist
Norman Gerstein
Director, Ecosystem Survival Plan
Arthur J. Goedewaagen
Board Member, SPEAK
John E. Hafernik Jr.
Professor Biology, SFSU
Roger Hopkins
Director, Children’s Zoo
Michael Howsh
Assistant to the Mayor
David J. Howe
Animal Keeper
Mark Hurley
Animal Control & Welfare Commission
Norma J. Kristovich
Zoo Docent Council
Connie Lurie
Vice Chairman, Zoological Society Board

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We must rebuild and repair our infrastructure.
The October 17 quake was a warning.
More resources going to earthquake preparedness programs
today will save lives in the future.
Vote YES on A.

We urge everyone to vote YES on Proposition A. The people of San Francisco will have a $3.5 billion investment in public buildings. This bond issue will be used to fund repairs to many of our facilities damaged in last October's earthquake, including City Hall, General Hospital, neighborhood libraries, police stations and cultural buildings. It will also provide monies necessary to make life-safety improvements to other city buildings.

Your YES Vote on Proposition A will protect lives and property in the event of another major earthquake at a very small cost to businesses and homeowners. Because bonds to finance repairs will be sold over 6 - 10 years, replacing older bond issues as they are paid-off, the result will be an almost unchanged tax rate. In fact, the City's independent budget analyst found that the tax bill for an average homeowner will increase by less than $5.00 a month.

Proposition A is a small price to pay to preserve our investment in the city's valuable public facilities.
Vote YES on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

We ask that you join with us in Voting YES ON PROP. "A". Your "Yes on A" vote will provide funds to protect the two remaining Police Stations which are not yet earthquake safe or provided for in previous bond issues.

In an emergency we can do our jobs only if our own police facilities are earthquake resistant and if we can get to those places in the City which most need our services. That is why it is important to us that as many City buildings as possible are made earthquake resistant. The less damage and street obstruction that results from a future earthquake, the better we can get to these parts of the City where we are most needed. The safer the public buildings in the City are made, the better we will be able to serve the rest of the City if we ever have to face a major earthquake emergency.

For security vote "Yes on A".

Michael Keys President
San Francisco Police Officers' Association

The damage done by the October 17th earthquake to San Francisco's most important public buildings is considerable. To correct that damage and prepare for the future vitality of our City demands the kind of response represented by Proposition A. This proposition carefully earmarks funds to upgrade buildings such as City Hall, the War Memorial Opera House, and the Department of Public Health offices which are treasures that can never be replaced or reproduced. They not only need to be repaired, but strengthened structurally and improved, to meet today's building codes. The Federal Government will pick up some of the damage, but much more will be needed if these vital components of our City's daily life are to be improved and made ready for the next major quake.

Proposition A requests a large sum, but this is a time when we as a City have to agree to such a request. We strongly urge your support of Proposition A.

American Institute of Architects/San Francisco Chapter

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

We ask you to join us in voting “Yes on A”.
The primary purpose of Prop “A” is to protect lives and public buildings from the effects of the next earthquake. As San Franciscans we all share the responsibility of having to do all we can to avoid the loss of life, the suffering and the huge costs which another, perhaps stronger or longer quake would bring. Thus we see Proposition “A” as a necessary, prudent investment in all our future.

We have a special reason to support “Prop A” and to ask you to vote YES ON “A” as well. That special reason is the fact that 20 of the buildings which will be repaired or strengthened against future earthquakes if Prop “A” passes will also be made fully accessible to the disabled. We want our City’s buildings to be repaired, to be made safe and to be made accessible to all San Franciscans.
Vote “Yes on A”.

Kathy Uhl, Executive Director,
Independent Living Resource Center
Michael L. Comini, Executive Director,
Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition “A”.
Many city buildings were damaged in the October 17 earthquake. If these buildings are repaired and strengthened the Fire Department will be much safer when responding to future emergencies.
Please help the Fire Department do its job safely and effectively by voting “Yes” on Proposition “A”.

James D. Jefferson, President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn, Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bretz, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Souls, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Frederick F. Postel, Chief of Department

We urgently request that you vote “Yes on A”.
The War Memorial complex of buildings, dedicated to San Francisco’s veterans, are one of our city’s treasures, irreplaceable architecturally and economically. They are central to our history and we owe it to ourselves to make sure they are made as fully earthquake-resistant as possible.
The October 17 earthquake was a warning which we must heed. Proposition “A” is a prudent and necessary response. It will protect our treasured buildings and, even more importantly, it will protect the lives of those who use them and the memories of those whose lives they commemorate.

Harold F. Jackson, Chairman, American Legion War Memorial Commission
Claude M. Jarman, Jr., Vice-President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Mark Ryser, Executive Director, Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage

Save lives.
Support earthquake safety.
Vote YES on Propositions A and B.
Also vote YES on Proposition N. Limit San Francisco Supervisors to two-four year terms.

Terence Faulkner
Republican State Assembly Candidate
San Francisco Republican Party Chairman (1987-89)

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Candidate
Past San Francisco Democratic Party Secretary
Max Woods
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic County Central Committeewoman

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for your safety. Let us learn from the October 17th earthquake. 15 seconds of moderate shaking resulted in the need for $32 million in repairs to city buildings in the Civic Center alone. We need to be better prepared. We need to reduce known safety hazards. Please, vote YES on Proposition A.

Ken Dowlin, City Librarian
Steve Coulter, Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson, Library Commissioner
Lonni Chin, Library Commissioner
Jean Kall, Library Commissioner
Dennis Normandy, Library Commissioner
Roselyne Swig, Library Commissioner

Help the City of San Francisco and the Zoo rebuild. The animals will benefit, too! Vote YES on A.

Susanne Barthell,
Zoo Advisory Committee member,
Zoo Volunteer
Sophie Papageorge,
Zoologist
Jorge L. Garcia, D.V.M.,
Zoo Medicine Specialist
John J. Alcaraz,
Retired Zookeeper
Roni Joan Howard,
Educator

David J. Howe
Animalkeeper
Terrence J. Moyles
Animalkeeper
Linda Caratti
Animalkeeper
Anthony Sharp
Animalkeeper
Martin E. Dias
A.K.A. Big Bison, Animalkeeper
Jack W. Castor
Lion House, Animalkeeper
Sandra Keller
Director, Citizens for a Better Zoo

Proposition A will help restore structural safety to the San Francisco County Jails in San Bruno, which were built in 1934 and are badly in need of repair. This is the oldest operating jail in California and sits near the San Andreas fault.

For the safety of City employees and county jail inmates, please vote YES on Proposition A.

Michael Hennessey
San Francisco County Sheriff
Deputy Albert Waters, President
San Francisco Deputy Sheriff’s Association

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION A

This bond issue is iffy. It should have been presented to the voters as two separate bond issues.

One for $75 million — earthquake repairs to be partly refunded by F.E.M.A. for our present estimated damages. Another for $257.4 million to take care of our needed capital improvements so neglected by this and past administrations.

Vote NO and get one issue back on the November ballot.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1990, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, TO PAY FOR THE COST OF PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION, ASBESTOS ABATEMENT, PROVIDING ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED, ALL RELATED TO PUBLIC SAFETY TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING RELATED ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT FOR THE FOREGOING PURPOSE; AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND THE CONTROLLER TO MONITOR THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEM A OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; FINDING THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF THE ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 5th day of June, 1990, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of said city and county a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the herein-after described municipal improvements in the amount and for the purposes stated:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, to pay for the cost of public safety improvements to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled, all related to public safety to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including related acquisition, construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purpose; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual post-audit receipt of FEM A or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, Resolution No. 88-90, $332,400,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in said resolution are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. Authorizing and directing the Chief Administrative Officer and the Controller to monitor the issuance of the bonds and the actual post-audit receipt of FEM A or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction and to take any appropriate action so that the bonds issued will not duplicate FEM A or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 4. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the results thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 5. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 5, 1990, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 31, 1990.

Section 6. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch cards ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided,

(Continued on next page)
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however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be
incurred in any single fiscal year and
provided, further, that the authorization
in the amount of $332,400,000 will be
reduced by the amount of the actual re-
cipt of FEMA or State of California
grants for earthquake repairs and haz-
ards reduction."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby
submitted and in favor of the issuance of the
Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space
opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right
of said proposition, and to vote against said prop-
osition and against the issuance of the Bonds
shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space op-
opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right
of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the
cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards
are used at said special election, each voter to
vote for any said proposition shall punch the
ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to
the right of said proposition, and to vote against
said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the
hole after the word "NO" to the right of said

proposition.

Section 7. If at such special election it shall
appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on
the proposition voted in favor of and authorized
the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the
purposes set forth in said proposition, then such
proposition shall have been accepted by the elec-
tors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost
of the municipal improvements described herein.
Such bonds shall be of the form and character
known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a
rate not to exceed 12 per centum per annum,
payable semiannually, provided, that interest for
the first year after the date of any of said bonds
may be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective
proposition shall be counted separately and when
two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on
such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such
proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 8. For the purpose of paying the prin-
cipal and interest on said bonds, the Board of
Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general
tax levy and in the manner for such general tax
levy provided, levy and collect annually each
year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a

sum in the Treasury of said city and county set
apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming
due for the principal and interest on said bonds,
a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such
bonds as the same becomes due and also such
part of the principal thereof as shall become due
before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for
making the next general tax levy can be made
available for the payment of such principal.

Section 9. This ordinance shall be published
once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San
Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published
daily in the City and County of San Francisco,
being the official newspaper of said city and
county and such publication shall constitute no-
tice of said election and no other notice of the
election hereby called need be given.

Section 10. The appropriate officers, employ-
es, representatives and agents of the City and
County of San Francisco are hereby authorized
and directed to do everything necessary or desir-
able to the calling and holding of said special
election, and to otherwise carry out the provi-
sions of this ordinance.

☐
PROPOSITION B

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (I) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its after shocks), (II) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (III) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (IV) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-81 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269
NO 272

Analysis
by City Attorney

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Some School District buildings were damaged by the earthquake. Some District buildings do not meet present earthquake and fire standards.

The State Mello-Roos law allows the Board of Education to submit to the voters a measure authorizing a special property tax to pay for repairs and other improvements to school buildings.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize a special property tax to pay for costs of repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety. Some of the money would also be used for deferred capital maintenance. The repairs and maintenance would be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis. Since no money would be borrowed, there would be no interest costs to pay.

The tax would last for 20 years. The tax on single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels could be no more than $46 for each of the first six years and no more than $32.20 for each of the last 14 years. The tax on other types of parcels could be no more than $28 for each dwelling unit for each of the first six years and $16.10 for each dwelling unit for each of the last 14 years. Dwelling units occupied by persons 65 years of age or older would be eligible for an exemption from this tax. The measure would also set an annual appropriations limit of $12 million.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to authorize this property tax to pay for repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety and you want to authorize this annual appropriations limit.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to authorize this tax.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed special tax levy be approved, in my opinion, it would increase revenues for the San Francisco Unified School District, net of estimated senior citizen exemptions, by approximately $8 million per year for the first 6 years and $5.8 million per year for the next 14 years, based on the current assessment roll of the City and County. The approximately $127.2 million generated over a 20 year period by this special tax levy would be restricted for use by the District for the repair, restoration, replacement, seismic upgrading and capital maintenance of School District facilities.”

How “B” Got on the Ballot

On February 13, the Board of Education voted 5-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Board members voted as follows:


NO: Leland Yee.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When the earthquake struck last fall, our school buildings suffered. Sustaining major damage and at special risk in the future are our buildings that were not earthquake proofed in the 1970's. In that category are our child care centers serving our youngest students. Also, in the fall of 1988 the City Fire Marshall inspected our schools and reported that the majority of our school buildings do not meet fire safety standards. Our 63,000 students and the community groups that meet at our schools in the evenings and on weekends must have buildings that can withstand earthquakes, and meet fire safety standards.

Proposition B will authorize a tax to provide for: repairing earthquake damage at 131 sites including the reconstruction of John O'Connell High School, seismic improvement of nine Children's Centers, correction of fire code and safety violations at 97 sites and seismic improvement of John Swett, Jean Parker and Bessie Carmichael Elementary Schools and Parkside Curriculum Center. In addition, there will be funds for deferred capital maintenance.

Two years ago the citizens of this City voted to support major repairs for our school buildings. Now we must protect that investment by repairing the present earthquake damage and seeing that all our schools can withstand future earthquakes, be as safe as possible in case of fire and be well maintained into the next century.

Civic organizations who have joined in supporting Proposition B include: San Francisco League of Women Voters, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SF/PTA, Parents' Lobby, San Francisco Labor Council, United Educators of San Francisco, and Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth.

Submitted by Superintendent Ramon C. Cortines, San Francisco Unified School District, and Fred Rodriguez, President, Board of Education.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition B
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

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

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California
February 13, 1990
(For Board Meeting February 13, 1990)


REQUESTED ACTION:
WHEREAS, the Board of Education (the "Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "District"), did, on January 9, 1990, adopt its Resolution of Intention (the "Resolution") to form Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "Community Facilities District"), and levy a special tax therein, pursuant to Chapter 2.5 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 53311) of the California Government Code, commonly known as the "Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982," as amended, (the "Act"); and

WHEREAS, a copy of the Resolution (which sets forth a description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, the name of the Community Facilities District and the types of facilities proposed to be financed by the District (the "Facilities")), providing that, except where funds are otherwise available, a special tax sufficient to pay for all Facilities and the financing thereof (to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all non-exempt real property in the Community Facilities District) is proposed to be levied within the proposed Community Facilities District specifying the rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the proposed Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, and setting a hearing thereon, is on file with the Clerk of this Board and is incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, notice of said hearing was duly published as required by law, as evidenced by the affidavit of publication on file with the Clerk of this Board; and

WHEREAS, on February 13, 1990 this Board held the noticed public hearing as required by law relative to the proposed formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, prior to the noticed public hearing the report (the "Report") containing a description of the Facilities and an estimate of the cost of providing the Facilities, including the estimated fair and reasonable cost thereof, was filed with this Board as a part of the record of said hearing; and

WHEREAS, the public hearing on matters pertaining to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution, including all interested persons or taxpayers for or against the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent of the Community Facilities District, or the furnishing of specific types of public facilities, were heard and considered, and a full and fair hearing was held thereon; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing evidence was presented to this Board on the matters before it, and this Board at the conclusion of the hearing was fully advised as to all matters relating to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, written protests against the establishment of the District, the furnishing of specified type or types of facilities within the Community Facilities District as listed in the Report, or the levying of the special tax have not been filed with the Clerk of this Board by fifty percent (50%) or more of the registered voters, or six registered voters, whichever is more, residing within the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District, or the owners of one-half (1/2) or more of the area of land in the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District and not exempt from this special tax;

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District, in regular session assembled on February 13, 1990, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE, DETERMINE AND ORDER as follows:

Section 1: The foregoing recitals are true and correct.

Section 2. Written protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, or the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are insufficient in number and in amount under the Act, and this Board hereby further orders and determines that all protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are hereby overruled.

Section 3. As proposed in the Resolution, a community facilities district is hereby established pursuant to the Act, designated "Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District."

Section 4. The map and legal description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, filed with the Clerk of this Board on January 24, 1990, are hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the boundaries of the Community Facilities District.

Section 5. The Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District, set forth in Exhibit "B" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, shall be the Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District.

Section 6. As provided in Exhibit "B", it is the intention of this Board, subject to the approval of the qualified electors of the Community Facilities District, to levy a special tax sufficient to acquire, construct and improve the Facilities including administrative expenses to be incurred by the District and the Community Facilities District in connection therewith; said tax to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all non-exempt real property in the Community Facilities District.

The rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax, in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, is described in Exhibit "A" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.

Section 7. The description of the proposed voting procedure, as set forth in the Resolution, is hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the voting procedure to be used in these proceedings.

Section 8. The special tax has not been precluded by majority protest pursuant to Section 53324 of the Act.

Section 9. The Facilities to be funded from the special tax are identified in Exhibit "B" hereto.

Section 10. In accordance with Section 53340.1 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, this Board shall designate the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District as the office, department or bureau which will be responsible for annually preparing the current roll of special tax levy obligations by assessor's parcel number on non-exempt property within the District and which will be responsible for estimating future special tax levies pursuant to Section 53340.1 of the Act.

The name, address, and telephone number of the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District, and the person responsible for administering the District, is as follows:
Director of Fiscal Services
Fiscal Services Department
San Francisco Unified School District
135 Van Ness Avenue, Room 215
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 241-6480

Section 11. In accordance with Section 53328.3 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B (Continued)

consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, the Clerk of this Board shall record the notice of special tax lien provided for in Section 3114.5 of the Streets and Highways Code. Upon recordation of the notice of special tax lien pursuant to Section 3114.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, a continuing lien to secure each levy of the special tax shall attach to all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District, and this lien shall continue in force and effect for one year, and satisfaction of the lien shall be permanently satisfied and the lien cancelled in accordance with law or until collection of the tax by this Board ceases.

Section 12. A boundary map of the Community Facilities District has been recorded pursuant to Sections 3111 and 3113 of the Streets and Highways Code at Book 39, Page 182-183 in the Book of Maps of Assessment and Community Facilities Districts in the Office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 13. All prior proceedings taken with respect to the establishment of the District were valid and in conformity with the requirements of the Act.

Section 14. In accordance with Section 53325.7 of the Act, the annual appropriations limit of the District, as defined by subdivision (b) of Section 8 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution, is hereby preliminarily established in the amount of $36,000 per fiscal year, and said annual appropriations limit shall be submitted to the voters of the District as hereafter provided. The provision establishing said appropriations limit shall become effective if approved by the qualified electors voting thereon and shall be adjusted in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 53325.7 of the Act.

Section 15. The Board hereby calls an election and submits the question of levying the special tax, and the establishment of the annual appropriations limit for the District in connection therewith, to the qualified electors within the District, at an election to be held on Tuesday, June 5, 1990, all in accordance with and subject to the Act, the terms of which shall be applicable to such election.

Section 16. The Board hereby further directs that the election at which the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith is submitted to the qualified electors within the District shall be consolidated and shall be held in one ballot proposition, all as provided by the Act; and the Board further directs that notice of the consolidated election on the combined proposition of authorizing the levy of the special tax and of establishing an appropriations limit be published as required by law.

Section 17. If two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax are cast in favor of levying the tax, as determined by this Board after the canvass of the returns of such consolidated election, the Board may levy the special tax within the territory of the District in the amount and for the purposes as specified in this resolution. The special tax may be levied only at the rate and may be apportioned only in the manner specified in this resolution, subject to the Act, except that the special tax may be levied at a lower rate.

Section 18. The Clerk of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution, a certified map of the boundaries of the Community Facilities District, a sufficient description to allow the election official to determine the boundaries of the District, and the assessor's parcel numbers for the land within the District to the Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco within three business days after the adoption of this resolution.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 13th day of February, 1990.
President of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District
ATTEST:
Clerk of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District
Recommended by:
Ramon C. Cortines
Superintendent of Schools

EXHIBIT A
RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT BASIS OF SPECIAL TAX LEVY

The annual special tax shall be levied on each separate parcel within Community Facilities District No. 1 of the San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco County, California ("CFD 90-1") as shown on the San Francisco County Assessor's records, subject to the maximum rates specified below, as established by the Board of Education ("Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District ("District").

DETERMINATION OF PARCELS SUBJECT TO SPECIAL TAX

The records of the County Assessor of San Francisco County shall be used to determine the parcels subject to the special tax. The basis for determining the parcels will be the Secured Property Tax Roll. The land use code contained in the Secured Property Tax Roll, in combination with records maintained by the Assessor of the number of dwelling units on each residential parcel in CFD 90-1, will be the basis for assigning the appropriate tax rate to each parcel. If the District determines that the records maintained by the Assessor are incorrect with respect to one or more parcels, the District will assign the appropriate land use code and dwelling unit count based on its review of the property. All special taxes shall be based on parcels established in the County Assessor's records as of March 1 of each year and all land use categories shall be based on building permits and other relevant development approvals granted by the City and County of San Francisco or any successor jurisdiction as of June 1 of each year.

Using the records of the County Assessor, the District shall prepare a list of the parcels subject to the tax. The District shall establish the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.

1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which, supported publicly-owned and non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that leasehold/possessor interests shall be taxed.

2. From the parcels remaining identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor's determination, and the District's review of building permits and other changes in development status:

a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on that parcel will be classified based on the uses that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $32.20 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CFD 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CFD 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the deter-

(Continued on next page)
ministration of the parcels subject to the tax and their special tax assignments.

SENIOR CITIZEN EXEMPTION

A property owner may apply for a Senior Citizen Exemption which would provide an exemption from the special tax for the applicable tax year on dwelling units occupied by senior citizens, if the following conditions are met:

1. The applicant must show evidence that the dwelling unit is owned or rented by a citizen who is at least 65 years of age.

2. The applicant must show evidence of ownership of the property subject to the Exemption.

3. The Senior Citizen Exemption must be applied for annually.

4. If the applicant is a landlord, then he or she must certify that the entire tax exemption will be reflected only in the rent for the exempted dwelling unit(s).

EXHIBIT B
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO.

90-1 — Description of Facilities to be financed:
(i) Repair, restoration, and/or replacement of District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), to the extent that (A) such repair, restoration, or replacement is outside the scope of work approved by federal and state agencies for assistance from such agencies; (B) costs incurred in such repair, restoration, or replacement are ineligible for federal or state assistance; or (C) insufficient federal or state funds are appropriated, obligated, or approved to pay for repair, restoration, or replacement which would otherwise be eligible for federal or state assistance. Pending receipt by the District of disaster assistance from federal and/or state agencies, the Community Facilities District may advance funds to the District to pay costs eligible for federal or state disaster assistance; provided that upon receipt by the District of federal or state disaster assistance relating to such costs, the District shall promptly reimburse the Community Facilities District for any such advances.

(ii) Seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other District facilities.

(iii) Correction of fire safety violations of District facilities.

(iv) Deferred capital maintenance of District facilities. Incidental expenses, including the cost of planning and designing the Facilities and the cost of environmental evaluations thereof; all costs associated with the creation of the proposed Community Facilities District, the determination of the amount of and collection of taxes, the payment of taxes, and costs otherwise incurred in order to carry out the authorized purposes of the Community Facilities District; and any other expenses incidental to the construction, completion, and inspection of the Facilities and permitted under the Act.
BOUNDARIES OF SPECIAL TAX DISTRICT

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THIS __________ DAY OF __________.

RAMON C. CORTINES, CLERK
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE WITHIN MAP SHOWING PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, WAS APPROVED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AT A REGULAR MEETING THEREOF HELD ON THE 9TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1990, BY ITS RESOLUTION NO. 01-0981.

RAMON C. CORTINES, CLERK
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

FILED THIS __________ DAY OF __________, 1990, AT THE HOUR OF __________ O'CLOCK __________ M. IN BOOK __________ OF MAPS OF ASSESSMENT AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICTS AT PAGE __________, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER IN THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

BRUCE JAMISON
COUNTY RECORDER
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE: TITLE 3 DIVISION 1 CHAPTER 2 ARTICLE 2, 22138 — SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY LIMITS

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER, BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN MATEO IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN, ON THE EXTENSION OF NORTHERN LINE OF T3S OF MOUNT DIABLO BASE, THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE PACIFIC COAST, TO ITS POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE WESTERLY EXTENSION OF THE LOW-WATER LINE ON THE NORTHERN SIDE OF THE ENTRANCE TO SAN FRANCISCO BAY, BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MARIN AND NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN FRANCISCO, THENCE EASTERLY, THROUGH POINT BONITA AND POINT CAVALLO, TO THE MOST SOUTHEASTERN POINT OF ANGEL ISLAND, ALL ON THE LINE OF MARIN, THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE EASTERN LINE OF MARIN, TO THE NORTHWEST POINT OF GOLDEN ROCK (ALSO KNOW AS RED ROCK), BEING A COMMON CORNER OF MARIN, CONTRA COSTA AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE DUE SOUTHEAST FOUR AND ONE-HALF STATUTE MILES TO A POINT ESTABLISHED AS THE CORNER COMMON TO CONTRA COSTA, ALAMEDA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, ON THE WESTERN LINE OF ALAMEDA COUNTY TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF T3S, R.W., M.D.B. & M., THENCE WESTERLY ON THE TOWNSHIP LINES AND AN EXTENSION THEREOF TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING. THE ISLANDS KNOWN AS THE FARRALONES (FARRALLONA) ARE A PART OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY.

PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO STATE OF CALIFORNIA

KCA ENGINEERS, INC.
CONSULTING CIVIL ENGINEERS

JANUARY 1990
Equipment Lease Financing

PROPOSITION C

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277
NO 278

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City obtains computers, telephone systems and other equipment by paying for it all at once or by leasing it until it is paid for, which is called "lease financing." The City may not enter into long-term leases for financing equipment unless (1) the voters approve it, or (2) the lease requires the Board of Supervisors to approve the payments each year. When the Board of Supervisors must approve the lease payments each year, interest rates are higher than when the lease payments are not subject to annual approval. Also, interest rates charged by for-profit companies are generally higher than interest rates charged by non-profit corporations.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment. Under Proposition C, the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval, could authorize the lease financing of equipment without the lease payments being subject to annual approval. A non-profit corporation would be created to buy the equipment and would issue tax-exempt debt to pay for it. The City would lease the equipment from the non-profit until it was paid for. The total principal of the debt issued by the non-profit corporation could not be more than $20 million in the first year. This limit on the outstanding principal would increase five percent each year. The Board could approve this type of lease financing only if the Controller certified that the interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application, costs could be increased or decreased in presently indeterminate but probably not substantial amounts."

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Equipment Lease Financing

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would allow the City to lease finance needed equipment at the lowest possible interest rates. The City would establish a non-profit corporation, which would buy equipment approved by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors and lease it to City departments.

The charter currently requires the voters to approve lease financing if done through non-profit corporations. Financing through a non-profit is the less expensive method because interest rates are tax-exempt. The City has had to occasionally use the more expensive method because it is not always possible to delay purchasing critical equipment until an election is held.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Saves the City money by allowing current and future leases for equipment to be financed at lower interest rates (currently 6% to 7%) than must now be used with private corporations (ranging 9% to 16%).

By simply refinancing existing leases, the City could save over $500,000.

Additional money could be saved on any future leases.

Gives the City the option to pay cash for equipment or to finance it expeditiously at a low cost to the City.

Allows quicker replacement of inefficient and outdated equipment, which will reduce maintenance costs, decrease downtime, and increase productivity for equipment which has outlived its economic useful life.

Provides restrictions to insure prudent use of this financing mechanism.

Requires the Controller to certify that the lease is the least costly financing method.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition C
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition C

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

7.309 Voter Approval of Lease Financing

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financing arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purposes of this section, "lease financing" occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.
Recycling is not only easier than you might think, it's a simple way you can do your part for environmental conservation—and feel good about it, too.

All you need is an ordinary brown paper bag.

Each time you set up your kitchen garbage, place an extra brown bag or two out for recycling. Then every day just drop your newspaper into a recycling bag—a week's worth of papers fits perfectly (and your newspapers will stop piling up on the floor!).

When you're finished with an aluminum soda or beer can simply pop it in a separate bag. The same goes for bottles; just put them in a bag, labels and all. Then when you're on the way to the supermarket or heading out for the day, drop off the bags at a Recycling Center near you. Or, you can tie your newspaper with string and the garbage company will collect it free of charge.

That's it. When you think about it, isn't recycling almost as easy as not recycling?

And it really is the right thing to do.

For a free Recycling Guide and a list of Recycling Centers near you, call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL 554-6193
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

PROPOSITION D

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no special City fund to pay for neighborhood beautification projects or graffiti clean-up. Money can be spent for this purpose only when the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors approve it in the City's budget.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is an ordinance that would create a "Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund" ("the Fund") to pay for cleaning up graffiti on public buildings and beautifying the neighborhood.

The Chief Administrative Officer would manage the Fund. Businesses could pay up to one percent of their payroll or business taxes into the Fund. Grants or money donated for graffiti clean-up would be deposited in the Fund. The goal of the ordinance is to produce for the Fund $1,000,000 each year, adjusted annually for inflation. The Controller would change the percentage of taxes businesses could pay into the Fund to produce $1,000,000 in the fund each fiscal year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this fund.

Controller's Statement on "D"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, General Fund revenues could decrease by as much as $1.4 million in fiscal 1990 and as much as $1 million per year, adjusted for inflation, thereafter."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker.
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D asks the voters to make the revitalization of our neighborhoods and the wiping out of graffiti a top city priority without raising taxes.

Proposition D will permit those employers currently eligible in San Francisco to earmark up to 1% of their payroll or gross receipts tax bill to establish The Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

The fund will be used to award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city. The Budget Analyst has estimated that approximately one million dollars would be available every year.

Proposition D creates a unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers to keep our city attractive. It will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting and graffiti clean-up.

Also, Proposition D will fund public information and education campaigns to combat litter, and instill in our youth the old-fashioned virtue of respect for public and private property.

The fund created by Proposition D will be administered by the Chief Administrative Officer with public input from environmental organizations and neighborhood committees.

Proposition D was authored by Supervisor Jim Gonzales and has been submitted to the voters with the support of the Sierra Club, San Francisco Beautiful, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

According to their ballot argument, the Board of Supervisors wants to create a “unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers” to reduce graffiti. What’s stopping them from doing that now?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

The supervisors also say they want to provide “seed money” for planting trees and improving street lighting. Well, why haven’t they placed items in the city budget to do so?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

In their rebuttal argument, the supervisors claim that “many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle.” Whose fault is that, if not their own?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

Finally, the supervisors have the temerity to state: “With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark” funds for graffiti. What would be “fair” is if San Francisco businesses paid lower taxes. But no one should be “earmarking” tax dollars except elected representatives of the people!

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

There’s no question that graffiti is a serious problem demanding serious solutions. But what good is it to divert $1,000,000 a year from other city programs? That’s robbing Peter to pay Paul! It’s bad government!

Why do we need Proposition D? We don’t.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

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

56
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

I know something about graffiti.
I wrote the city ordinances prohibiting the sale of spray paint and large, felt-tip pens to minors. I also authored the state law to allow police officers greater latitude in arresting juveniles who deface public transit vehicles. This year, I'm pursuing a bill to revoke for one year the driver's license of any person convicted of graffiti vandalism.

Proposition D is not about graffiti or "neighborhood beautification". It's about diverting millions from the city's General Fund. It's about depriving existing city programs of critically needed revenue. Proposition D is a financial shell game.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Proposition D would allow any city business to designate up to 1% of its payroll tax check for deposit in a special fund. According to the supervisors' Budget Analyst, Proposition D could divert up to $1,442,260 from the General Fund in the program's first year.

Thereafter, annual diversions would approximate $1,000,000, plus inflation.
That's over $1,000,000 per year which cannot be spent on police services, fire protection, libraries, and public health.
As you can plainly see from my legislative record, I'm no soft touch when it comes to graffiti prevention and clean-up. But Proposition D is the wrong approach. "Special funds" and "segregated accounts" have no place in our city budget.

Graffiti programs deserve adequate city funding, and the Board of Supervisors and Mayor should move promptly to appropriate such funds in the next regular budgetary cycle.

The voters, meanwhile, should move promptly to reject Proposition D on June 5th!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We need a city plan that invests in the quality of our neighborhoods . . . Now. It's obvious laws banning the sale of spray paint and felt pens have done nothing to stop the sprawl of graffiti or create a climate of cooperation between city officials and neighborhood groups to find real solutions.

Proposition D is about beautifying our neighborhoods consistently. Proposition D is about wiping out graffiti permanently. With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark a mere one-hundredth to be poured back into the neighborhoods.

Out of a greater than two billion dollar annual budget, the city can afford a guaranteed million dollars to help keep our city beautiful, clean, and graffiti-free. Year in and year out, many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle. Proposi-

 tion D will provide a solid foundation for the revitalization of our neighborhoods, which no one can tamper with and that requires no new taxes.

Over the last few years, individual Supervisors have spent many weekends planting trees and removing graffiti with neighborhood groups. Working with groups such as SF ALIVE, San Francisco Conservation Corps, 24th Street Revitalization Committee and the West Portal Merchants Association to make our neighborhoods shine has taught us one thing . . . neighborhood environmentalists and city departments working together as partners will be a winning combination for San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

When City Hall and neighborhood organizations work together, problems can be solved. Vote YES on D.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

There is a reason that the San Francisco Beautiful, the Sierra Club and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, along with dozens of neighborhood groups support placing PROPOSITION D on the ballot.

San Franciscans are united in wanting to preserve and enhance our city’s attractiveness and keep San Francisco one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

Our Supervisors put PROPOSITION D on the ballot for your approval because they realize that a more attractive city starts with people like you and me and our neighbors who truly care about San Francisco.

YES ON PROPOSITION D creates a working partnership between our neighborhoods and city government;
YES ON PROPOSITION D means a more beautiful city and enhancement of your neighborhood and mine;
YES ON PROPOSITION D accomplishes this with NO NEW TAXES, allowing large employers to earmark up to 1% of their current payroll tax for beautification and graffiti cleanup;
YES ON PROPOSITION D pays for neighborhood-generated projects, giving residents a say in how these reserved funds are spent;
YES ON PROPOSITION D is the first step to guaranteeing more beautiful and attractive neighborhoods.

Join your neighbors, business owners and environmentalists by voting YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Al Pross, Chair
COMMITTEE FOR BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBORHOODS

The quality of life in our neighborhoods will truly become a top city priority with the passage of Proposition D.
• Proposition D will provide over a million dollars a year from the business community to stop neighborhood decay (through a voluntary checkoff on their payroll or gross receipts tax bill).
• Proposition D will award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city.
• Proposition D will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting, and graffiti clean-up.
• Proposition D will fund an educational campaign to teach our youngsters a new respect for public and private property.
Let’s protect our city’s special livability. Let’s foster civic pride. Let’s invest in the long term health of San Francisco’s residential neighborhoods. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Supervisor Jim Gonzales

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

Graffiti is a blight on the beauty of San Francisco. We strongly encourage the continued generosity of grants and donations to eradicate this problem. However, during the current deficit-ridden period, it is irresponsible for the City to direct at least $1,000,000 a year from the General Fund for this purpose.

The San Francisco Republican Party urges you to vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley
William E. Grayson

Anna M. Guth
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hanyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"

Why add more government to your taxes. $1 million per year to be funded from Payroll taxes which has a sunset clause to expire in 1990.

Then who pays the tab? You do.
If the police would assert their powers and nab the violators, instead of the City offering to pay to clean up their "works of art" this ordinance would not be necessary.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION D

[Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund]

AN ORDINANCE, ADDING SECTIONS 10.98 AND 10.98-1 TO THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO ESTABLISH A NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND AND SPECIFYING THE PURPOSES THEREOF AND AMENDING PART III, SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, BY ADDING ARTICLE 12B-1 THERETO, TO PROVIDE THAT ANY BUSINESS WHICH OWES A PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX OR BUSINESS TAX MAY ELECT TO DESIGNATE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE TAX FOR DEPOSIT IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND.

NOTE: All sections are new.

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Sections 10.98 and 10.98-1 thereto, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.98. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: FINDINGS AND INTENT.

(a) Findings.

The proliferation of graffiti on public buildings and other public property has created a blight which offends both citizens of and visitors to San Francisco. The removal of such graffiti will enhance the beauty of the city in which we live and will encourage others to visit and to relocate here. Removal will thus both reflect and renew our civic pride and contribute to our economic viability. Providing a source of funds for the promotion of neighborhood beautification projects will support the efforts of local residents and businesses to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and the local economy, and assist in reducing the amount of graffiti in San Francisco.

(b) Statement of Intent.

The Board of Supervisors wishes to address the above concerns by establishing a neighborhood beautification and graffiti clean-up fund which will promote neighborhood beautification projects, including projects designed to improve the environmental quality of neighborhoods, and finance the clean-up of graffiti on public property.

SEC. 10.98-1. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: ESTABLISHMENT; ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS; DUTIES.

(a) Establishment of Fund. There is hereby established a special fund for the purpose of receiving all donations of money which may be collected by the City and County of San Francisco for the purposes enumerated in Section 10.98(b). Monies deposited in the fund shall only be expended for the purposes enumerated therein, provided that such expenditures shall include reimbursement to City and County departments for expenses incurred in the administration of the fund. The special fund shall be known and designated as the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

(b) Acceptance of Gifts. All donations of money which may be offered to the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund are hereby accepted for such purposes. Any grants, gifts and bequests from private sources for this purpose shall be deposited into said special fund.

(c) Duties of the Chief Administrative Officer.

1. The Chief Administrative Officer, or his or her designee, shall be responsible for the administration of the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund, and shall have all such authority as may be reasonably necessary to carry out those responsibilities.

2. The Chief Administrative Officer shall promulgate such rules and regulations as he or she may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Section and Section 10.98. Before issuing or amending any rules and regulations, the Chief Administrative Officer shall provide a thirty (30) day public comment period by providing published notice in an official newspaper of general circulation in the City of the intent to issue or amend the rules and regulations. The rules and regulations shall be approved by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. Such rules and regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the qualifications of applicants and factors to be considered in the award of grants to fund programs to help remove graffiti and promote neighborhood beautification projects, including preference for the following projects: youth programs and innovation, projects that are neighborhood generated, and projects designed to benefit areas of San Francisco that are economically disadvantaged.

3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall submit a semi-annual report to the Board of Supervisors setting forth an accounting of the amounts disbursed and the uses for which said funds were made.

(d) Budgetary and Fiscal Provisions of the Charter. The monies in this fund are subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter and may be expended only when authorized by appropriation ordinance of the Board of Supervisors.

(e) Interest. Interest earned from the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund shall become part of the principal thereof, and shall not be expended for any purpose other than that for which said fund is established.

(f) Accumulation of Monies in Fund. The balance remaining in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Charter Section 6.306 and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said fund for the purposes recited herein.

Section 2. Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code is hereby amended by adding Article 12B-1 thereto, to read as follows:

ART. 12B-1

NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND TAX

OPTION.

SEC. 1030. Initial Option. Commencing in tax year 1990, any business, as defined in Section 1002.1 of this Code, that is subject to the Payroll Expense Tax or the Business Tax may elect to designate up to one per cent (1%) of its tax liability for deposit in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

SEC. 1031. Amount of Fund Annually. It is the intent of the voters of the City and County of San Francisco that one million dollars ($1,000,000.00), derived from tax proceeds designated by the taxpayers pursuant to Section 1031, shall be deposited annually into the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund. The Controller shall annually adjust this figure for inflation to reflect changes in the most recently available U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose Metropolitan Area, or its successor index.

SEC. 1032. Subsequent Option. For each tax year after 1990, the Controller shall determine the amount of fund revenues actually generated in the prior year, including the interest thereon and the balance, if any, remaining at the close of the tax year. On the basis of the prior year’s experience of taxpayer contributions and total revenues generated by the payroll expense and business taxes, the Controller shall calculate a percentage ceiling of total tax liability which taxpayers may designate for deposit in the fund the following tax year. The Controller shall set the percentage ceiling so that the revenues produced thereby are most likely to generate a total of one million dollars (adjusted for inflation) in the fund for the forthcoming tax year. The Controller shall transmit his or her calculation to the Board of Supervisors, which shall adopt a new tax designation ceiling, if necessary, in advance of the tax year to enable the Tax Collector to perform his or her collection duties.

SEC. 1033. Severability. If any section, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof as a separate and distinct proposition.

The continued validity of the Payroll Expense Tax and Business Tax.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PROPOSITION F
Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Fire Commission has the authority to decide the number and staffing of fire companies and the number and location of fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors may change the number of firefighters. The Fire Commission may close or move fire stations or reduce the number of fire companies if it decides they are no longer needed. A fire company typically consists of a fire engine or other emergency vehicle and the firefighters needed to operate it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would specify a minimum number of fire stations and fire companies and minimum levels of staffing for those fire companies. Proposition F would increase the number of firefighters assigned to some types of fire companies. This means that the number of firefighters on duty at all times would increase from 297 to 322. Where necessary, Proposition F’s minimum level of staffing would be met by firefighters working overtime. Overtime pay for firefighters is one and one-half times their normal salary.

Proposition F would limit the power of the Fire Commission, Mayor and Board of Supervisors to set the number of fire stations and staffing levels.

Before closing any fire station or reducing the number of fire companies or units required by Proposition F, the measure would require (1) a recommendation by the Fire Chief; (2) approval by the Fire Commission, after public hearings; (3) approval by the Board of Supervisors; and (4) approval by the voters.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current salary rates and staffing levels of the Fire Department, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $4.9 million per year.”

How “F” Got on the Ballot

On March 2, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition F to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,485* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 21 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 56,384 of the signatures submitted were valid, 15,879 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WHAT IS PROP F?

PROPOSITION F IS A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WILL ESTABLISH A MINIMUM LEVEL OF FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS FOR SAN FRANCISCO. IT GIVES THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE FIRE CHIEF THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MANAGE THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITIZENS.

SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT BECAUSE IT WILL:

1. GUARANTEE THAT THE PRESENT 41 FIRE STATIONS STAY OPEN
2. GUARANTEE FULLY-STAFFED FIRE TRUCKS AT ALL TIMES
3. GUARANTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BEFORE ANY FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED
4. GUARANTEE THAT YOUR FIREBOAT WILL BE STAFFED WITH A FIREFIGHTING CREW OF TWO

THE 7.1 QUAKE OF OCTOBER 17 WARNED US AGAIN — WE MUST BE PREPARED!

ITEM A — MAYOR AGNOS CUT THE FIRE DEPART-
MENT ON-DUTY STAFFING BY 19 PERSONS A DAY IN 1989.

PROP F RESTORES THOSE CUTS.


ITEM C — PROP F DOES NOT REQUIRE "GUARANTEED OVERTIME" AND, IN FACT, BY JULY 1992 NO OVERTIME WILL BE NEEDED FOR THE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS OF PROP F.

(Overtime is now caused by large numbers of vacant positions. New hiring will eliminate all vacancies and overtime by July 1992. Prop F will safeguard this full-staffing.)

PROP F IS A COMMON SENSE MEASURE TO GIVE ADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION TO ALL CITIZENS.

VOTE YES ON F!

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F;
COMMITTEE FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTH-
QUAKE PREPAREDNESS
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

It is clear that Proposition F is not a Fire Safety Issue.

It is clearly an issue to guarantee overtime.

1. This Mayor and Board of Supervisors have never closed a single fire station and have no intention to close firehouses.

2. Most major cities in America consider five firefighters per truck to be fully-staffed. More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire.

3. Proposition F will not restore cuts in firefighters. We are mandated by law to provide 90 new firefighters this year. Proposition F only guarantees overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day, $3.5 million per year.

Our firefighters do a tough job! But we compensate them well!

We need new equipment — not more overtime. Following the earthquake, a fire truck had to be taken from the fire museum to fight fires. Let’s not waste money which could be used for new firefighting equipment.

San Francisco voters rejected a similar proposal in 1987 and it should be rejected again in 1990.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will waste millions of your tax dollars. Just look at the facts.

Fact: Proposition F does not hire new firefighters. The Federal Consent Decree already sets hiring standards — 90 new firefighters will be hired this year without Prop. F.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that Assistant Chiefs and Battalion Chiefs will continue to have chauffeurs.

Fact: Proposition F is not needed to save fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors have no intention of closing any fire stations.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that 18 current firefighters will get daily time-and-a-half overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day . . . or more than $3.5 million extra per year.

Fact: Proposition F is not a fire safety issue. Virtually every major American city deploys five or fewer firefighters on fire trucks. A sixth firefighter is featherbedding, not chauffeurs.

More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire. That’s enough people to raise ladders, ventilate rooftops and carry out lifesaving tasks.

FACT: Our firefighters do a tough job. But they are well compensated already and do not need additional guaranteed overtime . . . especially when there are so many other pressing needs in San Francisco.

FACT: Firefighters in San Francisco are currently paid $300 more per month than the average salaries of firefighters in the four largest California cities. But the other firefighters work 15 percent more hours than San Francisco.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters already receive 23 percent more vacation, sick and holiday leave than other city workers. A recent study by the Controller shows that increased overtime results in increased sick leave and disability.

Study the facts and you’ll agree. Proposition F is nothing more than $7 million per year in unnecessary guaranteed overtime.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

FACT: PROP F does:
- Guarantee that the 90 new firefighters cannot later be eliminated by politicians.
- Require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people before cutbacks can be made to the minimum staffing.
FACT: The Mayor DID cut back Fire Department staffing in August 1989 from 315 to 296.

FACT: Assistant and Battalion Chiefs DO NOT have “chauffeurs.” They DO have an operations and communications assistant.

FACT: Prop F IS needed to guarantee public review and input before any fire station can be closed.

FACT: SIX fire stations have been closed by the Mayor’s office since 1972 without any public review.

FACT: Prop F DOES guarantee that the 19 on-duty firefighters cut by the Mayor in 1989 will be restored. When sufficient new firefighters are hired, NO OVERTIME will be required.

FACT: PROP F IS A FIRE SAFETY ISSUE!

FACT: San Francisco firefighters ARE REQUIRED to work overtime because previous policies of politicians allowed large numbers of vacant positions to occur.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters DO NOT get a paid health plan for dependents, nor do they get longevity pay or other benefits enjoyed by firefighters in the four largest California cities.

FACT: ALL city employees, including firefighters, receive EXACTLY THE SAME vacation, sick and holiday leave. This is a city Charter requirement.

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I STRONGLY SUPPORT PROP F!

Prop F will benefit all the people of San Francisco. Over 71,000 voters from every part of the City signed the petition to put Prop F on the ballot. They expressed enthusiastic support for a stronger Fire Department.

The City is becoming increasingly built-up, causing greater congestion. This means that fire hazards are increasing and adequate fire protection will be even more important to us than ever.

The October 17th earthquake was an urgent reminder of how fragile our city is and how important our Fire Department is to all of us.

When you, the people, call for help, whether it is for a medical emergency, a rescue, or fire, the firefighters come.

PROP F MAKES SENSE FOR ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

It allows you to participate in fire safety decisions that affect your neighborhood.

Our neighborhoods are the "heart" of San Francisco. OUR FAMILIES, HOMES, CHURCHES, FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS NEED SATISFACTORY FIRE PROTECTION.

PROP F WILL MAKE SAN FRANCISCO A SAFER PLACE TO LIVE IN.

VOTE YES ON F!

Bill Maher, Member
Board of Supervisors

I STRONGLY SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!

They provide vital services to our citizens. Last year, our firefighters answered a record-breaking 58,000 alarms and saved thousands of lives. The greatest number of calls came from the Tenderloin, the Inner Mission, the Fillmore, Civic Center/Hayes Valley, Hunters Point and Visitation Valley. I WANT TO BE SURE YOU GET THE HELP YOU NEED — WHEN YOU NEED IT!

Over the past 20 years, unlike other city departments, Fire Department staffing has been slashed by 40%! THREE FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT AGREE THAT THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY ARE TOO FEW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS! THEY AGREE THAT NO MORE FIREFHOUSES SHOULD BE CLOSED.

We NEED Proposition F. It will:
- Put firefighters back on the ladder trucks
- Put firefighters back on our fireboat
- Bring daily staffing up to an adequate level
- Guarantee that any proposed closings of fire companies will be subject to a public review and vote by the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people
- Guarantee the SFFD the funding it needs

THE COST OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT IS ONLY 2 CENTS A DAY FOR EACH OF US! That 2 cents could easily save a life — maybe yours, or that of a loved one. PROP. F WILL BENEFIT ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

I STRONGLY SUPPORT IMPROVED FIRE PROTECTION IN SAN FRANCISCO!

I SHARE THE CONCERNS OF THE 71,000 VOTERS WHO PUT THIS PROPOSITION ON THE BALLOT. Fire Department daily staffing has been forced so low that our safety is threatened. WE MUST KEEP OUR FIREFHOUSES OPEN AND FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED.

In addition to fighting fires, our firefighters perform many services for our elderly, disabled and low income families that no one else does. FIREFIGHTERS RESPONDED TO OVER 58,000 EMERGENCIES LAST YEAR, INCLUDING 26,000 MEDICAL CALLS.

We depend on our firefighters to protect our families, homes, and businesses. Our narrow streets, steep hills and rows of wood frame buildings make firefighting very difficult. SAN FRANCISCO HAS SPECIAL FIREFIGHTING AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL NEEDS! We are different from other California cities with their wide streets, flat terrain and detached buildings!

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING FOR PROPOSITION F. THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL BENEFIT ALL OUR CITIZENS.

WENDY NELDER, Member
Board of Supervisors
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

STOP REDUCTIONS IN CITY FIRE PROTECTION! VOTE YES ON F!

Over 71,000 San Francisco voters from every neighborhood, ethnic group and economic level joined to put PROPOSITION F on this ballot. They are concerned because politicians have reduced daily staffing to a dangerous all-time low while emergency calls reached an all-time high of 58,000 last year. People want their neighborhood firehouses to stay open and their fire engines, aerial ladder trucks and fireboat fully staffed to meet their emergency needs. They want a Charter Amendment to take politics out of fire safety decisions.

Remember October 17! We learned that we need a strong Fire Department to fight fires, perform rescues and coordinate civilian volunteers. When both bridges are down, we need a strong SFFD!

THIS IS A COMMON SENSE PROPOSITION — IT IS SUPPORTED BY 3 FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT!

Join your friends and neighbors! VOTE YES ON F!

John L. Molinari
Former member of the Board of Supervisors

ONLY YOU CAN STOP FURTHER DANGEROUS CUTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

Over the years, the San Francisco Fire Department has assisted hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans in time of great personal need. The people understand how important the SFFD is in their lives, and OVER 71,000 OF THEM SIGNED THE PETITION TO PLACE PROPOSITION F ON THE BALLOT. The citizens want to be heard!

SFFD EMERGENCY RESPONSES ARE INCREASING DRAMATICALLY EVERY YEAR! Fiscal year totals have gone from 28,000 in 1970 to over 58,000 in 1989, while politicians have slashed daily on-duty staffing from 482, when I was Fire Chief, to today’s all-time low of 296. Department resources are being stretched thinner and thinner despite greater and greater needs. THIS DANGEROUS TREND MUST BE STOPPED!

The Department must be able to meet the complex and highly varied needs of today’s San Francisco. These include fighting structural fires, providing medical assistance, performing cliff and water rescues, responding to BART and MUNI fires and accidents, controlling hazardous materials emergencies, assisting victims of industrial accidents, and responding to many other emergency needs.

Many seniors, low income families and handicapped people rely on the SFFD to help them. THE PERSONAL ATTENTION THAT THE SFFD PROVIDES CAN NEVER BE CONVERTED TO SELF-SERVICE OR AUTOMATED! Firefighters, not machines, put out fires, perform rescues and meet all the other emergency needs of our city. You need these firefighters! THE NEXT CALL HELP MAY BE YOURS!

The need for Fire Department services crosses all social, ethnic and economic strata. We can all get behind this quality of life issue. Proposition F will strengthen your Fire Department and take politics out of fire safety.

William F. Murray
Chief of Department, SFFD, Retired

VOTE YES ON PROP F!

It takes teamwork to put out a fire. Without it, lives and property can be lost. Without it, firefighters can pay a hard price, for their lives, when in danger, may depend on having a buddy to lend a hand or go for help. As much a part of their job as hose, ladders, and water is that firefighters work in pairs when possible. It can be critical where dense smoke obscures vision or — as so many San Francisco neighborhoods well know — when trying to maneuver on a steeply pitched roof.

Current staffing of aerial ladder trucks leaves one firefighter without a buddy, the team short one vital hand. Proposition F will restore the balance that a fire — and time-tested system needs.

It also will mean two firefighters ready to move out with the fireboat when it has a job to do. Because they weren’t readily available, the fireboat was delayed in pumping bay water to put out the disastrous Marina fire after last October’s earthquake.

That’s why I’m voting “Yes” on Prop F and am urging all San Franciscans to do the same.

Edward J. Phipps
Chief of Department, SFFD (Retired)
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I OWE MY LIFE TO THE QUICK AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS STATIONED AT MY LOCAL FIREHOUSE

Over 26,000 San Franciscans received emergency medical assistance last year by the SFFD. Many lives were saved because firefighters were on the scene in 3 minutes of less. The neighborhood firehouse is an essential part of San Francisco’s complex fire protection system.

The October 17th earthquake and the great Marina fire showed us how vital it is to have our Fire Department maintained at an adequate level. There were no firefighters on board the Fireboat Phoenix when it arrived in the Marina, and for over 1 1/2 hours firefighting and search and rescue operations were hindered by a lack of firefighters, as well as by a lack of water. UNDERSTAFFING CAN CAUSE FIRE DEATHS.

Proposition F will answer these critical needs by restoring funds for adequate staffing of fire companies, including the fireboat, and it will require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission and Board of Supervisors before any further cutbacks in fire protection can be made.

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING YES ON F!

John Barbagela

---

PENNY-POWER! LOOK — HOW CAN YOU BUY SOMETHING PRICELESS FOR ONLY PENNIES A DAY?

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F!

FOR ONLY 2 CENTS PER DAY, YOU WILL:

- KEEP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIREHOUSE OPEN
- KEEP FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED
- KEEP YOUR FIREBOAT IN SERVICE AND STAFFED WITH FIREFIGHTERS
- GUARANTEE THAT NO FIREHOUSES OR FIRE COMPANIES WILL BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT
- REMOVE POLITICS FROM FIRE SAFETY

THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL COST EACH OF SAN FRANCISCO’S 732,000 RESIDENTS JUST PENNIES A DAY:

YEAR 1 — COST $5.3 MILLION = 2 CENTS PER DAY!
YEAR 2 — COST $2.8 MILLION = 1 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 3 — COST $0.8 MILLION = 1/2 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 4 — NO ADDITIONAL COST!

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE POLICY YOU WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON’T MISS THE CHANCE!

VOTE YES ON F!

W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

---

WE STRONGLY SUPPORT PROPOSITION F!

No one worries more about costs than working people. For their hard-earned dollars, breadwinners demand value in return.

Value is what Proposition F is all about. It restores adequate staffing of engine and ladder truck companies, staffs the fireboat, and assures that you and I will have a voice in any proposed closing of a fire company or firehouse.

Proposition F is an insurance policy that is clearly a benefit to all San Franciscans. And, there is no question that the benefits greatly exceed the cost — to each of us, just 2 cents a day for the first year, 1 cent a day for the second year, and no cost thereafter. Without adequate fire protection, San Francisco has too much to lose.

VOTE YES ON F!

Walter L. Johnson
San Francisco Labor Council
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
THEY PROVIDE ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL SERVICES FOR OUR CITIZENS, AND NO ONE ELSE CAN DO THEIR JOB! We have 500 high rise buildings, BART and MUNI tunnels, and large business, school and hospital complexes where firefighting requires many firefighters.

On October 17, we were lucky! It was just a warning. THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY IS TOO LOW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR

DISASTER NEEDS!
Let's all get behind Proposition F! It will assure stability in Department funding, guarantee adequate staffing for our firehouses and apparatus, and permit long-range planning and improvements. Our firefighters need your vote!

James A. Hood
Chairman
San Franciscans for Fire Safety

VOTE YES ON F!
SAN FRANCISCO IS A FRAGILE CITY. OVER 90% OF ALL STRUCTURES ARE OF WOOD FRAME CONSTRUCTION. YOUR HOMES ARE BUILT IN SOLID BLOCKS OF WOODEN BUILDINGS. THIS SITUATION PRESENTS THE POSSIBILITY OF A DISASTEROUS FIRE OR CONFLAGRATION OCCURRING, ESPECIALLY FOLLOWING AN EARTHQUAKE.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS THE LIFELINE FOR ALL OF US WHO LIVE IN THIS CITY. THE EARTHQUAKE ON OCTOBER 17TH AND THE GREAT FIRE IN THE MARINA SHOW HOW IMPORTANT THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS TO SAN FRANCISCO.

POLITICIANS ARE USING SHRILL RHETORIC AND OTHER OFFENSIVE TACTICS IN AN ATTEMPT TO MISLEAD THE PUBLIC AS TO WHAT THE REAL MEANING OF PROP F IS. DO NOT BE MISLED! PROP F PROVIDES THREE MAIN POINTS:

- ESTABLISHES THE PRESENT 41 NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS AS A MINIMUM STANDARD
- PUTS A FIREFIGHTING CREW ON THE FIREBOAT
- REQUIRES PUBLIC HEARINGS AND APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE CITIZENS BEFORE A FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED.

THESE ARE COMMON SENSE MEASURES THAT PROVIDE A MINIMUM LEVEL OF PUBLIC SAFETY FOR OUR FAMILIES AND CITY.

PLEASE JOIN ME, AND THE 70,000 OTHER SAN FRANCISCANS WHO SIGNED THE PETITIONS TO PROP F ON THE BALLOT, AND VOTE YES ON "F!"

FRANK T. BLACKBURN
ASSISTANT FIRE CHIEF

VOTE YES ON F!
Fire protection is vital for our families and businesses. Prop F will stabilize protection and prevent further cuts in the Fire Department.

Protect our city. Vote Yes on F.

Robt. E. Donohue
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)

Charles D. Cresci
Deputy Chief, SFFD (Retired)

Charles H. Lee
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T TAKE YOUR FIREFIGHTERS FOR GRANTED!
San Francisco firefighters answered a record 58,000 calls for help last year. Of these, 26,000 were for medical emergencies. Heart attacks, auto accidents, building collapses, childbirths were just a few. BUT EVERY YEAR THERE ARE FEWER AND FEWER FIREFIGHTERS TO HELP YOU! In 1970 there were 482 firefighters on duty each day — in 1990 there are only 296! Six firehouses and 12 fire companies have been closed.

FIRE SAFETY DECISIONS MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE HANDS OF POLITICIANS! Only a Charter amendment will assure that your Fire Department is adequately staffed to meet San Francisco's special needs — now and in the future. FOR JUST 2 CENTS A DAY, WE CAN KEEP OUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS OPEN AND OUR FIRE APPARATUS ADE-quatefly Staffed.

This is the cheapest — and the best — insurance we will ever be able to buy. Don't miss the chance! Vote yes on F!

Walter G. Jabe
John J. Figone
Caesar A. Churchwell
Alessandro Baccari
Virgil Caselli
Marsha Garland
Tom Creedon
Ed Farrah
Michael Salerno

NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS

Pride, trust, reliance. They're all wrapped up in a San Francisco institution. The neighborhood fire station turns out to be more — it's a rock, an anchor, a point of reference in people's lives.

City residents have said so loud and clear in endorsing Proposition F. Besides setting a minimum number of firefighters to be on duty each day, the June ballot measure guarantees a public hearing in the area concerned and a vote of the people, if needed, before any fire station may be closed.

Seventy thousand people petitioned to put F on the ballot. Their reasons all had a common core. It's not THE fire station but OUR fire station, they said — a place to expect and get help in a fire or medical emergency, a place the local community can turn to and rely on if the earth shakes, buildings fall, and other resources break down.

Neighborhoods and fire stations. The one requires the other, San Franciscans say.

John W. Flaherty
Mark L. Kaplan
Robert L. Barisone
Elvera Jane Barisone
William A. Roberts Jr.
Maureen Porter
William Porter Jr.
Homer G. Miles
Dorothy L. Miles
Peter C. Gardner
Joan M. Gardner
John Daly
Lucia R. Flaherty
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DON'T BE MISLED BY MAYOR AGNOS!
PROP F IS A LIFE AND DEATH ISSUE!
FIRE, INSURANCE AND EARTHQUAKE EXPERTS
AGREE: SAN FRANCISCO FACES THE HIGHEST RISK OF
CONFAGRATION OF ANY CITY IN THE UNITED STATES!
FIRE RISK IS HIGHER THAN IN 1906!
SAN FRANCISCO'S FIRE PROTECTION NEEDS ARE DIC-
TATED BY THE NATURE OF OUR CITY, with its:
• Blocks and blocks of adjoining wood frame buildings
• Steep hills
• Narrow streets
• Traffic congestion
• Network of overhead electrical, trolley and telephone lines
• Prevailing winds
• 500 high rise buildings
• High density residential areas
• Large population of seniors and low-income families
• High vulnerability to severe earthquake damage
• Isolation from outside help in time of disaster
SAN FRANCISCO IS IN TROUBLE BECAUSE THERE ARE
NOT ENOUGH FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY. Former
SF Fire Chief Emmet Condon in his book "Denial of Disaster":
"THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT IS BELOW
THE DAILY MANNING LEVEL THAT ANY EXPERIENCED

CHIEF OFFICER KNOWS IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE
ADEQUATE SERVICE TO THE CITY." Condon continues:
"I WOULD AGREE THAT THE HAZARD OF FIRE TO THE
CITY AFTER A SIMILAR DISASTER TODAY IS MUCH
GREATER THAN IN 1906." And,
"SYNTHETIC MATERIALS HAVE GREATLY IN-
CREASED THE FIRE RISK IN MODERN BUILDINGS AND
WILL MAGNIFY THE FIRE PROBLEM IN THE MULTIPLE
FIRES THAT WILL BREAK OUT AFTER A SERIOUS
EARTHQUAKE."

At least 400 of the city's 500 high rise buildings do not have
modern life-safety systems! HIGH RISE FIRES CAUSE A
HUGE DRAIN ON FIRE DEPARTMENT RESOURCES.
PROP F IS STRONGLY SUPPORTED BY INDIVIDUALS;
CITIZEN, BUSINESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS:
FIRE SAFETY EXPERTS, AND A BROAD SPECTRUM OF
KNOWLEDGEABLE CIVIC LEADERS.
There is no significant opposition to Prop F.
PROTECT YOURSELF, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR FRIENDS
— YOU HAVE A LOT TO LOSE! VOTE YES ON F!

GERRY LONG
Concerned Citizen

WHY VOTE YES ON F? WHY A CHARTER AMENDMENT?
City politicians have been consistently unresponsive to your fire
safety concerns. It is the duty of the City to provide its citizens with
adequate fire protection and earthquake preparedness. Instead,
Fire Department staffing has been cut to a dangerous level.
The Politicians Say, "Trust Us!"
We can see that this has not worked, and a Charter provision is
necessary. YOUR EMERGENCY NEEDS ARE TOO VITAL TO
BE LEFT VULNERABLE TO POLITICAL GAMES.
You hear the sirens every day — BUT HAVE YOU COUNTED

THE FIREFIGHTERS? Fewer firefighters means greatly reduced
fighting capacity. FIRE DEPARTMENT STAFFING IS NOW
AT AN ALL-TIME LOW AND CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO
FALL FURTHER!
WE NEED A STRONG FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES
ON F!

John Flaherty
Battalion Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Past President, S.F. Fire Chiefs Assn.
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HIGH RISE BUILDINGS AND BART AND MUNI UNDERGROUND FACILITIES MAKE SPECIAL FIRE PROTECTION DEMANDS

Today, San Francisco has over 500 high rise buildings. Fires in these buildings require many firefighters because equipment must be carried by hand to the fire — often up many flights of stairs. In 1988 in Los Angeles, a fire on three floors of a high rise building required 383 firefighters to bring it under control. In San Francisco, our entire on-duty force would be required, leaving the rest of the city completely unprotected. Mutual aid from neighboring communities would be totally inadequate to cover our needs.

BART and MUNI underground facilities present special fire and rescue problems. Large numbers of firefighters are required to fight these fires and perform rescue and evacuation operations.

In July 1989, Mayor Agnos forced reductions in truck company staffing — the key players in rescue and ventilation operations. Now these aerial ladder teams can no longer function properly.

Building ventilation is delayed, greatly increasing the risk of deadly backdrafts.

The Department’s daily staffing has fallen to 296 firefighters, the lowest in history, while fire, medical and other emergencies are higher than ever. Proposition F will bring SFFD staffing up to 320. This is critically needed to meet these ever-increasing demands.

In the past, some Fire Chiefs have thought that you could safely relocate or close a firehouse, but I now recognize that this is dangerous. The SFFD can now get to most emergencies within 3 minutes, but if we close a firehouse we lose that prompt response. With our rows of wood buildings, our large population of elderly citizens, we must get there quickly.

The SFFD is your lifeline. Protect it! I strongly urge all citizens to vote YES on F!

James P. Olson, President
San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

Any firefighter responsible for any racist act or statement on duty, after due process, should be disciplined. Repeat occurrences must result in severe penalties.

Expensive overtime can be largely eliminated by adding more firefighters.

Differences between the union and the mayor should be resolved through good faith negotiations, not through the election process. Maintaining high morale is the only way to insure efficiency.

The neighborhood service cuts need to be restored.

Vote YES on F.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Becoming a victim in another major earthquake or runaway fire in one of San Francisco’s densely populated neighborhoods continues to be a hazard for all of us.

Nonetheless, because the Firefighters Union did not endorse him, Mayor Agnos has seen fit to reduce the staffing levels of the Fire Department in any twenty-four hour period from 315 to 296. The San Francisco Republican Party believes these cuts are penny-wise, pound-foolish, and politically motivated.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. DO NOT let the Mayor’s political vendetta jeopardize public safety.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley

William E. Grayson
Anna M. Guth
Tina H. Frank
Christopher L. Bowman
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatooyama
Wade Francois
Marin Keller
Harriet Ross
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition F. This proposition, if passed, will require twenty-five extra fire fighters to be hired each day — five of these fire fighters will have no specific functions — their daily assignment will be at the discretion of the Chief of Department. It will also require that daily truck staffing be increased from five to six persons and the fireboat staffing be increased by another two fire fighters daily. These increases are unnecessary and are not required — fire suppression units are now staffed to provide effective and efficient fire service for San Francisco.

Proposition F will take management control and responsibility away from the Chief of Department by requiring organizational changes to be approved by the voters at a regular election. This would not allow the Chief, through the Fire Commission, to respond to the changing demands placed on the Fire Department. Fire protection decisions can’t wait until an election. To provide for and maintain the most cost effective and efficient fire department, I urge you to vote NO on Proposition F.

Frederick F. Postel
Chief of Department

Overtime pay is bleeding the Fire Department’s budget dry!
Over 92 percent of the budget goes for personnel costs. In 1988-89 uniformed personnel were paid salaries totaling $53,567,000 plus mandatory fringe benefits of $53,543,000 and still another $11,893,000 for overtime!

Proposition F would increase that bleeding by creating new positions not necessary for the safety of San Franciscans despite the scare statements made by the firefighters’ union.

Proposition F would cost $4,900,000 in overtime thereby siphoning away money needed to make major improvements!

We already have excellent protection but we want to upgrade it by developing a comprehensive earthquake program, by improving our response to emergency medical calls (over 4 1/2 times the number of fires) and by purchasing more modern fire equipment.

During the October quake 522 off-duty firefighters reported back immediately yet there were not enough engines and trucks for them; in fact, one old piece had to be taken out of the Fire Museum to help fight the Marina District fire.

Our firefighters work nine days out of 31 in shifts of approximately 24 hours on and 48 off.

Many are “double-dippers” holding down well paid outside jobs such as contractors, lawyers, plumbers and electricians. They still put in overtime because the Charter provides for such generous pay.

Overtime pay for a firefighter is $585 per shift, for a Captain $776 and for an Assistant Chief $1077! Last year the average firefighter’s cost to the City was $90,000, including salary, fringe benefits and overtime.

Do not pay out more money just for overtime.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

James Jefferson
President, Fire Commission
Frank Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted Souls
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

San Francisco has the finest fire protection in California. Now is not the time to jeopardize it with Proposition F. Proposition F is an ill-advised and wasteful measure.

First, it would wrest management of the Fire Department away from the Fire Commission and the Chief, where management properly and historically belongs.

Management of the Fire Department should remain accountable to the citizens of San Francisco, through its appointed Fire Commission. This principle is violated when rigid language is placed in the Charter.

Second, Proposition F would unnecessarily increase the Fire Department’s budget by approximately $4.9 million a year.

The San Francisco Fire Department already has staffing levels on its fire engines and aerial ladder trucks that are equal to the best in California.

To overstaff the engines and trucks would be counterproductive as well as wasteful, especially in a time of limited resources and ever-increasing demands for City services.

Let life and death decisions of fire protection in San Francisco remain in the control of the Fire Commission and the Chief.

Let the buck stop where it has always stopped — with the Fire Commission and the Chief. And let San Francisco’s first-rate fire protection continue.

We can’t afford to play around with fire, or with Proposition F. A similar Proposition was defeated in November, 1987. Vote NO on this Proposition in 1990.

Vote NO on Proposition F.

James D. Jefferson
President, Fire Commission

Frank A. Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission

Henry E. Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Sharon L. Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Ted N. Soulis
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Employment of unnecessary personnel is called “featherbedding.” Proposition F is just that — at a cost of $6 million.

San Francisco has the best fire protection services in the country. We already pay more per person for that service than any other city in California.

Stop a $6 million raid on the City Treasury. Vote NO on Proposition F.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Like all San Franciscans, we want a safe and healthy city. But Proposition F could jeopardize our safety and health.

By spending more than $7 million on unnecessary overtime, Proposition F will take money away from other vitally needed services like fire equipment, police protection, health care and children’s programs.

The annual fire department budget is already $150 million. Firefighters are already getting a pay raise of almost 10%. That’s more than most city workers — and most of us.

San Francisco already has more firefighters per thousand residents than any other major Western city.

Yet San Francisco has fewer fire and emergency alarms than other cities. In 1986, San Francisco had 78,000 emergency calls. Oakland had 95,000.

We appreciate the job that our firefighters do. But we cannot support this multi-million dollar attempt to win back overtime for just 18 firefighters per day.

Susan J. Bierman
Agar Jaicks
Mauri Schwartz
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Sunset Democratic Club
Margaret Brodkin, Director Coleman Advocates for Children
Carole Migden, chair, San Francisco Democratic County
Central Committee

I respect and admire the work done by San Francisco’s firefighters.

It’s a dangerous job.

That’s why they’re paid more than firefighters in any other large city in California, even though our firefighters work 15 percent fewer hours.

But today our average cost per firefighter has hit $96,000 per year.

We have been reducing this amount — and improving fire service at the same time — by hiring more new firefighters and reducing costly overtime payments.

That overtime runs as much as $585 per day for a fourth-year firefighter, and up to $1077 per day at the higher ranks.

When they argue for Proposition F, the union avoids mentioning this fact. They raise a false alarm about closing down firehouses, when in reality we are adding new firefighters as quickly as we can train them.

Ninety new firefighters are being hired this year alone. We have full classes in the Fire Academy for the first time in years.

Prop F asks you, the voters, to put an unnecessary sixth firefighter back on every fire truck, in order to give current firefighters millions in guaranteed overtime.

There’s no need for it. Even a one-alarm fire in San Francisco draws 30 firefighters in response.

It’s easy, when you think about the heroic work firefighters do, to justify giving them whatever they ask for.

I made the same mistake myself three years ago, before I was mayor. As a State Assemblyman and a strong union supporter, I lent my name to a measure that was similar to Proposition F.

But no group, however much we appreciate their work, is entitled to millions of taxpayer dollars a year in guaranteed, unnecessary overtime — especially when they are trying to feather their own nests by keeping out women and minorities.

With all the pressing needs facing our city, we can’t afford to give away $7 million and get nothing in return. Please vote No on Proposition F.

Mayor Art Agnos
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NOTE: This entire section is new.

The Proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

NEW CHARTER SECTION: 3.548:
MINIMUM LEVELS OF FIRE PROTECTION FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Notwithstanding any other section of this Charter, the minimum levels of fire protection for the City and County of San Francisco shall be specified as follows:

A. The MINIMUM level of Fire Protection for the City and County of San Francisco, in fire suppression, effective July 1, 1990, except as specified in Section C shall be as follows:

1. Engine Companies: 41
   Truck Companies: 18
   Rescue Companies: 2
   Fireboat Companies: 1
   Battalion Districts: 10
   Divisions: 3
   Service Units: 1
   Bureau of Equipment: 2
   High Pressure System: 1
   Tank (staffed) (Jones St. Tank): 1
   Assigned Firefighters (At Chief's Discretion): 2

2. Fire station: The minimum number of stations shall be 41, at locations listed on the SFFD Station Directory for July 1, 1987.

B. MINIMUM daily staffing of Fire Companies and other Units:

1. Engine Companies: 1 Officer and 3 Firefighters
2. Truck Companies: 1 Officer and 5 Firefighters
3. Rescue Company: 1 Officer and 3 Firefighters
4. Fireboat Company: 1 Officer, 1 Pilot, 1 Marine Engineer and 2 Firefighters
5. Service Units: 1 Firefighter
6. Bureau of Equipment: 2 Firefighters

7. Battalion District: 1 Battalion Chief, 1 Chief's Aide, 1 Assistant Chief, 1 Chief's Aide, 1 qualified person to operate gates, valves and communications equipment of the High Pressure System.

Required minimum staffing shall be maintained on a constant basis, 24 hours per day. Sufficient personnel and positions shall be authorized and funded to maintain MINIMUM required staffing levels established in this section. When assigned personnel are not available, then staffing shall be maintained by working of overtime.

C. CLOSURE AND RELOCATION OF FIRE STATIONS, DEACTIVATION OF FIRE STATIONS OR UNITS REQUIRED BY THIS SECTION:

1. Fire Stations, Fire Companies or other Units required by this section may be closed or deactivated only when each of the following procedures is completed:

   a. It is recommended by the Chief of Department and approved for consideration by the Fire Commission.
   b. The Fire Commission shall hold at least two public hearings on the matter so that affected citizens may appear to express their views.
   c. At least one of the public hearings shall be held in the neighborhood of the Station, Company, or Unit to be closed or deactivated. Such meeting to be held at a time and place most suitable for maximum public attendance.
   d. Except as provided by this section, other facilities or units may be closed or deactivated by majority of the five members of the Fire Commission upon recommendation by the Chief of Department.
   e. Upon conclusion of public hearings and approval by a majority of the five members of the Fire Commission for the closure or deactivation of a Company or Unit, the Fire Commission shall forward its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors within 30 calendar days.
   f. Upon receipt of the Fire Commission recommendation, the Board of Supervisors may hold public hearings on the matter and they may approve or disapprove of the recommendation of the Fire Commission for closure or deactivation of a Station, Company or Unit. Such approval or disapproval shall be by majority vote of the Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors approves of the Fire Commission recommendation, then they shall direct the Clerk of the Board to have the matter put on the ballot of the next regular election for final determination by the voters of the City and County.

D. DEFINITIONS — EQUIPMENT

1. ENGINE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying hose and a pump to pump water of at least 1,500 gallons per minute.
2. TRUCK COMPANY: A tractor-trailer vehicle carrying ladders and rescue equipment with a 100-foot aerial ladder or equivalent device to reach upper floors of buildings.
3. RESCUE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying rescue equipment capable of heavy rescue and diving equipment for underwater rescue.
4. FIRE BOAT COMPANY: A boat equipped with pumps, hose, monitor nozzles and able to navigate San Francisco Bay for firefighting and rescue duty along the shorelines of the City and County.
5. SERVICE UNIT: A vehicle carrying spare supply of air and equipment for self-contained breathing apparatus and resuscitators.
6. HIGH PRESSURE SYSTEM PUMP STATION: A facility capable of pumping at least 10,000 gallons per minute from San Francisco Bay or other water source into the mains of the high pressure water system.
7. BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT: A vehicle capable of carrying equipment for emergency repairs or towing of fire apparatus under emergency conditions.
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?

YES 288
NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Health Service System provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Supervisors may not continue to receive health insurance from the Health Service System after they leave the Board of Supervisors.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Board of Supervisors could allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G will allow former Supervisors to buy health insurance coverage from the City's Health Service system, when they leave office. THERE WILL BE NO COST TO THE CITY.

The Health Service System now provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Proposition G simply allows former Supervisors to BUY continued health coverage in the City's Health Plan, at their own expense.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition G
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “G”

Former supervisors are either those who have decided not to run; or those the electorate voted out of office. Even as it claims they will pay their own health plan benefits, why continue to have them in the system.

Cut bait.
Vote NO.

Marguerite Warren
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8.425 Persons Covered

Each plan may make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system by the dependents of members, retired city and county employees, temporary city and county employees, such other dependents of deceased and retired city and county employees as the board of supervisors may authorize by ordinance, teachers and other employees of the San Francisco Unified School District retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System and resigned employees of the city and county and resigned teachers and employees of the school district whose resignations occur after June 15, 1955, and within 30 days immediately prior to the date on which, but for their resignations, they would have become retired members of the said retirement system, on whose relinquishment of retirement allowances as permitted by the charter occurs after such date and resigned employees of the San Francisco Unified School District not otherwise included. A resigned employee or teacher is one whose employment has terminated other than by retirement, discharge or death or who has relinquished retirement allowances. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system to the aforementioned resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District is to enable them, subject to the health service board’s exercise of its power, to participate in the benefits of the system after transferring to the State Teachers’ Retirement System from the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for participation in the benefits of the system by the aforementioned resigned employees of the city and county and other resigned employees of San Francisco Unified School District is to permit the health service board to have power to treat them the same as it treats resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District.

As used in this section, the terms “city and county employees” and “employees of the city and county” shall include officers and employees of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco.

The board of supervisors may also provide by ordinance for the continuation in any plan by former supervisors who agree to and do pay the full cost of such benefit.
Fire Inspector and Engineer Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION H
Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?

YES 290
NO 292

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers belong to the City’s Retirement System. Under the charter, the Board of Supervisors may contract with the State’s Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) to allow certain safety employees to be members of PERS instead of the City’s Retirement System, if there is no additional cost to the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City’s Retirement System, if there would be no additional cost to the City.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City’s Retirement System.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want these employees to continue to be covered by the City’s Retirement System.

Controller’s Statement on “H”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This Charter Amendment would provide for safety retirement for eighteen civilian Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers employed by the San Francisco Fire Department, at no additional cost to the City.

Fire Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers are classified by the State of California as safety personnel and properly belong in a safety retirement program that is not offered by the City's Retirement System for non-uniformed employees. Instead, the City contracts with the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) for its public safety officers who are not police officers or firefighters.

Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers, along with their counterparts in the uniformed firefighter ranks, provide the professional expertise necessary for the City’s fire prevention program. Proposition H provides a retirement plan for this small group of civilians equivalent to the retirement plan for their uniformed firefighter counterparts, at no additional cost to the City.

Voters approved similar measures in recent years that provided for safety requirement for probation officers, investigator groups and various other safety personnel.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition H
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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8.506-2 Miscellaneous Safety Employees
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the board of supervisors or the community college board shall have the power to contract with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System of the State of California to provide that the probation officers, airport police officers, district attorney and public defender investigators, coroner investigators, juvenile court counselors, and institutional police, fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers who are not members of the Section 8.598 plans, shall be members of the public employees' retirement system, and the board of supervisors, the community college board and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such contract.

The power to contract created herein shall be limited to a contract with no net increase in cost to the city and county or the community college district.

Any person who shall become a member of the public employees' retirement system pursuant to such contract shall have the right to be a member of the health service system and the health board shall make provision for the participation in the benefits of the health service system by such persons.

Out of town on June 5, 1990? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
Nearly 70,000 homes in the southern and eastern parts of the City have curbside recycling. By 1991, every resident will have curbside collection service.

Until curbside reaches your neighborhood, you can recycle at our many community recycling centers.

For a free Recycling Starter Kit and information on where to recycle call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL
554-6193
PROPOSITION I

Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?

YES 293
NO 295

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the State Retirement System are allowed to work for the San Francisco Unified School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. Retired San Francisco teachers in the City Retirement system are not allowed to do so.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow retired teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. While they are consultants they would not make retirement contributions or earn additional retirement credits.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, costs could increase, the amount of which, being dependent upon the dollar amount and the number of personal service contracts executed, cannot be determined, but should not be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Jim Gonzalez and Richard Hongisto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Retired Teachers
Consulting Contracts

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is necessary to correct an inequity that exists between teachers in the State Teachers' Retirement System and those in the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. Teachers in the state system can retire up to three years early and supplement their reduced retirement income by serving as consultants to the school district developing curriculum, orienting new teachers, substituting for absent teachers, tutoring students, etc. The Charter denies the right to the four hundred teachers in the city retirement system to continue serving students and schools in these ways. Proposition I would correct this inequity by extending the same right to teachers in the city retirement system.

Proposition I will save taxpayers' money by encouraging teachers at the top of the salary scale to retire early. New hires at the low end of the salary scale will earn little more than half as much as those at the top.

Proposition I will also improve education in San Francisco schools by continuing to take advantage of the experience and expertise of retired teachers. It will also help to solve the shortage of qualified substitute teacher.

Vote YES on Proposition I for equity, economy, and educational excellence.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition I
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition I

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

PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will bring equity and fairness to retired teachers, save the taxpayers money and improve the educational system in San Francisco.

Assemblyman Willie Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John Burton
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Jim Gonzalez
San Francisco Democratic Party
Fred Rodriguez, President of the Board of Education

United Educators of San Francisco, Joan-Marie Shelley
Judy Dellamonica
Joanne Miller, vice-president of the San Francisco Board of Education
Thomas Ammiano
Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council
Larry Martin, Transport Workers of America
Robert Barnes
James Wachob
Jose Medina
Harry G. Britt, President of the Board of Supervisors

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I
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8,509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the charter on February 1, 1969, and persons who become miscellaneous officers and employees after February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 9.500, 9.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under Section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under Section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(a) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

"Retirement allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payments is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workers' compensation laws of the State of California, shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation earneable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the retirement board, which would have been earned by the member had he worked, throughout the period under consideration, the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position prior to entering city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police department as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under Section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in Section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in Section 3.670 of the charter.

"Charter" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural, and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(b) Any member who completes at least 20 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 50 years, or at least 10 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 60 years, said service to be computed under Subsection (g) hereof, may retire from service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after reaching the age of 60 years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of two percent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of 65 years, if the allowance available to such member, pursuant to the provisions of Subsection (f) of this section, shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this Subsection (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this Subsection (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said Subsection (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of 60 years, after rendering 20 years or more of such service and having attained the age of 50 years, computed under Subsection (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under Subsection (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/4</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/2</td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-3/4</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-1/4</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed 75 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or Subsection (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of 65 years may elect, without right of reversion, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system, and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection (c), this subsection and Section 8.507 of the charter shall not apply to any member of the retirement system on and after January 1, 1947, who is not a member of the fire or police department as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system. (Continued on next page)
tion 8.514 of this charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $100 per month upon retirement after 30 years of service and after attaining the age of 60 years, and provided further that to any member within 15 years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of 65, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $100 per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculations of retirement allowances.

(e) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least 10 years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in Subsection (g) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in Subsection (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds 40 percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age 60, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed 40 percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated in the manner prescribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earnable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one year immediately preceding his retirement. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied as full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

(d) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

(e) If a member shall die, before retirement, (1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of 12 months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(2) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired from service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated-beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under Subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) shall be paid in lump sum as follows:

(A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election, but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 years, may make the election herein provided before benefit has been paid under this Subsection (e), for and on behalf of such children if, in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this Subsection (e), any allowance payable under this Subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least 10 years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed $1,000, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service (Continued on next page)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued)

retirement, but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1-2/3 percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

1. Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.

2. Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitled him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contributions standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member, to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

3. Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of this section, and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

4. Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under Section 8.507.

5. The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fifths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and service rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefor shall be required of the city and county.

6. All payments provided under this section shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation paid to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to 7-1/2 percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system of the city and county. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of Subsection (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members, and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this Subsection (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), Subsection (h), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits, on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement, and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year, and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this Subdivision (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(1) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said Subsection (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(2) Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(3) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsections (b), (c), (f), and (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and
PROPOSITION J

Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?

YES 296
NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Human Rights Commission was created by an ordinance. Under that ordinance, the Human Rights Commission has 15 members.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment that would make the existing Human Rights Commission a charter commission; it would reduce the number of members from 15 to 11.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you want to reduce its size to 11 members.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you do not want to reduce its size to 11 members.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government in an amount not to exceed $4,200.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Thomas Hsieh.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Let us make human rights a fundamental part of the fabric of San Francisco.
San Francisco is the birthplace of the United Nations and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, our Human Rights Commission is not even a part of our constitution — the Charter.
Proposition J will make the Human Rights Commission a charter commission. Proposition J will take the position of the Human Rights Commission out of politics and ensures its place in the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.
Please vote in favor of Proposition J to recognize the importance of human rights to San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition J
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition J
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department and a candidate for Municipal Court Judge I urge you to vote for Ballot Measure J.

The Human Rights Commission has been a positive voice for 25 years. Thousands of San Franciscans have directly benefited from the Commission’s efforts. Its mandate will be greatly strengthened by extending Charter status through this measure.

Please join me and vote yes on J!

James Harrigan
For Municipal Court

---

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “J”

We have a Human Rights Commission NOW, appointed by the Mayor. A new one in the charter would have the same appointing officer.

We don’t need a confirmation of said committee. It will not take it out of politics. No reason for this.

Just another layer of government — for what.

Vote no on “J”.

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: This entire section is new.

PART TWENTY-FOUR: HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
3.699-5 Commission; Composition

A human rights commission is hereby established. The human rights commission shall consist of eleven members broadly representative of the general public to be appointed by the mayor. Three of the members who are first appointed shall be designated to serve for terms of one year, three for two years, three for three years and two for four years from the date of their appointments. Thereafter, members shall be appointed as aforesaid for a term of office of four years, except that all of the vacancies occurring during a term shall be filled for the unexpired term. Members of said commission shall be compensated for each commission or committee meeting actually attended by said members in an amount as may be established and amended, from time to time, by ordinance of the board of supervisors, but not less than $50 per meeting provided, however, that no member shall be paid for attending more than two commission or committee meetings in any one calendar month.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION J (Continued from page 88)

County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system, an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984, are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not apply to any member a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons

(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.381 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(e) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be re-instated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

8.584-10 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.584 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.584, he shall re-enter membership under Section 8.584 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.584. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for service or disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 60 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable at the time he engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he held the position which he held at the time of his retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he held the position from which he was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
Seven Member Commissions

PROPOSITION K
Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department, Fire Department, Social Services Department, Port of San Francisco, Public Utilities Commission, Board of Permit Appeals, Civil Service Commission, Airports Commission and Parking and Traffic Department are managed by a board or commission. Each of these boards and commissions has five members appointed by the Mayor.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K is a charter amendment that would increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the size of these boards and commissions to stay the same.

Controller's Statement on "K"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $18,800 annually beginning January, 1991."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh, Bill Maher, and Wendy Nelder.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K expands the opportunity for San Francisco’s varied communities to participate in City government. Proposition K increases, from five to seven, the membership of the Board of Permit Appeals and seven City commissions: Police, Fire, Social Services, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports, and Parking and Traffic. It also includes the Port Commission, subject to amendment of state law to authorize such an increase.

Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities. Only five members of these crucial commissions is insufficient to address the diversity of concerns in our City; seven members will provide greater representation and greater leadership from a variety of communities. The expansion of the size of these commissions enhances the possibility for all San Franciscans to be part of decision-making and policy-making processes at every level.

The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions. Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor, but instead of the many under-represented voices in San Francisco.

Proposition K would make these commissions representative of the interests of more San Franciscans, while maintaining the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants. San Franciscans want accessible, responsive, and active commissioners. We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns, and Proposition K is a method for achieving these goals.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

You need a decoder ring to read the Supervisors’ argument in favor of creating 18 new commissioner slots. Here’s what the Board says, and here’s what they really mean.

The Board says: “Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities.”

The Board means: All you interest groups out there, it’s time to get yours.

The Board says: “The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions.”

The Board means: With 18 more political appointments, a mayor won’t offend as many supporters by passing them over for city jobs.

The Board says: “Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor.”

The Board means: Adding 18 new city commissioners isn’t really a boon to the incumbent mayor — unless he’s re-elected.

The Board says: “Proposition K would . . . maintain the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants.”

The Board means: Increasing commission memberships by 40% isn’t that big a deal.

The Board says: “We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns.”

The Board means: A fair hearing before city commissions isn’t enough; we want guaranteed results!

Let’s stop speaking in code and talk plainly. Proposition K is based on the notion that people should be treated as groups — not individuals — in the political process. That’s offensive, and so is Proposition K.

Please vote NO on K!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is a textbook example of what’s wrong with contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K demeans us because it lumps city residents into groups, rather than respecting their rights as individuals.

Proposition K divides us because it stresses what such interest groups (the polite euphemism is “communities”) disagree about, rather than what all San Franciscans share in common.

Proposition K debases us because it is premised on a “quota system” for city boards and commissions. There shouldn’t be “white seats” or “black seats”, “gay seats” or “straight seats” on city commissions. There should be but two qualifications for service as a city commissioner: San Francisco residency and individual ability!

Vote NO on Proposition K!

San Francisco is indeed a polyglot and richly diverse community. City residents come from all corners of the country and the globe. Their political opinions range from radical to reactionary and all points in between.

It’s impossible for each point of view, each ethnic group, each political persuasion, each neighborhood to be represented on city commissions. Increasing the membership on those bodies from five to seven persons is like buying a bigger umbrella in a hurricane. It won’t make a bit of difference.

It is possible, however, for city commissioners from all walks of life to represent views and interests other than their own. It happens all the time in countless actions by city boards and agencies. And if we want to encourage consensus and better understanding among San Francisco’s many “communities”, we must resist attempts — such as Proposition K — to make the labels we all wear easier to read.

Three years ago, Mayor Agnos campaigned on the slogan, “One City, One Future”. The supporters of Proposition K have failed to heed those words.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The opponents of Proposition K are clearly on the wrong page of the textbook of contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K values us because it gives city residents greater ability to be heard, individually and as a community.

Proposition K unites us because it reinforces what we all share in common: respect for democracy. If, as the opposition claims, the ability to have more access to representation is divisive, democratic ideals such as checks and balances must therefore also be divisive and undesirable.

Proposition K elevates us because it originates from that respect for democracy. This does not limit or allocate, but reasonably expands available seats on the commissions. Proposition K effectively dilutes the influence of special interests in favor of more broad-based views.

San Francisco is an extremely diverse city and that diversity should be reasonably represented. Democracy requires the opportunity for representation of all points of view. Good government demands that the number of appointed officials be limited so that debate can be functional. Proposition K addresses these two needs: increased citizen participation, and reasonable size to facilitate getting work done.

If you take the opposition’s argument — that it is not meaningful to have representatives from different neighborhoods, ethnicities, political persuasions — to its logical extreme, you could have one member commissions achieving a consensus at the price of democracy.

Proposition K is good government, since it integrates the multiplicity of voices into a united future for the residents of San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition K!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
Seven Member Commissions

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

We need to create an open, democratic, and participatory local government. This measure will encourage more participation. Vote YES on K.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Individuals and community groups strongly support K. Increasing the membership on these bodies expands the opportunity to participate for all San Franciscans. Vote YES on K!

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Robert McCarthy
Ruth Picon
President, Latino Democratic Club
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead, Pres.
Bernal Heights Community Foundation
Jake McGoldrick
Arnie Scher
Natalie Berg
Sodonia Wilson,
San Francisco Board of Education
Alma Jackson
Margaret Brady
Reverend Anos Brown
Yori Wada

Mayor Art Agnos
Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John L. Burton
State Senator Milton Marks
Fr. James Goode
Carole Migden
Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes
Political Action Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Catherine Baccari
Bob Dockendorf
Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

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

Vote No on Proposition K.
Proposition K unnecessarily tinkers with our commission system for managing city departments.

Many of the most important city functions — police and fire services, libraries and health care — are governed by five-member city commissions. Proposition K would increase the size of these commissions to seven members. The Planning Commission would be expanded to nine members.

For what reason? The supporters say that the commissions cannot reflect our diverse community unless we allow the mayor to appoint more commissioners. They miss the point of the commission system.

Commissioners are not advisors or members of a community-wide study panel. They are managers. They set city policy, recommend hundreds of millions of dollars in spending, and hire and fire key departmental personnel.

Preserve our system of citizen management. Don’t make city commissions debating societies.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Are not seven Deputy Mayors at the rate of $94,000 a year a sufficient number of political plums for the Mayor? Does he really need eighteen more commissioners to achieve good government in San Francisco?

Do not give the Mayor additional tools to promote his re-election efforts. The San Francisco Republican Party urges voters to Vote No on Proposition K.

San Francisco Republican Party
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Anna M. Guth

William E. Grayson
Honor H. Bulkley
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Brian Mavrogeorge
Ronald G. Kershaw
Sam T. Harper
Jun Hatoriama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

No sound arguments have been presented which support the need for Proposition K. Enlarging Boards and Commissions would increase city costs without improving productivity. Indeed, extra members may impede efficiency and result in protracted proceedings.

Don’t give the Mayor additional opportunities for patronage.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

PROPOSITION K WILL ADD TO BUREAUCRACY
Proposition K will hinder quick and fair response to citizen concerns. Larger commissions do not mean better commissions; on the contrary, they mean a less efficient, more cumbersome process.

PROPOSITION K WILL NOT MAKE COMMISSIONS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INTERESTS OF SAN FRANCISCO
Present commissions serve a diverse San Francisco by appointment of individuals who reflect and possess sensitivity, respect for different backgrounds and points of views.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

Sharon Bretz
Susann L. Danielson
Jean Kalil
Victor Makras
Esther Marks
Beverly Prior

Larger commissions and larger support bureaucracy are not the answer to better representation. The answer is less political patronage and more appointments based on experience and knowledge. This proposal only makes government more cumbersome and less effective.

... Vote NO on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Proposition K is not about democracy. It is about patronage. It is about creating many new commission positions to hand out as political plums. To whom? For what? And why should the taxpayers be forced to pay for it?

No one, not even the author, Supervisor Ward, claims that it will improve the efficiency of the government, yet it will certainly add to the costs. The true costs will include trips, staff time, expenses, etc., with no discernable benefit to the public.

This measure will lead to longer meetings, more arguments, divisiveness and politics while providing less management oversight.

Proposition K is an insider’s game. They gain and the voters pay. It is a costly bad idea and should be soundly rejected by the voters.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Bill Maher

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”

If qualified commissioners were appointed who understood they represented ALL of San Francisco this charter amendment would not be necessary.

There are nine commissions listed for additional members — 18 more appointments. Just another avenue for political appointments.

Vote No on Proposition “K”.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

PART FOUR: POLICE DEPARTMENT
3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, police force, an office of citizen complaint and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of five seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission to seven members, shall continue to hold their respective positions subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the police department. They shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the police department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the police commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position shall be made pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation for the new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter, provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The police commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

PART FIVE: FIRE DEPARTMENT
3.540 Fire Department

The fire department shall be under the management of a fire commission, consisting of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor; and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years of 1948, 1949, and 1950, respectively, two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The chief of department shall have power to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for fire-fighting purposes. The commissioners shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the fire department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the fire commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position shall be made pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation for the new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter, provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The fire commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

There shall be a fire chief, appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each chief officer shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years of 1948, 1949, and 1950, respectively, two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The chief of department shall have power to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for fire-fighting purposes. The commissioners shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the fire department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the fire commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position shall be made pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation for the new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter, provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The fire commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

Positions of officers and employees of the fire department legally authorized shall continue, and the incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall continue as the officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as in this charter otherwise provided.

PART EIGHT: SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
3.570 Composition of Department; Commission

There is hereby established a social services department. This department shall consist of a social services commission of five seven members, a director of social services, and such employees and assistants as may be necessary to carry out the work and functions of said department. The members of the social services commission shall be appointed thereto by the mayor and shall be selected for their respective positions on the basis of their interest in and understanding of the problems of public welfare. The members of said commission shall serve without compensation and no person shall be eligible to serve on said commission while holding a salaried public office, position or employment.

The term of office of the members of the said commission, subject to the provisions hereof relative to removal and the terms of the first mem-
bers of the commission, shall be four years. The mayor shall appoint five or seven members to said social services commission, one member to be appointed for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1938; one for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1939; one for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1940, and two for terms to expire on the 15th day of January, 1941; and two for terms to expire on the 15th day of January, 1946; and upon the expiration of the terms of each of said members of said commission so appointed, the mayor shall fill the vacancy arising by reason of the expiration of said term by the appointment of a member to said commission for a term of four years. Vacancies occurring in the membership of said commission shall be filled by an appointment to be made by the mayor for the unexpired term of said person in whose place said appointment is made; and when the term of any member of said commission shall expire, then said appointment shall be made for the full period of four years from the date of the expiration of the term. All vacancies shall be filled within 30 days of the occurrence thereof.

Members of the commission shall be subject to removal from office by the mayor for cause, but only upon written charges made and signed by the mayor, copy of said charges to be served upon the offending commissioner; and said charges shall be heard by the mayor and on said hearing of said charges the said commissioner so charged shall have the opportunity to appear and to be heard.

The commission shall be a policy-determining and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in Section 3.500 of the charter. This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART NINE: PORT COMMISSION 3.580 Commission; Composition The San Francisco Port Commission shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, their appointment being subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors. Each of said members shall serve for a term of four years. Vacancies on the commission shall be filled by the mayor for the unexpired portion of the term. Initial appointive members of the commission shall consist of the incumbent members of the San Francisco Port Authority, who shall serve as commissioners for a term corresponding to the unexpired portion of their tenure as members of the port authority. Subject to amendment of state law to authorize the increase in membership, the commission shall consist of seven members. The two additional members shall be appointed by the mayor after the eighth day of January, 1992. The initial term of office not to exceed four years shall be fixed by the mayor to insure that the term of office for a majority of the commission shall not expire in the same year. In addition, the director of finance and secretary of agriculture and services, or their designated representatives, shall be ex-officio members of the commission. Persons appointed to the port commission shall be subject to recall, suspension, and removal in the same manner as an elected official.

The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 3.590 Commission; Composition A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five or seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o'clock, on the 8th day of January, 1932, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of two other commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936. The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992. On the expiration of these and successive terms, the mayor shall appoint their successors for four years. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS 3.650 Board Composition The mayor shall appoint five or seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $5,000 $7,000 per year. One such term shall expire at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934 and 1935, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936, and two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1996, and upon these and successiveexpirationsthe mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SEVENTEEN: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION 3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county.

The civil service commission shall consist of five or seven members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the 1st day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and, provided further, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall be as follows: one shall expire on June 30, 1996 and one on June 30, 2000, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. No less than one member of said commission shall be a woman. The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this (Continued on page 128)
Commissioner
Residency Requirement

PROPOSITION L

Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Candidates for elective office and members of charter boards and commissions must be San Francisco residents and electors. For other boards, commissions and advisory bodies, the law creating them may set residency requirements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L is a charter amendment that would require the members of all boards, commissions and advisory bodies to be San Francisco residents and electors.

This rule would not apply where a non-charter board, commission or advisory body requires a person with specific qualifications, and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found. Also, this rule would not apply to the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Fine Arts Museums, the Asian Arts Commission, the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission and the elected members of the San Francisco Retirement Board and Health Service Board.

Proposition L would delete the current requirement that candidates and members of charter boards and commissions be residents and electors for a certain length of time before assuming office, which courts have found unconstitutional.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

Controller's Statement on "L"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "L"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh and Bill Maher.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

This charter amendment provides that all individuals serving on city boards and commissions and committees with few exceptions, must be citizens of voting age of San Francisco.

Members of boards and commissions and committees often have policy making and regulatory responsibilities. Clearly, San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco. With a population of 750,000 residents, surely we have enough qualified and talented San Franciscans who can get the job done.

This charter amendment offers the appointing officer with some flexibility. If a qualified candidate for a public post requiring specialized skills cannot be found in our city, then, following such a declaration, the appointing officer may search elsewhere.

Let’s open up more opportunities for our residents to serve San Francisco. VOTE YES FOR THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERSHIP ON CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I was mistaken in one of my objections to Proposition L. Some years ago, a court decision invalidated the voter-adopted Charter requirement that a person be a San Francisco resident for five years before appointment to a city commission. I disagree strongly with that decision, for the reasons cited in my ballot argument appearing on the opposite page. The inoperative language remained in our Charter, however, and Proposition L disingenuously removes it — like pruning a dead branch from a tree.

But, there are still plenty of reasons to vote against Proposition L.

(1) Proposition L eliminates the requirement that a commissioner be an “elector” of San Francisco (a voter, meaning also a U.S. citizen) for at least one year. This Charter provision has not been altered by a court, but Proposition L would strike it from the books.

A person could move into town, register to vote, and be appointed that day to a city post.

(2) Proposition L exempts three city commissions — Health System, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board — from any residency requirement whatsoever.

(3) Proposition L would allow non-residents to serve on any board or commission created by the Board of Supervisors. In fact, Proposition L could even be interpreted to allow the appointment of non-citizens to such posts!

Don’t be misled or confused. If you want San Franciscans to make decisions about San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition L!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

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

If you want San Francisco residents to serve on all city commissions established by the charter, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you think San Franciscans should serve on boards and committees created by the Board of Supervisors, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you favor city residents serving on the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees, vote NO on Proposition L.

The Board of Supervisors says "San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco." I agree completely. Trouble is, Proposition L weakens the existing residency requirement in our City Charter.

Charter Section 8.100 states that no person "shall be appointed as a member of any board or commission unless he shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years." Proposition L eliminates the five-year residency requirement! Proposition L also exempts from any residency requirement whatsoever members of the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees.

The idea behind the five-year residency rule is that city commissioners should have first-hand knowledge and personal experience of San Francisco's people and neighborhoods, its problems and possibilities. City commissioners should not just rely on staff reports and statistical abstracts. Proposition L would destroy this sensible safeguard. Instead, a person could move into town and be appointed, that day, to a city post!

Finally, Proposition L purports to extend the Charter's residency rules to advisory boards and committees established by the Board of Supervisors. But the residency requirement can be waived for a person "with specific experience, skills, or qualifications." That's a loophole big enough to drive a truck through!

San Franciscans should make decisions about San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition L.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for most advisory panels of the City.

Under Proposition L, panel members MUST be residents of San Francisco.

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for membership on the Health System Board, Retirement Board and War Memorial Board.

Under Proposition L, there is no change. Membership on the Health System Board and Retirement Board is by DIRECT ELECTION of city employees. The Health Fund and Retirement Fund are operated by and for city workers. Because employees are not required to live in the city, there are serious constitutional problems with denying a worker the right to be a candidate for trustee of a fund controlled by employees.

The way things are now, the courts have thrown out San Francisco's five-year residency requirement. Reports the City Attorney:

"In the years since Charter Section 8.100 (residency rule) was originally adopted, the California courts have struck down all durational residency requirements applicable to candidates for elective or appointive office."

Most Supervisors like the durational requirement. But even Supervisors cannot overrule the Supreme Court.

The bottom line: Proposition L does not cover everything. Just most things. It's time San Franciscans were making the decisions about San Francisco. Proposition L is a major step in the right direction.

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S FUTURE. YES ON PROPOSITION L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

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

San Franciscans deserve to be represented by commissioners who live within San Francisco, not by employees filling in for their ex-officio bosses. Vote for San Francisco commissions made of San Francisco voters.

... Vote Yes on Proposition L!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Don’t clutter the Charter with unnecessary provisions. Vote No on Proposition L.

Proposition L would require almost all commissions and advisory board members to be city residents. That makes sense — so much sense that, for most commissions, it is already the law.

This is one more example of a needless Charter amendment. If the Board of Supervisors wants to require members of any advisory body to be city residents, they can pass an ordinance to accomplish it.

Adding an unnecessary provision to a Charter that is already too long and complicated is not the answer.

Vote No on Proposition L.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.100 Qualifications
(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for at least one year immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retired system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.686, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.

Notwithstanding this requirement, in the case of boards, commissions or advisory bodies established by legislative act, the residency requirement may be waived by the appointing officer, or entity upon a finding that the board, commission or body requires the appointment of a person with specific experience, skills or qualifications and after exercising due diligence, an eligible and willing appointee residing within the city and county could not be located.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 7 through Tuesday, June 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. - 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease.
Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals
it's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be
TOXIC FREE 554-4333

HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR
YOUR HOME'S
TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday
8 am. to 4 pm. 554-4333
Commission Gender Composition

PROPOSITION M

Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by the Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?

YES 302
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter requires some City boards and commissions, such as the Police and Fire Commissions, to have at least one woman member. However, the charter does not have a general policy on balancing the number of men and women on City boards and commissions.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a charter amendment that would create a City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex. This charter amendment does not apply to the Commission on the Status of Women.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex.

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

Controller’s Statement on “M”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “M”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Bill Maher and Wendy Nelder.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The 1990s are here — but you would never know it by the few women serving on City boards and commissions. In fact, of ten major commissions — Police, Fire, Airports, Ports, Public Utilities, Parking Authority, Social Services, City Planning, Elections, Housing Authority — women hold just 18 percent of the seats. And only one woman serves as a president of these commissions.

Women do not fare much better on other key commissions. For instance, women hold just two seats on the seven-member Recreation and Park Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission. Three women serve on the eleven-member Small Business Advisory Commission.

Despite the enormous influence and regulatory controls most commissions have over the lives of all citizens, women's voices and leadership on city panels do not equal their numbers in society.

These gloomy statistics aside, women have begun to make gains during the past two years. Women are now being regularly considered and appointed to boards and commissions. But, clearly, much more needs to be done.

Proposition M will emblazon into the Charter a policy goal of gender equality on all boards and commissions. This amendment, authored by Supervisor Richard Hongisto, is a simple measure of justice.

Only the Commission on the Status of Women is excluded from the provisions of this charter amendment, since its sole purpose is to serve as an advocacy forum for women.

Increasingly, communities and groups are instituting gender parity provisions in their constitutions with much success. For instance, the Democratic Party has dramatically brought about near gender equality of delegates to its national and state conventions.

Let's start the 1990s off with a renewed commitment to fairness and equality.

VOTE YES ON THE GENDER PARITY AMENDMENT.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition M
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition M
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M moves San Francisco into the 1990s. It is stunning to review the composition of our city boards and commissions and see just how few women are serving. Women comprise 18 percent of the seats on ten major commissions. This is an untold tragedy. Women have been making gains in recent time. We can do even better.

Proposition M is about fairness and equality. Iowa enacted a law in 1987 to require greater gender balance on all boards, commissions, committees, and councils.

Vote Yes for Gender Justice. Yes on Proposition M.

SF Chapter, National Organization for Women
Legal Advocates for Women
San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Creating political leadership opportunities for women will strengthen the public policy decision-making process.

Vote YES on M.

As a predominately lesbian and gay Republican volunteer organization we believe it is a travesty that after fifteen years of three liberal Democrat mayors only 38% of the city's Commissioners are women. This negligence has prompted the need to enact gender-parity. We support Proposition M.

In the future, the provisions of Proposition M should be amended to apply to the Commission on the Status of Women. Women and men must actively dialogue so that our city begins to address the concerns of all.

Judiciary Project/California
TJ Anthony
Mary C. Dunlap
Ruth Picon, President, Latino Democratic Club
Helen Grieco, Director, SF NOW
Laura Campbell
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Agar Jaicks, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Greg Day, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Jean K. Harris
Geraldine Johnson
Joyce Newstat, Chair, Lesbian Caucus, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
James Harrigan

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw
Paul Kavouksorian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulroney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

 Requirement that any commission be comprised of a certain number of persons of any gender is as inappropriate as requiring a certain number of persons who have red hair or blue eyes. Please vote to maintain the mayoral prerogative to appoint the best San Franciscans for the job.

... Vote NO on Proposition M!
Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Vote No on Proposition M.
Like Proposition L, but only more so, Proposition M does not belong in the City Charter.
The power to make appointments to boards and commissions rests with the Mayor. Proposition M would write into the Charter a non-binding policy statement urging the Mayor to fill not more than 50% plus one of any commission with members of the same sex.
The City Attorney advised the Board of Supervisors that the Constitution prohibits the city from adopting a quota for male and female appointments. Instead, the Board of Supervisors proposes to clutter up the Charter with a non-binding, legally unenforceable policy statement.
If the Board of Supervisors wants to send a message to the Mayor it should be done by resolution, not costly and unnecessary Charter amendments.
Vote No on Proposition M.
Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “M”
There is nothing in the charter NOW that prevents the Mayor or Board of Supervisors to appoint more women to achieve gender parity now.

Why now does it have to be written in concrete.
Vote NO on “M”.
Marguerie Warren
NOTE: Entire section is new.
3.503 Composition of Boards and Commissions.
It is the policy of the city and county, which shall be considered a goal when filling vacancies on boards or commissions appointed by the mayor, or otherwise provided by this charter, except for the Commission on the Status of Women, to achieve gender parity on these boards and commissions by limiting to a simple majority of board and commission membership the number of members who are of the same sex.

***

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 24.

***
MISSING SOMETHING IN YOUR LIFE?

If your life seems to be missing that special warmth that comes from having a pet, come and see us at the new San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department. We have a wide variety of dogs, cats and other animals available for adoption.

A waggly tail, a sweet meow or a gentle squeak - it'll make you glad to come home at night.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PROPOSITION N

Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?

YES 305
NO 307

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter does not limit the number of consecutive terms a person may serve on the Board of Supervisors. A full term on the Board of Supervisors is four years.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a charter amendment. Under Proposition N, no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors. After two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, a person must wait four years before serving again. Any person appointed to the Board of Supervisors to complete more than half a four-year term would be considered to have served one full term. A member of the Board of Supervisors who resigned with less than half a four-year term remaining would be considered to have served a full term. This charter amendment would go into effect July 1, 1990. Each Supervisor holding office on that date would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when his or her current term ends.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the charter so that no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors and you want to prohibit persons who served two consecutive four-year terms from serving on the Board of Supervisors again until four years after their second consecutive term in office.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to limit Supervisors to serving two consecutive terms.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On January 25, 1990, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition N to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,151* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 45,408 of the signatures submitted were valid, 5,257 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is a non-partisan, reasonable, fair and democratic measure to reform our government and improve the present city-wide system for electing supervisors. Neighborhood, civic leaders, current and former elected officials, community activists, business owners, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, unionists, and minorities all support Proposition N.

Limiting politicians' consecutive terms is not radical or extreme. In fact, it helps to prevent political corruption and power grabbing. More than 150 cities, towns and counties in the United States have laws limiting politicians terms. Governors in 30 states can only serve two terms. San Mateo county limits supervisors terms and for more than 30 years San Francisco's mayors have been limited to two consecutive terms.

Proposition N is a very modest and reasonable proposal.

Proposition N does not recall or force any current member of the board from office. Proposition N allows supervisors whose terms expire in 1991 to serve until January 1995 if they are reelected. Supervisors whose terms end in 1993 may serve until 1997 if reelected. Former supervisors may run for office again after 4 years.

The current system favors incumbent politicians and denies experienced newcomers a fair chance to serve. Since 1973, only 3 newcomers have been elected to the city-wide board. 5 supervisors have already served 10 years. By 1995 most board members will have been in office 14 years or more.

We know that a lake or pond will stagnate unless its waters are replenished from time to time. So too will an elected body grow stale without a regular infusion of fresh faces and new ideas.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Richard Bodisco
Chairman, San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
Steve Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu
Harold Hoogasian
Joseph L. Powell
Raymond Chalker
Robert A. Reveles
Robert C. Sanchez
Joel Ventresca
Barry Lastra
Daniel Willson

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N backers have misrepresented the facts to get you to vote for N. Since just 1982 three non-incumbent supervisors have been independently elected to the Board. Proposition N is not true reform — it only tinkers with the citywide election process. It is not democratic — it takes power away from the people. It is not a solution — it's an additional problem.

Supervisors are elected to carry out the will of the people. When they fail to serve, they are unselected — by vote of the people. Appointed department heads, who are not supposed to have their own political agendas, are balanced only by the Mayor's and the Board's overseeing eyes.

With the Mayor already limited to two terms, the Board must not consist only of rookies and lame ducks, or department heads can consolidate their power and bide their time, waiting until watchdog Supervisors are automatically thrown from office. Proposition N threatens accountability and increases the chances for bureaucratic corruption.

Uninformed actions are foolish actions — closely examine the facts, and you'll agree that blindly forcing change is a bad plan. If Proposition N passes, nothing can stop department heads from installing power bases immune to voter inspection. Voters have the right to choose — this measure permanently limits that right.

PROTECT YOUR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Two years ago, San Francisco voted on Proposition O, a recall of the Board of Supervisors thinly disguised as a ‘good government’ initiative. San Franciscans saw through this scheme, and sent the measure down to defeat.

Last year, the same group attempted to offer a similar proposal to the voters, but failed to collect enough signatures to qualify it for the ballot.

Now they’re at it again.

They say that Supervisors have lost touch with the people of San Francisco, and should automatically be thrown from office after they’ve served two terms — but by bringing up this rejected issue again and again, they’re proving that THEY are the ones who are out of touch.

San Francisco doesn’t need a two-term limit. When supervisors stop working for the people, they stop getting elected. If Board members are prematurely removed, more power falls into the hands of civil servants and department heads, who are unaccountable to the voters. These unelected officials who already hold great power must be balanced by supervisors free to do their jobs, or citizens lose their representation.

The diversity of our City is one of our greatest strengths. San Franciscans have always individually evaluated our city’s varied issues, judging each on its specific merits. The Board of Supervisors is similarly diverse, and should also be evaluated selectively. Citizens should use the election process to tell their representatives when they’re not doing their jobs — not by acting blindly and installing an arbitrary time limit. San Franciscans are smart enough to tell the difference between voting an incompetent out of office and firing a valuable employee without cause.

Proposition N denies San Franciscans the right to vote for legislators of their choice, and that’s not fair.

Vote NO on Proposition N.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Let’s talk about what WE want City Hall to do for US, not the politicians.

Politicians will tell you anything to advance their political careers.

They won’t tell you the TRUTH about the Two Term Limit.

The politicians say we failed to collect enough signatures last year to qualify for the ballot.

But here’s what their appointee, the city’s Chief Administrative Officer says:

“Last year’s Proposition removal was forced by an error, one which we admitted, apologized for and tried to repair . . .”

(Letter to Two Term Limit — Chairman — Richard Bodisco, dated February 7, 1990.)

We need new leadership in City Hall.

We have some hard and serious problems to solve in San Francisco and we can’t solve them with political rhetoric and name calling.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N removes experienced supervisors from the Board.

FACT:

Proposition N insures that San Francisco will always have 5 or 6 supervisors with seniority and experience on the Board.

Proposition N also gives experienced and concerned citizens an opportunity to serve without needing to become professional, career politicians.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N will take away your right to vote for a legislator of your choice.

FACT:

Proposition N gives you more choices because it removes the current system which favors incumbent politicians.

The politicians have spoken too long for themselves.

It is time City Hall spoke for us.

Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Submitted by San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Richard Bodisco
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

This citizen’s initiative is a good government reform measure which will guarantee change, encourage competition, improve the chances of electing new political leadership, and curtail the influence of special interests.

Vote YES on N.
SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

Change is the driving force in our economy, our lives...and our government! Eight years on the Board of Supervisors is enough time to initiate changes espoused in any candidacy. Our City government is in desperate need of change. Vote for new life in San Francisco government.

... Vote Yes on Proposition N!
Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

The longer supervisors remain in office the more likely they become captives of special interests who bankroll their costly campaigns.

Entrenched incumbent politicians often end up working against the public interest, rather than for it.

Only two supervisors have been defeated at the polls since the end of 1980.

New faces, new ideas, new leaders, and new directions are needed at City Hall.

Vote YES on N.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

The Two-Term Limit is an idea whose time has come!

The United States Constitution limits the President to two terms in office. Similarly, the San Francisco Charter limits our Mayor to two terms.

Incumbent San Francisco Supervisors, however, continue to win re-elections year after year. This has made many of them less accountable to the voters.

Eight years is enough! Let’s bring new people, new ideas, and new energy to our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Citizens for a Better San Francisco

It works for executive offices, let’s put a limit on the terms of service for our supervisors. As Thomas Jefferson called it, “rotation in office”. Let’s have some healthy competition for these positions, let’s take advantage of the many experienced people around who are willing to serve.

Let’s vote YES on Proposition N for reasonable reform.

John and Carol Maerske

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

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will ensure that we have a Board of Supervisors of concerned citizens, not career politicians.

For almost forty years, San Francisco has limited its Mayor to eight years in office. Many cities around the Bay Area, such as San Jose, Richmond, Mountain View and Redwood City, limit terms in office for their city councils. Yet we have had supervisors serve up to 16 years in office. Why? Because by raising large sums of money and using the power of incumbency, supervisors face little chance of defeat when running for re-election.

Proposition N will not remove any member of the Board of Supervisors from office. It is a fair proposal that allows each current supervisor to run for one more four year term. But in the future, each supervisor will be limited to eight years in office.

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will give the city fresh leadership on the Board of Supervisors. It will open up the city’s political processes, reversing the trend in recent years towards full-time professional politicians. Most importantly, it will mean that our elected representatives put the city’s needs and interests ahead of their desire for re-election.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

I’m supporting Proposition N because of my concern about the status of women and children in San Francisco.

As a long time supporter and treasurer of a shelter for battered women in the City, I have had the opportunity to closely observe how our City government works. I think there are more important things than politics.

San Francisco needs leaders in government who will show more compassion and concern about peoples’ lives as opposed to their reelection campaigns.

I don’t feel that every member of the Board of Supervisors is bad, but the two term limit will improve the current system and help our Supervisors do a better job for us.

That is why I am voting YES on Proposition N.

Millie Favetti

Over the past 20 years women have made enormous gains in electoral politics. The situation is far, far from ideal but some positive changes have taken place. Therefore, we think it is important to encourage and support the entry of women into elective politics.

We’re supporting Proposition N because it ensures that more women will have the opportunity to assume leadership roles in City government. The two year experiment with district elections produced more women supervisors than at any other time in San Francisco’s history.

The gains women have made could be easily lost under the current city-wide system. Proposition N will prevent the clock from being turned back because it allows newcomers a fair chance to compete without always having to run against entrenched incumbents.

Proposition N is equitable and fair to everyone.

Join us and vote YES on Proposition N.

Helen Dawson
Miriam Smith

As a small business owner and long time resident of San Francisco, I’m supporting Proposition N because it makes good sense for our City.

Limiting Supervisors’ terms will create a Board of Supervisors more accountable to the needs of San Franciscans. Under the current city-wide system, too many Supervisors see service on the Board as a career.

They worry more about keeping their seats than about doing the job they were elected to do. As a result, politics is all to often put ahead of the City welfare.

Let’s get politics out of City Hall.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Zdenka Bodisco
Mike Salaro
Harold Hoogasian
Small Business Owners
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Paid Arguments in Favor of Proposition N

We're supporting the Two Term Limit because San Francisco needs new political leadership. The Two Term Limit will open the "Door of Opportunity" for new candidates to serve on the Board of Supervisors.

The Two Term Limit will allow a new generation of civic leaders to represent our City. It is a fair and democratic way to reform the current system and to restore citizens' confidence in City Hall.

San Francisco's government should reflect the diversity of the people who live here. This is the meaning of a Democratic and free system. The Two Term Limit insures that new people with new ideas will have a fair chance to serve the City.

Don't be fooled by arguments of professional, career politicians. The Two Term Limit is good for our community and it is good for San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Steve M. Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu

* * *

Why Didn't We Get to Vote on the Two-Term Limit Last Year?

Because Louise Renne found a legal loophole to get the measure thrown off the ballot after the Registrar of Voters had certified that it qualified for submission to the electorate.

Never mind that when Renne violated a number of election laws several years ago she got everyone to overlook the "technicality."

But what do you expect?

This is the same Louise Renne who sued the Olympic Club because it had no female members conveniently "overlooking" the fact that her husband Paul belongs to the all-white, all-male San Francisco Golf Club.

Say "No" to Renne's legal machinations!

Vote "Yes" on "N."

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committee member
Terence Falkner
Former Republican Chairman

* * *

What Are They Afraid Of?

Why are the Supervisors and their contributors fighting the two-term limit so hard?

Why did City officials use a legal loophole to get this same measure thrown off the ballot last fall?

Are they afraid they won't be able to give away another city street worth $9 million to the Rockefellers for free like they did in 1987?

Are they afraid that the people might vote to turn them out?

Clean up City Hall! Yes on N!

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic Senate Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committee member
Terence Falkner
Former Republican Chairman
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The Two-Term Limit is a reform whose time has come! At the Federal, State, and Local levels, political reformers agree that the powers of incumbency virtually preclude incumbents from being defeated at the polls, and that term limitation is the only way to ensure turnover in legislative bodies. Even Attorney General John Van de Kamp has proposed a twelve-year limit for State legislators.

Since the return to City-wide elections in 1980, only two incumbent Supervisors have been defeated at the polls. They were replaced by Wendy Nelder and Angela Alioto— the daughters of a former Police Chief and Mayor, respectively. Because of this trend, Supervisors have become burned-out, complacent, less accountable to the voters, and more beholden to the special interests who contributed to their re-election campaigns.

Proposition N would limit San Francisco supervisors to two consecutive terms of office, just like the mayor. It’s a modest reform that deserves your vote.

Proposition N would not force any incumbent out of office. All current supervisors could run for one more term after their present term expires. And after four years, they could run again and hold office for two more terms.

The President of the United States has been limited to two consecutive terms of office since 1951. The Mayor of San Francisco has been limited to two consecutive terms since 1953. San Mateo County has a term limit for its board of supervisors. Proposition N is not a new or radical idea; it’s an overdue reform for a stagnant system.

The founders of our city charter envisioned supervisors as part-time citizen legislators, not full-time professional politicians. Proposition N respects and revives that tradition.

A bit of fresh air never hurt anybody — even two-term supervisors!

Please vote YES on Proposition N.

---

Senator Quentin Kopp

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

The current system of electing supervisors in San Francisco badly needs reform. But Proposition N is not the answer. The Board of Supervisors is not accountable to the people, largely because of the pernicious influence of large monetary contributions. A two-term limit would only exacerbate the problem. All supervisors would either be rookies or lame ducks, resulting in a tremendous shift of power to the bureaucracy, without lessening the powerful influence of money in campaigns.

Dennis Antonore  
Robert Barnes  
Ron Braithwaite  
Supervisor Harry Britt  
Gordon Chin  
Brother Kelly Cullen  
Catherine Dodd R.N.  
Noah Giffin  
Sue Hestor  
Agar Jaacks  
Geraldine M. Johnson  
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco  
Labor Council  
Leslie Katz  
Tony Kitroy  
Myra G. Kopf  
Steven M. Krefting  
William J. Brandy Moore  
Jim Morales  
Connie O’Connor  
Ruth Picon  
Mauri Schwartz  
Yori Wada  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Calvin Welch  
Gerald Whitehead  
Harold T. Yee  
San Francisco Democratic  
County Central Committee

What San Francisco needs is real campaign reform — limiting the ability of supervisors to vote on the pet projects of their major contributors, and district election of supervisors. Both would greatly reduce the enormous sums of money needed to run for office citywide.

Proposition N is a false promise of reform. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N!
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The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and the county commissioners with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943 and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and a public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, 11 members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected to a term of four years, from the commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the eighth day of January, 1981, shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on that date, and the 11 persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said eighth day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms. Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the eighth day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the eighth day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor, or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

The effective date of this section as amended is July 1, 1990. All supervisors holding office on that date shall be deemed to have served one full four year term upon the expiration of their then current terms of office.
Hypodermic Syringes

PROPOSITION O
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?

YES 309
NO 310

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law regulates the sale, distribution and use of hypodermic syringes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

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

Controller’s Statement on “O”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

“Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “O” Got on the Ballot
On September 15, 1989 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,173 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,774 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.
Hypodermic Syringes

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

The connection between AIDS and unclean needles is unchallenged. Virtually every authority on the subject agrees that sharing needles increases the chances of contracting AIDS. San Francisco has an estimated 13,000 IV drug users, each of whom is at risk of contracting AIDS and spreading it to their sexual partners or their unborn children. Tens of thousands of people are being directly threatened with contracting AIDS because it is illegal to obtain clean, safe needles.

Some groups are trading clean needles with addicts for their dirty ones. This removes contaminated needles from circulation and can dramatically cut the infection rate among drug users and their partners. But these groups face up to a six months in jail and a $1,000 fine. One member of this group, who lost her mother to AIDS, contracted through a dirty needle, said, “I lost a parent to this because this bureaucracy sits around and talks while lots of people are dying.” Dr. John Newmeyer of the Haight Ashbury Free Medical Clinics said, “People are dying because of our institution’s resistance to AIDS risk reduction methods.”

In an attempt to stop this disease from being spread to drug users and their partners AIDS prevention workers are risking legal persecution. Jerry DeJong, who works with substance abusers and is a member of the Mayor’s Narcotic’s Task Force, said “. . . with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives.” But in a sane, free society it shouldn’t be necessary to break the law to save lives.

The only way this deadly policy can be changed is for the state legislature to change the law. These State laws should be repealed.

Pamela Willard Pickens
Secretary San Francisco Libertarian Party

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition O
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition O

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 0

Dr. John Waters of the Urban Health Study says that, “The middle class have access to clean needles.” Poor people can’t get clean needles, because they are illegal. Black and Latino IV drug users have a more difficult time finding clean needles and are thus more likely to be infected with AIDS. Because minorities are more likely to be infected with AIDS a higher proportion of their sexual partners or unborn children are being infected. AIDS is likely to become the leading cause of death in young Blacks and Latinos if things continue as they have. Legal clean needles will help save their lives.

Christina Groth

The San Francisco Department of Health estimates that there are 13,000 IV drug users in the city. If clean needles remain unavailable to them the AIDS infection rate can easily reach over 60%. If these 60% infect just two other people either through shared needles or sex, the total number of infected people can reach 23,400. San Francisco can’t afford the financial burden it is under today from AIDS cases. Prevention through clean and legal needles can save us millions of tax dollars without costing us a cent. Legal needles make financial sense.

Isaac Klein

The San Francisco Chronicle has reported on the use of needles for IV drug use in Scotland. The newspaper said that in Edinburgh police launched a crackdown on the availability of clean needles. Within 18 months of the crackdown 50% of all IV drug users were infected with AIDS. Soon their sexual partners and unborn babies were infected with the disease. But 30 miles away in Glasgow the police took no action against the availability of clean needles and only 4 to 7 percent of needle users were infected. Dr. Roy Robertson, Edinburgh’s leading authority on AIDS said, “Making needles available to addicts is not the only answer to the problem of AIDS among drug users but certainly, it has to be part of the solution.”

VOTE YES!

George Meyer

WHAT IS CANADA DOING RIGHT?

In Canada, fewer than 1% of AIDS cases are from needles!

In the United States, about 50% of new cases now involve needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners and babies, (up from about 20-30% in the beginning of the epidemic).

What is Canada doing right?

In Canada, drug-users can buy sterile needles in drugstores.

GRASSROOTS

The AIDS epidemic has hit here many times worse than there. Why?

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

SURGEON GENERAL KOOP ON CLEAN NEEDLES

"One of the strongest advocates of making needles legal is Surgeon General Koop who addressed that issue last November (1987):

"I'm asked about clean needles everyplace I go. I've always said the same thing. If clean needles will do anything to contain a part of the epidemic, we should not have any foolish inhibitions about so doing."

(S.F. Sentinel 1/22/88)

Wm. Schwartzman, M.D.

Clean needles cause no diseases.
Legal needles are clean needles.
Vote Yes.

William Schwartzman, MD

Does this initiative "condone drugs"?
If you vote Yes, that could be interpreted as condoning drugs.
But if you vote No, that could equally well be interpreted as condoning the spread of AIDS (and hepatitis, and many other diseases).

The present state law is like the "death penalty" — not just for drug abusers, but also their spouses, their babies, transfusion recipients and others. Who can "condone that"?

GRASSROOTS

The AIDS epidemic was caused by a combination of germs, working together to collapse the immune system.
N.Y.'s health department has concluded that the HIV epidemic already existed among New York addicts in the 1970's.
That epidemic existed only because New York has laws against addicts buying clean needles.
If we keep these deadly laws, no one can predict what future epidemics might result.

GRASSROOTS

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES ENCOURAGES STERILE NEEDLES

The National Academy of Sciences the country's most prestigious scientific organization in 1986, issued a major study titled "Confronting AIDS". Many lives could have been saved if California had promptly implemented the conclusion drawn by America's leading scientists:

"IT IS TIME TO BEGIN EXPERIMENTING WITH PUBLIC

POLICIES TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF STERILE NEEDLES AND SYRINGES BY REMOVING LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS TO THEIR POSSESSION AND USE."

Wm. Schwartzman, MD
Wm. Steinsmith, MD

The issue is not "free needles".
Some of us believe that mass giveaways of clean needles is best.
Others of us believe it would be enough if doctors and pharmacies were allowed to sell needles, as with diabetes.
Legal needles are as cheap as ballpoint pens, so cheap that price

would be no barrier.
This initiative takes no position on "free needles" programs, only for legalization — a prerequisite for either approach.

GRASSROOTS

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

Under present California law, even doctors aren’t allowed to provide needles except for approved purposes. So far “stopping AIDS” is not an approved purpose.

Under "legalization", needles are a medical question, not a police question. A doctor’s prescription could still be required, as with diabetes. Whatever controls are adopted, needles will be better controlled under legalization than they are now.

William Steinsmith, M.D.

Dr. Don Francis, an epidemiologist with the Centers for Disease Control said, "We can’t overstate the threat of AIDS among addicts in the minority population in the inner city." Dr. Francis says that there is no evidence that legal, clean needles increase the use of drugs. The only thing stopping clean needles is the law. It’s time for Sacramento to repeal the law and save lives.

Will Wohler

According to the New York Times a new, rare virus known as HTLV-II is spreading through the IV drug community because of needle sharing. Spread in the same manner as AIDS, this virus “could cause leukemia or other serious diseases and may exact a rising toll in future years." Surveys have found that 20% of addicts in New Orleans were infected and in San Francisco a preliminary survey of blood donors showed this new disease has a higher rate of incidence than the AIDS virus. Because it can take as long as 20 years to develop no one can know for sure how many people have been infected. Clean, legal needles will stop the transmission of this disease. VOTE YES!

John Whisman

Clean needles save the lives of innocent victims of AIDS. Not everyone who gets AIDS because people share needles is an addict. Some are small babies. The Centers for Disease Control says 314 babies were born in 1988 with AIDS because their mothers used infected needles. Dr. James Buehler of the CDC said “We need to do what we can to prevent the sharing of dirty needles. Sharing dirty equipment is the worst problem.” In California it is illegal to obtain clean needles so addicts share. Because they share, babies are born with AIDS. Save lives. Legalize needles. VOTE YES!

Mark Pickens

Illegal needles, which force IV drug users to share unclean needles, is now the cause of over one-third of all AIDS cases in the United States according to the federal government’s Centers for Disease Control. In 1988, 10,747 people contracted AIDS because of sharing unclean needles. Some of these people never used needles themselves. 226 were men who had sex with women who used needles, 623 were women who had sex with men who used unclean needles and 314 were unborn babies. Over 1,000 people who don’t use drugs were infected because clean needles are illegal. VOTE YES FOR LEGAL, CLEAN NEEDLES!

Pamela Williard Pickens

Proposition O was endorsed by the Central Committee of the Democratic Party of San Francisco on March 21, 1990. VOTE YES!

John Whisman
Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Clean, legal needles will save lives. Jerry DeJong of the Mayor’s Narcotics Task Force said, “The bottom line is that this is not a moral or legal issue. Unfortunately with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives.” Something is very wrong when its illegal to save lives; and that wrong must be corrected. Tell Sacramento that we want to legalize saving lives. We need clean, legal needles now!

Ron Dorsey

Illegal needles are the primary means of spreading AIDS to minority communities. Most of the IV drug users and their partners who have been infected with AIDS are Black or Latino. Most of the babies born with AIDS because of needle sharing by their mothers are also Black and Latino. Blacks and Latinos are now more likely than ever before to become infected with AIDS because clean needles are illegal. Legal, clean needles will slow down the infection rate and decrease the number of deaths in minority communities. Illegal needles hurt Blacks and Latinos more than they hurt others. Support legal needles.

Jim Peron

Prof. Ethan Nadelman, in the Washington Post, reported that “The governments of England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, the Netherlands and several other countries have actively attempted to limit the spread of AIDS by removing restrictions on the sale of syringes . . . .” Dr. Nadelman notes that there is growing evidence that legal needles do not increase the use of drugs but they do save lives.

George O’Brien

A former prosecutor of high-level drug dealers, Ben Clark, said in The Daily Recorder, a law newspaper, that legal restrictions on clean needles “have had the disastrous effect of forcing drug users to share syringes. Over half the addicts in New York State are infected with AIDS, and the rate of infection among intravenous drug users in Illinois is growing dramatically.”

While some people may say addicts deserve to die, Clark notes, “. . . the issue is not simply whether society should sit back and watch addicts kill themselves off: AIDS transmitted by needles does not stay within the druggie population. Unborn children of AIDS-infected female users may become infected. The sex partners of persons with AIDS are exposed to the disease. Needle-sharing prostitutes interact with the drug-free heterosexual community on a daily basis.” Clark says that clean, legal needles have never been proven to increase drug use but they do save lives. VOTE YES!

Sam Grove

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

There is no scientific evidence that unlimited and uncontrolled availability of hypodermic syringes/needles will stop the spread of AIDS. Proposition "O" would open the floodgates to the purchase and distribution of hypodermic syringes, without prescription, in drug stores, supermarkets and in the streets without medical supervision under the guise of stopping the spread of AIDS. Addicts will continue to commit crimes to pay for the dope since possession and sale of drugs, such as crack cocaine and heroin, will still be illegal.

Latest statistics show that over 80 percent of inmates in our already overcrowded jails are there for illegal drug offenses.

Who will protect the public against the careless disposition of these used needles by addicts?

Black communities in San Francisco are under siege from the sale of illegal drugs and the crime this produces. Approval of Proposition "O" by the voters permitting use of unprescribed legal needles and illegal drugs could leave the City open to millions of dollars in lawsuits for unsupervised use of a medical procedure by intravenous drug addicts from death and other causes.

WE URGE A "NO" VOTE ON PROPOSITION "O". It should not be City policy to support the removal of all restrictions in the distribution, sale and use of hypodermic syringes.

Rev. Amos Brown
Hon. Naomi Gray
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Senator Quentin Kopp
Dr. Raye Richardson
Lulann McGriff
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Melvin Miles

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION O

We, the people of the City and County of San Francisco, California, call upon the California State Legislature to eliminate all sanctions, criminal, regulatory, or civil, on the manufacture, use, sale or other distribution of hypodermic syringes. We do this to reduce the spread of AIDS and other diseases.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION K (Continued from page 100)

charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of $100.

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such a time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission after the regular daily working hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

This amendment shall become operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY: AIRPORTS COMMISSION

3.690 Commission; Composition

An airports commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on September 1, 1996. On the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

All rights, claims, actions, orders, obligations, proceedings and contracts relating to the airport department under the public utilities commission existing prior to the effective date of these amendments shall not be affected by the adoption thereof, and shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the airports commission.

This amendment shall be operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY-TWO: PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION

3.698 Commission — Composition

A parking and traffic commission and the department of parking and traffic are hereby established. The parking and traffic commission shall consist of five seven members. If not in conflict with state law, members of the parking and traffic commission shall serve ex-officio as members of the parking authority.

The term of each member shall be for four years; provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section shall, by lot classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided further, that terms of the two commissioners created by the amendment of June, 1990 shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 5th day of December, 1992; and on the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month. Any person may serve concurrently as a member of the San Francisco parking authority and the parking and traffic commission.
Did you know that you can vote before Election Day?
Vote absentee in person at City Hall (Room 158) starting May 7
or by mail — fill out the application on the back cover.
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IS GOING TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON ELECTION DAY A PROBLEM?

If you are unable to go to your polling place to vote on Election Day (Tuesday, June 5, 1990), you may vote by absentee ballot in one of two ways:

1. **Vote at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.** Starting on May 7 through June 5, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., you can vote in Room 158 at City Hall.

2. **Vote by mail.** Complete the application for an absentee ballot on the back cover. Tear or cut off the back cover, fold it in half with the address of the Registrar of Voters on the outside, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated, and mail the form.

Voters who have specified disabilities may apply to be a **permanent absentee voter.** Please refer to page 24.

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside
(do not cut or tear off)

---

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
158 CITY HALL
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
GERMANE O WONG
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
158 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

DO NOT REMOVE LABEL

BALLOT TYPE
R6 42
90

REPUBLICAN
16th Assembly District
8th Senate District
5th Congressional District

PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
1200's, 1400's,

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside

(Do not cut or tear off)

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION
Must be received by the Registrar of Voters
no later than May 29, 1990
June 5, 1990 Consolidated Primary Election

FIRST NAME MIDDLE INITIAL LAST NAME

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX OR MAIL DROP ADDRESS)

NUMBER AND STREET CITY ZIP CODE

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (if different from above)

P.O. BOX OR STREET CITY STATE ZIP CODE

I HAVE NOT AND WILL NOT APPLY FOR AN ABSENTEE BALLOT BY ANY OTHER MEANS.

X

SIGNATURE (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER EVENING PHONE NUMBER

⇒ I understand that voters with specified disabilities may qualify as Permanent Absent Voters. See page 24.

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
VOTE!

Polls are open from 7 am to 8 pm
See the label on the back cover for the location of your polling place.

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot
Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

(The workday is from 6:30 a.m. to about 9:00 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name ____________________________________________________________

Address __________________________________________________________ Apt. # _________

Telephone No. (required) _________________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) ________________________________

Signature _______________________________________________________
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

STEP 1

STEP 2

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

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

G 第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接
合于二红点之上。

STEP 3

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

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

D 第三步
请把带针之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入
打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封
袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republican Party</th>
<th>GOBERNADOR 州長</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>票</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DONALD L. BULLOCK</td>
<td>Gun Show Producer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAVID M. WILLIAMS</td>
<td>Businessman-Engineer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PETE WILSON</td>
<td>U.S. Senator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEFFREY T. GREENE</td>
<td>Industrial Hygienics Supervisor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VICEGOBERNADOR 副州長</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>票</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARIAN BERGESON</td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN SEYMOUR</td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECRETARIO DE ESTADO  省務卿
Secretary of State

JOAN MILKE FLORES
Los Angeles Councilwoman
Concejala de Los Angeles 洛杉磯市議員

GORDON P. LEVY
Deputy District Attorney
Fiscal Asistente del Distrito 段地方檢察官

CONTRALOR  市計官
Controller

MATT FONG
Business Attorney
Abogado de Negocios 商務律師

TESORERO  財政長
Treasurer

ANGELA "BAY" BUCHANAN
Chief Financial Officer
Funcionario Financiero Principal 總財務主任

THOMAS W. HAYES
Appointed State Treasurer
Tesorero Estatal Nombrado 被委任的州財庫

選一人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

29  →
31  →
36  →
45  →
47  →
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>PRIMARY ELECTION</th>
<th>JUNE 5, 1990</th>
<th>COMMISSIONADO DE SEGUROS</th>
<th>Insurance Commissioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO REPUBLICANO</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td>JOHN S. PARISE</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney - Insurance Broker</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado - Agente de Seguros</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOSEPH D. DUNLOP</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claims Consultant</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor de Reclamos</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN L. &quot;JACK&quot; HARDEN</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance Adjustor / Investigator</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ajustador de Seguros / Investigador</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THOMAS A. SKORNIA</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman / Lawyer</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de Negocios / Abogado</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WES BANNISTER</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dueño de una Pequeña Empresa</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO REPUBLICANO</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICAN PARTY</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN**

**Member, State Board of Equalization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAUDE W. PARRISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Executive, Controller / Ejecutivo de Negocios, Contralor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL DUPLISSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Representative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALAN NICHOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)**

**(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)**

**MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL**

**Member of the State Assembly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERENCE FAULKNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

vote for uno  
80 ➔  
82 ➔  
92 ➔  
102 ➔
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TINA H. FRANK</td>
<td>Businesswoman</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN KELLER</td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS J. MARK</td>
<td>Accountant/Businessman, Contador/Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PABLO J. WONG</td>
<td>Real Estate Consultant, Consultor de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOK F. PON</td>
<td>Community Outreach Director, Director de Extensión Comunitaria</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL GRAYSON</td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES E. GILLERAN</td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNA M. GUTH</td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAROLD M. HOOGASIAN</td>
<td>Small Businessperson/Florist, Hombre de Negocios/Florista</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES L. HOWARD</td>
<td>Child Welfare Supervisor, Supervisor del Bienestar Infantil</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN R. HATOYAMA</td>
<td>Incumbent, Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDENDE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA</td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5</td>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15</td>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Vote #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

YES 185  NO 187

PAASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for the acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

YES 189  NO 190

GOVERNOR'S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor's time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 192  NO 193

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

YES 195  NO 197

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

YES 200  NO 203
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE  
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 SI  贊成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un empréstito de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de viviendas que incluya: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias y individuos en necesidad de vivienda. (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias individuales y hogares de menos ingresos que cumplan con las necesidades específicas de los ancianos, discapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar con que quienes compren casa por primera vez.

187 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INFRAESTRUCTURA PARA PASEOS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un empréstito de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de derechos de vía, desmontes de capital, y para la adquisición de terrenos y travesías para ferrocarriles en estas ciudades, para transporte en tiempo, y para el funcionamiento de varios programas de transporte en otras. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resuelve del cálculo por el Analista de la Legislatura sobre el impuesto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatales y locales; si todos los bonos autorizados fueron vendidos el 7.5 por ciento y pagados durante un período de 20 años, el Fondo General Incurrirá en unos $1,164 millones para pagar el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($760 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula el costo anual del capital a interés en los bonos será de $600 millones.

189 SI  贊成

190 NO 反對

192 SI  贊成

193 NO 反對

195 SI  贊成

197 NO 反對

ACTA PARA EL DESCONECTAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establece un programa de desconectamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondrá al día la limitación en las asignas de los despachos de los estados para sellar calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establece un aumento del 5% en los cobros por peso a los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible a partir de 1990, y un centavo adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el desconectamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en el gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios de educación y de los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciban al menos el 45% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondrá que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

1990年房屋與無家可歸者公投法案。此法案提案發行公債 $150,000,000 資助的房屋計劃包括以下: (1) 無家可歸者及家庭的緊急避難所及動態型房屋的出租給個人及家庭的房屋來符合老年人、殘障者及貧窮者特別需要(2) 離婚及出租屋的補救及規定給首次買貴的買蛋资助。

200 SI  贊成

203 NO 反對

107

108

109

110

111

13-1N
STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.


MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands "peace officer" definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.

CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.

RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).

WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

211 SI 贊成
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependerían de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

213 NO 反對

215 SI 贊成

217 NO 反對

218 SI 贊成
ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENA. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la definición de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena para asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Menos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia general en asesinatos en primer grado.

220 NO 反對

222 SI 贊成
DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA ESTATUTARIO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estadísticos. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectiva significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce como se pondría en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

224 NO 反對

226 SI 贊成
TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,500,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requerirá del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

228 NO 反對

230 SI 贊成
PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $3 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

232 NO 反對

N 51, N 52 & N 53

15-1N
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT
AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee
created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by
costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.

118
YES 236
NO 238

REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STAT-
UTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legisla-
tive seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars
each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.

119
YES 240
NO 242

NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred
fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the
Youth Authority facilities through new construction.

120
YES 243
NO 245

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of
four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of
facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s
nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community
Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of
the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July
1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction
or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other
health or safety improvements.

121
YES 248
NO 250

EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This
act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the
reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government
buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.

122
YES 254
NO 256

1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars
($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

123
YES 258
NO 259
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

236 SI 贷成
LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, EMENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE LAS DISTINCIONES DE LOS ASUNTOS DE LA REDISTRIBUCIÓN DE DISTritos EN LOS ASUNTOS DE LA REDISTRIBUCIÓN DE DISTritos A LOS 238 SI 贷成
238 NO 反对
立法局。重新分配，道德行为标准。修宪案及立法局的初步提案，改变选区必须通过三分之二的投票。选民投票赞成或反对。立法局的一项初步提案，改变选区管辖的明确界线，将选区的划分的区域所剩下的，应尊重选民的投票结果。重新分配的费用可能较高。

240 SI 贷成
REDISTRIBUCIÓN POR COMISIÓN, EMENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución en los distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reducirá los costos de la redistrucción en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarán, disminuyendo los ahorros.

242 NO 反对

243 SI 贷成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

245 NO 反对

248 SI 贷成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos millones de dólares ($400,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes "Hastings," la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California simpatizadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 Inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salud y seguridad.

250 NO 反对

254 SI 贷成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SIEMBROS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por treceientos millones de dólares ($1300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aditamentos a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

256 NO 反对

258 SI 贷成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolsos de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.

259 NO 反对
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Public Safety Improvement Bonds, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.</td>
<td>YES 263</td>
<td>NO 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $33.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?</td>
<td>YES 269</td>
<td>NO 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?</td>
<td>YES 277</td>
<td>NO 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?</td>
<td>YES 280</td>
<td>NO 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>WITHDRAWN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?</td>
<td>YES 284</td>
<td>NO 285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

263 SI 贊成
SONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1988. Para contrar el daño en bonos de $322,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condados de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de las daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la eliminación del asbesto, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se emitan bonos por más de $322,400,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $322,400,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FAA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los edificios causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

265 NO 反对

269 SI 贊成
¿Tendrás el Distrito No. 91 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar (I) la reparación, la restauración, y el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, debajo del terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989, y (II) la mejora anual de los servicios inafables y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (III) la reciclación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (IV) la conservación diaria de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (V) que serán varias categorías relacionadas a la anterior por medio de la recuperación de un impuesto especial y ser recolectado durante veinte (20) años con una base anual (1) para parques residenciales de familias únicas y parques residenciales de familias únicas y parques residenciales de familias, de $65.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.20 por parcela durante los siguientes años (14) años, después del sexto año, para parcelas de uso mixto (parques con una o más unidades residenciales adicionales de uno a más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $33.00 por unidad de año durante los primeros seis (6) primeros años y de $15.18 por unidad de vivienda durante los años restantes (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles relativo al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, ciertos terrenos y propiedades de propiedad pública y otras usos, tal como se dispone con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 90-24-5-81 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990, y debería establecerse un límite de apropinaciones de $172,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

272 NO 反对

277 SI 贊成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Superintendentes, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda aprobados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por el ahorro de una empresa sin líneas de crédito, el Consejo certifica que el costo real en intereses a la Ciudad será menos que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por ahorro?

278 NO 反对

Dé la Ciudad un fondo de Embalaje (los embalajes que el vecindario recoja y elimina) y de Limpieza de las Escrituras en las Paredes para pagar por embalaje los vecindarios de la Ciudad y eliminar las escrituras de las paredes, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un 15 por ciento de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 mil millones disponible en el fondo cada año?

280 SI 贊成
¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 43 horas (después de la cual un bombero ganara horas extra) a una semana normal de trabajo de 40 horas para la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo del servicio de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comiencen a las 8 a.m.? (2) cambios en la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo del servicio de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comiencen a las 8 a.m.?

281 NO 反对

284 SI 贊成

285 NO 反对

ELIMINADA

Ẹ 撤消

286 SI 贊成

287 NO 反对
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## MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Votación</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>贳成</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>市議會是否有權許可曾任市議員繼續參加本市的健康服務制度如果他們付全部費用？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>贳成</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autoridad de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>市議會是否有權與加州公務員退休制度（PERS）簽約以使其消防安全官員及防火工程師成為公務員退休制度的成員而不需市退休制度只要市政府不須支付附加的費用？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>贳成</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá a los maestros jubilados dentro el sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebrar contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>現屬市退休制度的退休教師能否與三藩市聯合校區或三藩市社區大學簽約作有償顧問而不失掉他們的退休權益？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>贳成</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>人權委員會將被立為制憲委員會，並且委員會人數將由15名減至11名？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 SI</td>
<td>贳成</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tráfico, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a diez miembros?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>市警察、消防、社會服務、海港、公用事業、公共服務、社會事務、飛機場和停車及交通、對決上訴委員會的委員會人數將由5名增至7名？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>贳成</td>
<td>¿Realizará un recuento que los miembros de las comisiones y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se eran electos a los miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos auxiliares de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos enumerados, a los cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o aplicaciones específicas y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumple con esas condiciones?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>市議會委員會成員的委員會在本市居民及經選舉的委員會擴大本市議員的選舉、委員會選擇候選人但是定期選舉的委員會，選舉候選人時考慮經驗、技術、資格的人但非三藩市的任何選民？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>贳成</td>
<td>¿Serán designados o comisionados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>除婦委員會外，市議會是否著重訂立一項目使市長或市議會成立的委員會或委員會應否有過多數的同性別委員？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>贳成</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que están en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un periodo completo de cuatro años cuando termine su periodo actual?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>市民應否禁止任何人再在市議會連任多於兩期的「一期」市議員及議員等四年任期才可再出任市議員？若1990年7月就任期的市議員合議會已任期了一期「四年」的市議員？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 SI</td>
<td>贳成</td>
<td>¿Será política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>市民有此政策來要求加州立法局撤消或下注射的製造、使用、銷售或分發所涉及的刑事和民事懲罰？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 51, N 52 & N 53
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — If you do not wish to go to your polling place to vote, you may vote by mail or by going to the Registrar's Office in City Hall in person. This is called absentee voting.

BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest.


CHARTER BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (PROPOSITION J, K, L) — Boards and commissions created by the Charter, either directly or indirectly.

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

DEFERRED CAPITAL MAINTENANCE (PROPOSITION B) — Major building repair projects that have been postponed.

ELECTOR (PROPOSITION L) — A person who is eligible to register to vote.

FINANCE (PROPOSITION C) — Various ways to pay for something over time. This may include raising money or offering something in trade.

FISCAL YEAR (PROPOSITION A, D) — The twelve months from July 1 to June 30 make up a fiscal year. The City budgets revenues and expenses on a fiscal year basis.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INITIATIVE (PROPOSITION F, O) — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE (PROPOSITION D, J) — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters. For such a law to be passed by the Board of Supervisors, a majority, (or in some cases, three-fourths) of the Supervisors must vote to approve the law at two consecutive meetings.

OUTSTANDING PRINCIPAL (PROPOSITION A., C) — The actual amount of borrowed money, not yet paid back. Principal does not include interest charges.

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party's candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE for each office you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A person who has turned in the required papers and signatures with the Registrar of Voters to run for an office as a write-in candidate. The name of this person will not be on the ballot. Voters who want to vote for this person can do so by writing the name of the person on the inside of the grey envelope given with the ballot.

SPECIAL PROPERTY TAX [MELLO-ROOS DISTRICT] (PROPOSITION B) — A flat tax on a parcel of land, which is not based on the property's value. The special tax would be in addition to current property taxes. This tax requires a two-thirds majority vote.

STAFFING LEVEL (PROPOSITION F) — The number of employees on duty at any one time.

TAX EXEMPT DEBT (PROPOSITION C) — Money borrowed by the City which is paid back with interest. The lenders are not taxed on the money earned from these loans.

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now," "The Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters' rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.
## VOTER SELECTION COUPON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 15</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNOR</td>
<td>(Check Ballot for the number of candidates to vote for)</td>
<td>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT. GOVERNOR</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 3</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARY OF STATE</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROLLER</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURER</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE COMMISSIONER</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, BOARD OF EQUALIZATION</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>STATE SUPT. OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC DEFENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>WITDRAWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS**

*Mayoral appointees*: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, and Molly Wood

*Board of Supervisors appointees*: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gillham, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that absentee ballots be mailed to them or they may vote in person at City Hall from May 7 through June 5 during normal working hours (see “Your Rights as a Voter” section of this pamphlet). In addition, voters with specified disabilities enumerated below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library’s Branch for the Blind at 3150 Sacramento Street produces and distributes tape recorded copies of the State and Local Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually-impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voter’s office by calling 554-4386.

ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them. The persons providing assistance may be someone who came with the voter, or poll workers can be asked to provide needed assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the sidewalk in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If your polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided that this will not impede the flow of traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large print instructions on how to vote and magnifying sheets to enlarge the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows for seated voting.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip tool and pen to be used in punching the ballot and signing in.

APPLICATION TO BE A PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

The physically disabled may apply to be permanent absentee voters. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, you will automatically receive an absentee ballot every election until you move or re-register.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the form below and return it to the Registrar of Voters. Room 158, City Hall, San Francisco, 94102. Each time you move or re-register to vote, you must apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases you do not need to re-apply.

I hereby apply for “Permanent Absentee Voter” status in San Francisco by reason of:

____ Lost use of one or more limbs.       ____ Lost use of both hands.
____ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g. cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair).
____ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease.
____ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities.
____ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.
____ PLEASE SEE EXPLANATORY LETTER ATTACHED.

Name

FIRST

MIDDLE

LAST

Residence Address

STREET

# APT.#

Mailing Address

STREET

CITY

ZIP CODE

(if different than residence address given above)

I declare under penalty of Perjury that the above is true and correct:

Date________________________Signature________________________

(Return only this page; do not return the whole book)
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens over 18 years old who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 8, 1990.

Q — I moved before May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 8 and June 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — If you are registered as a member of a political party you may choose a candidate for: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Member-State Board of Equalization (District 2), Member-State Assembly, State Senator if you live in Senate District 8, United States Representative, and members of the County Central Committee. Non-partisan offices are: Superintendent of Public Instruction, Superior Court Judge, Municipal Court Judge, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 5, 1990. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar's Office at 554-4375 to let us know the polling place is not open.

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help you.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don't know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you. Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to my polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 5 by:
   - going to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall from May 7 through June 5, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday; or
   - mailing in a request for an absentee ballot. You may send in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. The application must be received by the Registrar of Voters before May 29, 1990.

Q — If I don't use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include:
   - your home address
   - the address to which you want the ballot mailed
   - your printed name and your signature.
   Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is paid $98,670 a year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is paid $102,882 a year.
The Public Defender represents the following persons unable to pay for their own lawyer: 1) persons accused of crimes, 2) juveniles in legal actions, and 3) persons in mental health hearings.
Candidates for Assessor

PAUL E. SCHWENGER

My address is 16 Ord Court, Apt. #4
My occupation is Deputy Assessor
My age is 53
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan, Mission High School graduate, and San Francisco State University graduate. I have been a Deputy Assessor for San Francisco for the past 22 years. I have been awarded the SRPA, Senior Real Property Designation, which is one of the highest awards for professional appraisers. My 22 years of experience will enable me to effectively represent homeowners' and renters' concerns before State Legislative Committees. I will analyze property values to make sure business pays its fair share and I will oversee the operations of the Assessor's office in an experienced and professional manner.

Paul E. Schwenger

The sponsors for Paul E. Schwenger are:


RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: With 28 years of public service, I am the only candidate with real management experience.

As Sheriff of San Francisco, I managed 399 employees; as Police Chief, 2,500; as New York Prison Commissioner, 13,000.

While this would be the largest managerial responsibility faced by the other candidates, it would be my smallest.

I want to be your assessor so I can make it a model agency. I know government and real estate. I am dedicated to public service and to lower taxes for you.

Mayor Agnos agrees I am the rational choice.

I would appreciate your vote.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:


Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Assessor

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Attorney/Supervisor
My age is 48

My qualifications for office are: I have absolutely no ownership or income interests in real property which create any conflict of interest as Assessor.

As attorney for 25 years, Supervisor for three terms, and past President of the Board, I have a proven record of unique, practical accomplishments.

Just as I've fought for reduced local government spending, I'll work for new statewide lower assessment formulas with the same energy that created the nationally copied No-Smoking Ordinance; the Police Fingerprint Computer which reduced our crime rate; laws allowing earthquake victims to quickly replace damaged buildings.

My goal is to achieve fair, reduced property assessments.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred S. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Chief of Police.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St. #20D, Attorney-Legislator.
Nancy Pelosi, 2640 Broadway, Member of Congress.
John Burton, 712 Vermont, Assemblyman.
Jim Gonzalez, 642 Edinburgh, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th Street, Community College Board.
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired City Treasurer.
Sam Duca, 16 Wawona St., Assessor.
John J. Lo Schiavo, 650 Parker Avenue, President - USF. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., University Professor, UCSF.
Sophie Hoffman, 2825 Lake St., Chairman, Salvation Army, Advisory Bd.
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave. #4, Teachers' Union President.
Collin P. Quock, 140 Casitas Avenue, Physician.
Richard Rodriguez, 37 Brentwood Ave., Vice President Teamsters.
Sam Jordan, 4006 3rd St., Caterer.
Alfred D. Trigueiro, 1956 Stockton St., Police Officers Association Official.
Lawrence B. Martin, 401 Garfield Street, International Representative, Transport Workers Union.
John Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist.
Louis G. Spadia, 1177 California St. #315, President, Bay Area Sports Hall of Fame.
Mary Frances Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Businesswoman.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Assistant to Speaker.
John J. Moylan, 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader.

RONALD G. KERSHAW

My address is 3533 21st Street
My occupation is Real Estate Portfolio Manager
My age is 39

My qualifications for office are: B.S. Accounting, Brigham Young University 1975
MBA Real Estate, Golden Gate University 1986
Eleven years experience in all aspects of property management, appraisals, renovation and property sales
Currently responsible for supervising a real estate portfolio of $150,000,000
Past President SF Chapter, Institute of Internal Auditors
Currently, President, Log Cabin Club of San Francisco
San Francisco homeowner and resident since 1975.
San Francisco needs a fiscal conservative who is the only qualified candidate to become the City’s new Assessor.

Ronald G. Kershaw

The sponsors for Ronald G. Kershaw are:

Christopher L. Bowman, 39 Fair Oaks #303, Political Consultant.
Nicole Brien, 147 10th Ave., Secretary. Honor H. Bulkley, 3 Downey St., Property Manager.
Albert C. Chang, 1328 Wawona St., Realtor.
Rose Chung, 2161 Mason St., Radiologic Technologist.
Theresa L. Claassen, 1940 Broadway, Retired Social Worker.
James Fang, 170 Gellert Drive, Journalist.
Wade Francois, 2436 15th Ave., Lawyer.
William E. Grayson, 95 Sea Cliff, Attorney.
Jun Retsu Hatoyama, 150 Glenbrook, Political Consultant.
James L. Howard, 839 41st Ave., Child Welfare Supervisor.
Ronald G. Kershaw, 3533 21st Street, Real Estate Portfolio Manager.
Leonard J. Lacayo, 925 Persia Ave., Consultant.
Tung K. Lee, 1312 California, President, Chinese Times Newspaper.
Christina I. Mack, 2963 23rd Ave., Accountant.
Nancy A. Nichols, 1032 Broadway, Archaeologist.
George H. Pfau, Jr., 2298 Vallejo St., Stockbroker.
Emily G. Pike, 1800 Broadway, Retired.
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Owner, Andre’s TV.
Helen Skripkin, 347 14th Avenue, Retired.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender represents people in trouble who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. The responsibility must be performed ethically, competently, and efficiently. During three terms in office, with the help of a superb staff of men and women, that duty has been fulfilled with compassion, dignity, and with the highest professional standards of the American legal system.

In the next term, I pledge to continue to carry out the special trust of this office: to guarantee that everyone in this City has the full benefit of our Constitution and is treated with fairness and with justice.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:


Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #3

ALEX SALDAMANDO

My address is 700 Arkansas Street
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: In my 11 years presiding as a Municipal Court Judge, I have worked to protect the citizens of San Francisco. I have delivered justice swiftly and firmly, in a fair and impartial manner. As a Superior Court Judge, I would bring the same approach to felony criminal cases and complex civil disputes. I am currently President of the California Judges Foundation. My background includes experience as a prosecutor and a public interest lawyer. A graduate of the University of California (Berkeley) and Hastings College of Law, I live with my wife and two children on Potrero Hill.

My sponsors include: Judge Ira Brown, Jr.; Judge John Dearman; Judge Isabella Grant; Judge Ed Stern; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Lillian Sing; Former Judge Charles Renfrew; Mayor Art Agnos; Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein; Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi; Assemblyman Willie Brown; Assemblyman John Burton; Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Harry Britt; Supervisor Jim Gonzalez; Supervisor Terence Hallinan; Supervisor Willie Kennedy; School Board Member Rosario Anaya; School Board Member Libby Deneheim; School Board Member Fred Rodriguez; Commissioner Paul Melbostad; Larry Mazzola, President, Local 38; Thelma Shelley, Director, Performing Arts Center; Benny Yee; Stan Smith, Building Trades Council; and Police Commissioner John Keker.

J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY

My address is 340 Magellan
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a Municipal Court Judge since 1974, native Californian, resident San Francisco since 1937; attended local schools, N.D.V., St. Ignatius, USF and USF School of Law; married Patricia M. Berti, admitted State Bar 1960, devoted thirty years to public service; adjunct Professor of Law, USF; participant, member and/or lecturer for many organizations — Salesian Boys Club, 44 years — Municipal Court Speakers Bureau — California Judges Association — California Center for Judicial Education and Research — San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project; Supervising Judge, Preliminary Courts, Presiding Judge, Assistant Presiding Judge, Court Administrative Committee member eight years; honored by: San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Irish-Israeli-Italian Society, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, Lawyers Club, USF School of Law and USF Law Society for outstanding community service.


Alex Saldamando

J. Dominique Olcomendy

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #5

KAY TSENIN

My address is 637 Steiner Street
My occupation is Attorney and Counselor at Law
My age is 43 years
My qualifications for office are: B.A., San Francisco State University (Dean’s List), graduate, University of San Francisco School of Law. Attorney for sixteen years specializing in civil litigation. Pro-Tem Municipal Court Judge in San Francisco for five years.

Born in China, moved to San Francisco as a child, graduate of George Washington High School.

Broad Community service includes founding of environmental law societies while in law school, Vice President for Legal Affairs for California National Organization for Women (NOW), Board Member for the Russian American Credit Union and San Francisco Trial Lawyers and Board Advisor for the Legal Advocates for Women. Vice-President, Alamo Square Neighborhood Association.

Strong commitment to equal justice for all without prejudice or bias. The following San Franciscans support me because they feel that the Superior Court needs a judge with my background, legal expertise and perspective on the law:

Sheriff Mike Hennessey, Supervisor Harry Britt, Dr. Leland Yee, Attorney Paul Melbostad, Jean Harris, Calvin Welch, Attorney Sue Hestor, Attorney Mary C. Dunlap, Roberto Esteves, Bob Ross, Matthew Rothschild, Pat Norman, Jonathan Bulkley, Susan P. Kennedy, Adrian Bermudez, Lawrence Brinkin, John H. Cusker, Attorney Anne Kiruashkin, Eugene Kiruashkin, N. Arden Danekas, Laura E. McBride, Donna Yutzy, Gale Armstrong.

Kay Tsenin

CARLOS BEA

My address is 2727 Pierce Street
My occupation is Judge Superior Court #5
My qualifications for office are: I am a Superior Court Judge in San Francisco and author of articles in several professional journals, such as California Trial Lawyers and Defense Research Institute’s. Am recognized by the State Bar for pro bono work with members of the Hispanic Community. Have served two terms as a member of the Board of Visitors, Stanford Law School. Was a panelist and lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar. Was an adjunct professor, Hastings College of Law and Stanford Law School. I graduated from Stanford Law School and have been an attorney in San Francisco since 1959.

Sponsors include: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Ollie Marie-Victoire, all the judges of the Superior Court, Angela Alioto, Ernest Chuck Ayala, Willie Brown, Jr., John Burton, Jim Gonzalez, Quentin Kopp, H. Jesse Arnelle, James Herman, Mary Noel Pepys, Robert McDonnell, G. Joseph Bertain, Edward McFetridge, Zeppelin Wong, Paul Renne, Leo Murphy, Jr., Gina Moscone, James Brosnahan, Barbara Caulfield, Robert Morales, Paul Haerle, Michael Hardeman, Howard Nemirovski, Edwin Heafey, Jr., Larry Mazzola, Vincent Friia, Putnam Livermore, William Coblenz.

Carlos Bea

Kay Tsenin
DONNA HITCHENS

My address is 468 30th Street
My occupation is attorney
My age is 42 years
My qualifications for office are: Over the past thirteen years, I have represented clients in San Francisco courts, taught law to San Francisco students and served on the Boards of Directors of private and public agencies designed to further the cause of justice in our city.

My experience as a mediator, counselor and advocate demonstrates my willingness to pursue alternative dispute resolutions. Judicial leadership and integrity are standards that the community should demand. My record attests to my ability to meet those standards.

- J.D. UC Berkeley 1977
- Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates, a public interest firm specializing in sex discrimination cases. 1978 – 1984
- Co-founder, Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom
- Staff Counsel, ACLU. 1984 – 85
- Partner, Hitchens & Brenner. Small Business, non-profit corporations, civil rights and family law. Presently
- Former chair, San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women.
- Member, Board of Directors, Pacific Primary PreSchool.

SUPPORT: Assemblymember John Burton; Roberta Achenberg; Supervisors Nancy Walker, Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, and Terence Hallinan; Judge Lillian Sing, Judge Mary Morgan, and Judge Herbert Donaldson; Commissioners Jim Jefferson, Adrian Bermudez, Jr., James Morales, Paul Melbostad, Richard Grosboll, and Leni Marin; Hon. Libby Denebeim; Hon. Leland Yee; Carol Migden; Will Leong; Catherine Dodd, R.N.; Jeff Mori, and Mauri Schwartz

DONNA HITCHENS

JEROME T. BENSON

My address is 187 Robinhood Drive
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the Superior Court
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are:
- 23 years public service in the courtroom protecting victims, litigants and the community.
- 7 years as Chief of the Criminal Division in the District Attorney’s Office including:
  - 65 felony jury trial prosecutions for murder, rape, child abuse, drugs, white-collar fraud.
  - Stanford Law School graduate 1964.
- Chairman, State Bar of California Subcommittee on Jury Instructions (Criminal).
- Member, Project Safer California.
- Fair and equal application of the law without regard to race, sex, or economic status.
- I am a native San Franciscan and homeowner living with my wife and two daughters near Miraloma Park.
- My judicial office is dedicated to fair rulings, hard work, human sensitivity, and legal equality.

CITYWIDE SUPPORT:
State Senator Quentin Kopp; Justice Harry Low; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Public Defender Jeff Brown; Sheriff Michael Hennessey; Former Chief of Police Alfred Nelder.

SUPERVISORS:
Angela Alioto, Tom Hsieh, Wendy Nelder;

JUDGES:
John Ertola, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Ina Gyemant, Paul Alvarado, Isabella Grant;

LABOR:
Mike Hardeman, Stan Smith, Kevin Ryan;

ATTORNEYS AND COMMUNITY:
William Coblentz; Harold Dobbs; Charles Breyer; Airport Commission President Morris Bernstein; Wayne Friday; Benny Yee; Louis Giraudo; Doris Thomas; Christopher Bowman; Haddie Redd; Elizabeth Aguilar-Tarchi; Ron Huberman;

JEROME T. BENSON
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

JAMES HARRIGAN

My address is 494 Mangels St.
My occupation is Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department.
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I live in Glen Park with my wife, Serena Lee, and our three children.
I received my law degree with academic awards and Law Review distinction in 1975 from Golden Gate University, San Francisco.
I have completed more than 80 jury and court trials in Municipal and Superior Court, representing thousands of citizens and victims of crime in civil and criminal cases in private practice, as a public defender, and as Legal Counsel to the Sheriff.
My expertise includes: employment law, labor relations, criminal, landlord/tenant, and constitutional law. As Counsel to the Sheriff, I resolve the legal affairs of a major law enforcement agency. My work brings me before the civil and criminal justice system each day.
“James Harrigan is by far the best qualified candidate. No other candidate has his broad range of experience: public service and private practice; law enforcement and defense law; extensive courtroom experience and administrative expertise. I strongly urge your vote for James Harrigan.”

Sheriff Michael Hennessey

I have not listed my sponsors. I firmly believe the voter’s decision should be based on one’s qualifications and experience—not on political connections.
I pledge equal application of the law. I ask for your support.
Thank you.

James Harrigan

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Ave.
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My qualifications for office are: What I am in life, I owe to my family and to an excellent education: M.A., counseling, Stanford University; B.A., psychology, University of San Francisco; Juris Doctorate, Hastings College of Law. I began practicing law in 1982 and have been an assistant district attorney since 1983: with experience in criminal prosecution and family law enforcing child support. I have served 10 years on the College Board; my colleagues elected me president three terms because of my firm but fair judgment. My duties include equitably settling conflicts, grievances and contracts. In my years of public service, compassion, integrity and common sense have always guided my decisions; and as a judge that will continue to be the case.
My supporters:
Justice Harry Low
Judges: Isabella Grant, Lenard Louie, David Garcia, Larry Kay, Mary Morgan, Bill Mallen, Herbert Donaldson.
District Attorney: Arlo Smith
Public Defender: Jeff Brown
Senators: Milton Marks, Quentin Kopp
Attorneys: Charlie Clifford, Harriet Ross, William Coblenz, Cedric Chao, Roberta Achtenberg
BART Director: Mike Bernick
Commissioners: Rosario Araya, Tim Wolfred, Chuck Ayala, Naomi Gray.
Supervisors: Thomas Hsieh, Angela Alioto
Walter Johnson; Alex Esclamado; Reverend Amos Brown;
Carole Migden;
UC Regent Yori Wada.

Julie Tang

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I'm honored that MAYOR ART AGNOS and 8 PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION — who know my courtroom experience and qualifications in civil and criminal law — endorse me.

As a lawyer in private practice 18 years, mother of 2 children, married 19 years, I care about the strength and integrity of San Francisco's courts.

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred community trust — not a consolation prize for a restless politician. A lawyer lacking courtroom experience is unqualified to be judge.

In HUNDREDS of court appearances and trials, as chair of the Bar Association Criminal Justice Advisory Council, as a San Francisco Delinquency Prevention Commissioner, and as a Hastings Law School teacher, I have demonstrated a longstanding commitment to professional excellence.

Community and law enforcement leaders who acknowledge my legal service and endorse me:

SPEAKER Willie Brown
SUPERVISORS Nancy Walker, Bill Maher, Harry Britt, Terence Hallinan
JUDGES Dorothy vonBeroldingen, John Dearman, Edward Stern
COURT COMMISSIONER George Colbert
SENATOR Milton Marks
SCHOOL BOARD JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Libby Denebeim, Myra Kopf
POLICE COMMISSIONER John Keker
FIRE COMMISSIONER Sharon Bretz
SHERIFF LIEUTENANT Connie O'Connor
POLICE OFFICERS VICE PRESIDENT Paul Chignell
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY Charles Wood
BUSINESSMAN Mel Swig
PUC COMMISSIONER Rodel Rodis

Ellen Chaitin

WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR

My address is 3615 Buchanan St. #206
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I am the most qualified candidate for this office. I have had judicial experience, serving as Municipal Court judge pro tem for over five years, and have been commended by the Presiding Judge for the quality of my service. I have been a journeyman lawyer for 15 years, with both criminal and civil experience, and have done over 30 jury trials.

With Amnesty International and Church representatives, I have been an International Trial Observer.

I have been a Board Member of the Elizabeth Frye Center and the Irish Forum, and a volunteer on the Bar Association’s free legal services panel.


William J. O'Connor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
LILLIAN K. SING

My address is San Francisco Municipal Court,
400 Van Ness Ave.
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the San Francisco
Municipal Court
My age is 47

My qualifications for office are: I am an incumbent judge, and
have been a judge since 1981. I am the first Asian-American
woman judge in the history of Northern California. In 1988, I
was awarded Trial Judge of the Year by San Francisco Trial
Lawyers Association, one of the highest awards a Bar Associa-
tion can bestow. Last year, I was unanimously elected as Municipal Court’s Presiding Judge. As Presiding Judge, I implemented
the Pro Tem Judge Program, drastically reduced backlog in
civil/criminal cases, brought Trial Court Funding to San Fran-
cisco, spearheaded San Francisco’s first judicial forum “Access
To Justice” attended by 680 people. I served as a faculty member
with the California Center for Judicial Education/Research
which trains all new judges in California and am a faculty judge
with the National Institute for Trial Advocacy which trains trial
lawyers. In 1988 I lectured throughout China on the U.S.
Legal/Judicial System.

Join San Francisco judges led by Presiding Judges Choppelas,
and Marie-Victoire, Mayor Art Agnos, President Harry Britt,
and the entire 11 Board of Supervisors, Assembly Speaker Willie
Brown, Assemblyman John Burton, Senator Milton Marks, For-
mer Police Chiefs Nelder/Cahill, DA Arlo Smith, PD Jeff
Brown, Sheriff Michael Hennessy and retain me as judge.

Lillian K. Sing

JEROME A. DEFILIPPO

My address is 1534 38th Avenue
My occupation is Attorney at Law

My qualifications for office are: A third generation San Fran-
ciscan. I have practiced law in The City since 1973, served as
the Legal Officer of the San Francisco Police Department and a
Deputy City Attorney. I am committed to the impartial applica-
tion of our laws in all judicial proceedings. Having served twenty
years as a Police Officer acquiring the position of Lieutenant, I
am well aware of the frustrations each of us feel by the impact
of crime in our City. If elected, I am committed to the imposition
of the maximum sentence allowed by law for persons convicted
of violent crimes or narcotic sales.

Partial list of sponsors follows:

Ann Alberigi, Catherine Archbold, Alfred Arnaud, Martin
Bastiani, Chief Thomas Cahill, Ann Carrick, Peter Cimarelli,
Hon. Antone Cincotta, Clement Collins, Jean DeFilippo, Cantor
Martin Feldman, Nancy Feldman, H. Welton Flynn, John
Fracchia, Carol Fujikawa, John Gallagher, Judith Gallen, Kath-een Gee, Dr. William Gee, Susanna Lee, Margaret Leong,
Maureen Mahoney, Carmelita Mathais, Phyllis Moylan, James
Pagano, Renzo Panelli, Timothy J. Riordan, Rollin Schrotth, Joan
Swendsen, Spiro Tentos, Paul Vigo, Rita Young

Jerome A. DeFilippo

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
City and County of San Francisco
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against these measures. All arguments, "official" and paid, are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None of them has been checked for accuracy by this office or any other city official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

"Official Arguments"

There is one "official" argument for and one against each measure, and they are published at no cost. "Official" arguments are selected by the Registrar of Voters in accordance with the priorities set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code as summarized below:

For:
1. Person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee supporting the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Against:
1. For a referendum, person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee against the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Rebuttals

Authors of official arguments may each prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. As with official and paid arguments, rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Each rebuttal follows immediately after its corresponding official argument.

 Paid Arguments

All paid arguments are accepted for publication upon (1) deposit of an amount equal to $50 plus $1.50 per word, (2) submission of a petition containing valid signatures of registered voters in lieu of the printing fee at the rate of two signatures for each dollar of the fee, or (3) a combination of a printing fee and signatures which together equal the number of signatures and/or amount of money required to qualify the argument for publication.

For each measure, paid arguments follow after the official arguments and rebuttals. All paid arguments supporting a measure are printed together followed by all paid arguments against that same measure. Paid arguments within each group (e.g. all paid arguments in favor of Proposition Z) are not printed in any particular order. Rather they are arranged so that each page is fully utilized.

There is one ballot measure for which paid arguments were not accepted. The School Facilities Safety Special Tax measure is being proposed under state law; only one argument for, one argument against, and respective rebuttals for this measure are allowed.

Again, arguments and rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked by this office or any other city official or agency.
Public Safety Improvement Bonds

PROPOSITION A

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City buildings were damaged by the October 17, 1989 earthquake and many may not survive another strong earthquake. Many City buildings contain asbestos and many are not accessible to disabled persons. Many City buildings do not meet current health, safety and building codes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $332,400,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This total would be reduced by the amount of grants the City receives from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the State of California for earthquake repair and hazard reduction. No more than $65,000,000 of bonds could be sold in any fiscal year.

This money would be used to pay for safety improvements to some City buildings, including repairing earthquake damage, making the buildings better able to survive earthquakes, removing or reducing the danger of asbestos in these buildings, making them more accessible to the disabled and bringing them up to current codes.

The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds for not more than $332,400,000 to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue bonds to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that the approximate costs would be as follows:

- Bond redemption: $332,400,000
- Bond interest: $244,314,000
- Debt service requirement: $576,714,000

The bond authorization limits the issuance of bonds to no more than $65 million per year. Assuming a single sale on a 20 year basis at current interest rates with no reduction for possible FEMA or State funding, annual debt service on each $65 million increment would amount to $5,638,750, which amount is equivalent to one and forty-eight hundredths cents ($0.0148) in the current tax rate."

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 26, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A the earthquake repair and protection measure.

Proposition A provides $332.4 million to repair earthquake damaged city buildings and to seismically reinforce many of them so that they would not sustain as much damage (or worse) during a future earthquake. This improves public safety while it also protects the investment we are making in repairs.

Your “Yes on A” vote will provide for:
Repairs of earthquake damage, asbestos removal and handicapped accessibility work in over 200 earthquake damaged city buildings.
Seismic strengthening of the Civic Center complex including City Hall, the Veterans Building, Opera House, Department of Public Health and Civic Auditorium.
Seismic strengthening for the Palace of Fine Arts/Exploratorium, nine additional branch libraries, two additional police stations, two jails and the services building at San Francisco General Hospital.

Replacement of the broken and earthquake damaged water and sewer lines at the Zoo.

Proposition A represents a prudent investment which would protect many irreplaceable public buildings from major damage or collapse in a future earthquake.

In order to keep property taxes from rising more than 2-3¢ per $100 of assessed value, Proposition A will not allow more than $65 million in bonds to be sold in any one year. It further requires that any Federal or State earthquake relief money we receive to repair these buildings reduce the amount of bonds sold. This assures that local taxpayers will not be required to pay for repairs that can be made using Federal/State emergency relief assistance.

Vote Yes on Proposition A to protect city buildings and increase public safety in a next major earthquake.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition A
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition A

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

When future earthquakes strike, our libraries need to be safe. Proposition A will provide funds to help earthquake proof our library system.

Vote YES on A.

This bond issue will help to ensure the seismic safety of the Palace of Fine Arts, home of the Exploratorium which is visited by over 600,000 people a year. Prop A represents a prudent investment to improve public safety and protect irreplaceable public buildings. We urge all citizens to vote “Yes” on Proposition A.

Replacement of the earthquake-damaged, underground, 50-year-old water, gas and sewer lines at the San Francisco Zoo is critically needed for the safety and well-being of the animals. It will significantly improve public services to the 1.2 million children and adults who visit annually. The Zoological Society will endeavor to raise funds to renovate and build new above-ground facilities to supplement the $26 million included in the bond issue for the Zoo. Help make the Zoo a true sanctuary.

Michael Mellor, President
Friends of the San Francisco Public Library

F. Van Kasper, Chairman
William K. Coblenz, Vice Chairman
C. Richard Kramlich, Vice Chairman
G. Steven Burrill, Treasurer

David E. Anderson
Zoo Director
Phil Arnold
Assistant General Manager
Recreation & Park
William Brewster Ely IV
Headmaster, Town School
Mary Burns
General Manager
Recreation & Park
Margaret K. Burks
Executive Director, Zoological Society
Jack W. Castor
Animal Keeper Shop Steward,
Local 858
Todd Cecil
Children’s Zoo Keeper
Sherri Chiesa
President, Local 2
Robert Todd Cockburn
Executive Director, Clean Water Program
Rosemary Davidson
Urban School
Dolores A. Donovan
Animal Control & Welfare Commission

Keith G. Eickman
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Roy Eisenhardt
Director, California Academy of Sciences
Becky Evans
Conservation Activist
Norman Gershenz
Director, Ecosystem Survival Plan
Arthur J. Goedewaagen
Board Member, SPEAK
John E. Hafernik Jr.
Professor Biology, SFSU
Roger Hoppes
Director, Children’s Zoo
Michael Howsh
Assistant to the Mayor
David J. Howe
Animal Keeper
Mark Hurley
Animal Control & Welfare Commission
Norma J. Kristovich
Zoo Docent Council
Connie Lurie
Vice Chairman, Zoological Society Board

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Zoological Society Board
Frances May McAteer
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Amy Meyer
People for GGNRA
Andrew Nash
President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Trent W. Orr
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Elizabeth D. Rieger
Zoo Volunteer
Fred A. Rodriguez
School Board Member
Carroll Soo-Hoo
Zoo Benefactor
Stephen V. R. Spaulding
Zoological Society Treasurer
James J. Walsh Jr.
Citizens Advisory Committee on Wastewater Management
Connie O’Connor
President, Recreation & Park Commission

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We must rebuild and repair our infrastructure. The October 17 quake was a warning. More resources going to earthquake preparedness programs today will save lives in the future. Vote YES on A.

Joel Ventresca
Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods Candidate for Supervisor

We urge everyone to vote Yes on Proposition A. The people of San Francisco have a $3.5 billion investment in public buildings. This bond issue will be used to fund repairs to many of our facilities damaged in last October's earthquake, including City Hall, General Hospital, neighborhood libraries, police stations and cultural buildings. It will also provide monies necessary to make life-safety improvements to other city buildings.

Your Yes Vote on Proposition A will protect lives and property in the event of another major earthquake at a very small cost to businesses and homeowners. Because bonds to finance repairs will be sold over 6 - 10 years, replacing older bond issues as they are paid-off, the result will be an almost unchanged tax rate. In fact, the City's independent budget analyst found that the tax bill for an average homeowner will increase by less than $5.00 a month.

Proposition A is a small price to pay to preserve our investment in the city's valuable public facilities. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

We ask that you join with us in Voting YES ON PROP. "A". Your "Yes on A" vote will provide funds to protect the two remaining Police Stations which are not yet earthquake safe or provided for in previous bond issues.

In an emergency we can do our jobs only if our own police facilities are earthquake resistant and if we can get to those places in the City which most need our services. That is why it is important to us that as many City buildings as possible are made earthquake resistant. The less damage and street obstruction that results from a future earthquake, the better we can get to these parts of the City where we are most needed. The safer the public buildings in the City are made, the better we will be able to serve the rest of the City if we ever have to face a major earthquake emergency.

For security vote "Yes on A".

Michael Keys President
San Francisco Police Officers' Association

The damage done by the October 17th earthquake to San Francisco's most important public buildings is considerable. To correct that damage and prepare for the future vitality of our City demands the kind of response represented by Proposition A. This proposition carefully earmarks funds to upgrade buildings such as City Hall, the War Memorial Opera House, and the Department of Public Health offices which are treasures that can never be replaced or reproduced. They not only need to be repaired, but strengthened structurally and improved, to meet today's building codes. The Federal Government will pick up some of the damage, but much more will be needed if these vital components of our City's daily life are to be improved and made ready for the next major quake. Proposition A requests a large sum, but this is a time when we as a City have to agree to such a request. We strongly urge your support of Proposition A.

American Institute of Architects/San Francisco Chapter

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

We ask you to join us in voting “Yes on A”.
The primary purpose of Prop “A” is to protect lives and public buildings from the effects of the next earthquake. As San Franciscans we all share the responsibility of having to do all we can to avoid the loss of life, the suffering and the huge costs which another, perhaps stronger or longer quake would bring. Thus we see Proposition “A” as a necessary, prudent investment in all our future.

We have a special reason to support “Prop A” and to ask you to vote YES ON “A” as well. That special reason is the fact that 20 of the buildings which will be repaired or strengthened against future earthquakes if Prop “A” passes will also be made fully accessible to the disabled. We want our City’s buildings to be repaired, to be made safe and to be made accessible to all San Franciscans.

Vote “Yes on A”.

Kathy Uhl, Executive Director,
Independent Living Resource Center
Michael L. Comini, Executive Director,
Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition “A”.
Many city buildings were damaged in the October 17 earthquake. If these buildings are repaired and strengthened the Fire Department will be much safer when responding to future emergencies.
Please help the Fire Department do its job safely and effectively by voting “Yes” on Proposition “A”.

James D. Jefferson, President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn, Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bretz, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Souls, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Frederick F. Postel, Chief of Department

We urgently request that you vote “Yes on A”.
The War Memorial complex of buildings, dedicated to San Francisco’s veterans, are one of our city’s treasures, irreplaceable architecturally and economically. They are central to our history and we owe it to ourselves to make sure they are made as fully earthquake-resistant as possible.
The October 17 earthquake was a warning which we must heed. Proposition “A” is a prudent and necessary response. It will protect our treasured buildings and, even more importantly, it will protect the lives of those who use them and the memories of those whose lives they commemorate.

Harold F. Jackson, Chairman, American Legion War Memorial Commission
Claude M. Jarman, Jr., Vice-President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Mark Ryser, Executive Director, Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage

Save lives.
Support earthquake safety.
Vote YES on Propositions A and B.
Also vote YES on Proposition N, Limit San Francisco Supervisors to two four-year terms.

Terence Faulkner
Republican State Assembly Candidate
San Francisco Republican Party Chairman (1987-89)

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for your safety. Let us learn from the October 17th earthquake. 15 seconds of moderate shaking resulted in the need for $32 million in repairs to city buildings in the Civic Center alone. We need to be better prepared. We need to reduce known safety hazards.
Please vote YES on Proposition A.

Ken Dowlin, City Librarian
Steve Coulter, Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson, Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin, Library Commissioner
Jean Kail, Library Commissioner
Dennis Normandy, Library Commissioner
Roselyne Swig, Library Commissioner

Help the City of San Francisco and the Zoo rebuild. The animals will benefit, too! Vote YES on A.

Susanne Barthell,
Zoo Advisory Committee member,
Zoo Volunteer
Sophie Papageorge,
Zoologist
Jorge L. Garcia, D.V.M.
Zoo Medicine Specialist
John J. Alcaras,
Retired Zookeeper
Roni Joan Howard,
 Educator

David J. Howe
Animalkeeper
Terrence J. Moyles
Linda Caraitt
Animalkeeper
Anthony Sharp
Animalkeeper
Martin E. Dias
A.K.A. Big Bison, Animalkeeper
Jack W. Castor
Lion House, Animalkeeper
Sandra Keller
Director, Citizens for a Better Zoo

Proposition A will help restore structural safety to the San Francisco County Jails in San Bruno, which were built in 1934 and are badly in need of repair. This is the oldest operating jail in California and sits near the San Andreas fault.
For the safety of City employees and county jail inmates, please vote YES on Proposition A.

Michael Hennessey
San Francisco County Sheriff
Deputy Albert Waters, President
San Francisco Deputy Sheriff’s Association

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION A
This bond issue is iffy.
It should have been presented to the voters as two separate bond issues.
One for $75 million — earthquake repairs to be partly refunded by F.E.M.A. for our present estimated damages. Another for

$257.4 million to take care of our needed capital improvements so neglected by this and past administrations.
Vote NO and get one issue back on the November ballot.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPE-
CIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY
AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON
TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1990, FOR THE PUR-
POSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR
THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE
CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISI-
TION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION
BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNIC-
IPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: PUBLIC
SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990,
$332,400,000, TO PAY FOR THE COST OF
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS TO
BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUD-
ING EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND EARTH-
QUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION,
ASBESTOS ABATEMENT, PROVIDING AC-
CESS FOR THE DISABLED, ALL RELATED
TO PUBLIC SAFETY TO BUILDINGS
OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF
SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING RELATED
ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND RE-
CONSTRUCTION NECESSARY OR
CONVENIENT FOR THE FOREGOING PUR-
POSE; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT NO
MORE THAN $65,000,000 OF SAID
BONDED INDEBTEDNESS SHALL BE IN-
CURRED IN ANY SINGLE FISCAL YEAR
AND PROVIDED, FURTHER, THAT THE
AUTHORIZATION IN THE AMOUNT OF
$332,400,000 WILL BE REDUCED BY THE
AMOUNT OF THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT
RECEIPT OF FEDERAL OR STATE OF CAL-
IFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE RE-
PAIRES AND HAZARDS REDUCTION;
AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND
THE CONTROLLER TO MONITOR THE IS-
SUANCE OF BONDS AND THE ACTUAL
POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEDERAL OR
STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR
EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS
REDUCTION AND TO TAKE ANY APPROP-
RIATE ACTION SO THAT THE BONDS
ISSUED WILL NOT DUPLICATE FEDERAL OR
STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR
EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS
REDUCTION; FINDING THAT THE ESTI-
MATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO OF SAID MUNICIPAL
IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO
GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDIN-
ARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO AND WILL REQUIRE EXPEN-
DITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT
ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL
TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED
COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVE-
MENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF THE ELEC-
TION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING
SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE
FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PRO-
POSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE
OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PRO-
VIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECT-
ION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL
AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING
NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELEC-
TION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL
ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELEC-
TION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE
ELECTION PRECURSNTS, VOTING PLACES
AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE
THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL
ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called
and ordered to be held in the City and County of
San Francisco on Tuesday, the 5th day of June,
1990, for the purpose of submitting to the electors
of said city and county a proposition to incur
bonded indebtedness of the City and County of
San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or
completion by the city and county of the herein-

after described municipal improvements in the
amount and for the purposes stated:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT
BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, to pay for the cost
of public safety improvements to buildings owned
by the City and County of San Francisco, including
earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards
reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access
for the disabled, all related to public safety to
buildings owned by the City and County of San
Francisco, including related acquisition, construction
and reconstruction necessary or convenient for
the foregoing purposes; provided, however,
that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded
indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal
year and provided, further, that the authorization
in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by
the amount of the actual post-audit receipt of
Federal or State of California grants for earthquake
repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal
improvements described in Section 1 hereof were
fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the follow-
ing resolution and in the amount specified:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT
BONDS, 1990, Resolution No. 88-90,
$332,400,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds
more of the Board of Supervisors and ap-
proved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was
recited and found that the sums of money speci-
- fied was too great to be paid out of the ordinary
annual income and revenue of the city and county
in addition to the other annual expenses thereof
or other funds derived from taxes levied for those
purposes and will require expenditures greater
than the amount allowed thereof by the annual
tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the
estimated cost of the municipal improvements
described herein are by the issuance of bonds of
the City and County of San Francisco in the
principal amount not to exceed the principal
amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in said reso-
lution are hereby adopted and determined to be
the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. Authorizing and directing the Chief
Administrative Officer and the Controller to
monitor the issuance of the bonds and the actual
post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California
grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduc-
tion and to take any appropriate action so that the
bonds issued will not duplicate FEMA or State of
California grants for earthquake repairs and
hazards reduction.

Section 4. The special election hereby called
and ordered to be held shall be held and con-
ducted and the votes thereat received and can-
vassed, and the returns thereof made and the
results thereof ascertained, determined and de-
clared as herein provided and in all particulars
not herein recited said election shall be held
according to the laws of the State of California
and the Charter of the City and County of San
Francisco providing for and governing elections
in the City and County of San Francisco, and the
polls for such election shall be and remain open
during the time required by said laws.

Section 5. The said special election hereby
called shall be and hereby is consolidated with
the General Election of the City and County of
San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 5, 1990,
and the voting precincts, polling places and offi-
cers of election for said General Election and
the same are hereby adopted, established, design-
ated and named, respectively, as the voting
precincts, polling places and officers of election
for such special election hereby called, and as
specifically set forth, in the official publication,
by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling
places and election officers for the said General
Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election
shall be the ballots to be used at said General
Election and reference is hereby made to the
notice of election setting forth the voting pre-
cincts, polling places and officers of election by
the Registrar of Voters for the General Election
to be published in the San Francisco Examiner
on or no later than May 31, 1990.

Section 6. On the ballots to be used at such
special election and on the punch card ballots
used at said special election, in addition to any
other matter required by law to be printed
thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be
separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as
a separate proposition:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVE-
MENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a
bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000
for acquisition, construction or recon-
struction of buildings owned by the City
and County of San Francisco, including
earthquake repairs and earthquake haz-
ards reduction, asbestos abatement,
providing access for the disabled; provided,

(Continued on next page)
however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.”

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word “YES” on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word “NO” on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special election, each voter to vote for any said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word “YES” to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word “NO” to the right of said proposition.

Section 7. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as “serials,” and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 12 per centum per annum, payable semiannually, provided, that interest for the first year after the date of any of said bonds may be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified voters voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 8. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 9. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 10. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.
PROPOSITION B

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particular relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269
NO 272

Analysis
by City Attorney

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City’s public schools. Some School District buildings were damaged by the earthquake. Some District buildings do not meet present earthquake and fire standards.

The State Mello-Roos law allows the Board of Education to submit to the voters a measure authorizing a special property tax to pay for repairs and other improvements to school buildings.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize a special property tax to pay for costs of repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety. Some of the money would also be used for deferred capital maintenance. The repairs and maintenance would be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis. Since no money would be borrowed, there would be no interest costs to pay.

The tax would last for twenty years. The tax on single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels could be no more than $46 for each of the first six years and no more than $32.20 for each of the last 14 years. The tax on other types of parcels could be no more than $23 for each dwelling unit for each of the first six years and $16.10 for each dwelling unit for each of the last 14 years. Dwelling units occupied by persons 65 years of age or older would be eligible for an exemption from this tax. The measure would also set an annual appropriations limit of $12 million.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to authorize this property tax to pay for repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety and you want to authorize this annual appropriations limit.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to authorize this tax.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed special tax levy be approved, in my opinion, it would increase revenues for the San Francisco Unified School District, net of estimated senior citizen exemptions, by approximately $8 million per year for the first 6 years and $5.6 million per year for the next 14 years, based on the current assessment roll of the City and County. The approximately $127.2 million generated over a 20 year period by this special tax levy would be restricted for use by the District for the repair, restoration, replacement, seismic upgrading and capital maintenance of School District facilities."

How “B” Got on the Ballot

On February 13, the Board of Education voted 5-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Board members voted as follows:


NO: Leland Yee.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When the earthquake struck last fall, our school buildings suffered. Sustaining major damage and at special risk in the future are our buildings that were not earthquake proofed in the 1970's. In that category are our child care centers serving our youngest students. Also, in the fall of 1988 the City Fire Marshall inspected our schools and reported that the majority of our school buildings do not meet fire safety standards. Our 63,000 students and the community groups that meet at our schools in the evenings and on weekends must have buildings that can withstand earthquakes, and meet fire safety standards.

Proposition B will authorize a tax to provide for: repairing earthquake damage at 131 sites including the reconstruction of John O'Connell High School, seismic improvement of nine Children's Centers, correction of fire code and safety violations at 97 sites and seismic improvement of John Swett, Jean Parker and Bessie Carmichael Elementary Schools and Parkside Curriculum Center. In addition, there will be funds for deferred capital maintenance.

Two years ago the citizens of this City voted to support major repairs for our school buildings. Now we must protect that investment by repairing the present earthquake damage and seeing that all our schools can withstand future earthquakes, be as safe as possible in case of fire and be well maintained into the next century.

Civic organizations who have joined in supporting Proposition B include: San Francisco League of Women Voters, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; SF/PTA, Parents' Lobby, San Francisco Labor Council, United Educators of San Francisco, and Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth.

Submitted by Superintendent Ramon C. Cortines, San Francisco Unified School District, and Fred Rodriguez, President, Board of Education.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition B
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California
February 13, 1990

(For Board Meeting February 13, 1990)


REQUESTED ACTION:
WHEREAS, the Board of Education (the "Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "District") did, on January 9, 1990, adopt its Resolution of Intention (the "Resolution") to form Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "Community Facilities District"), and levy a special tax therein, pursuant to Chapter 2.5 of Part I of Division 2 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 53311) of the California Government Code, commonly known as the "Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982," as amended, (the "Act");

WHEREAS, a copy of the Resolution (which sets forth a description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, the name of the Community Facilities District and the types of facilities proposed to be financed by the District (the "Facilities")), providing that, except where funds are otherwise available, a special tax sufficient to pay for all Facilities and the financing thereof (to be secured by a recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District) is proposed to be levied within the proposed Community Facilities District specifying the rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the proposed Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, and setting a hearing thereon, is on file with the Clerk of this Board and is incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, notice of said hearing was duly published as required by law, as evidenced by the affidavit of publication on file with the Clerk of this Board; and

WHEREAS, on February 13, 1990 this Board held the noticed public hearing as required by law relative to the proposed formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, prior to the noticed public hearing a report (the "Report") containing a description of the Facilities and an estimate of the cost of providing the Facilities, including the estimated fair and reasonable cost thereof, was filed with this Board as a part of the record of said hearing;

WHEREAS, at the public hearing all persons desiring to be heard on all matters pertaining to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution, including all interested persons or taxpayers for or against the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent of the Community Facilities District, or the furnishing of specific types of public facilities, were heard and considered, and a full and fair hearing was held thereon; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing evidence was presented to this Board on the matters before it, and this Board at the conclusion of the hearing was fully advised as to all matters relating to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, written protests against the establishment of the District, the furnishing of specified type or types of facilities within the Community Facilities District as listed in the Report, or the levying of the special tax have not been filed with the Clerk of this Board by fifty percent (50%) or more of the registered voters, or six registered voters, whichever is more, residing within the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District, or the owners of one-half (1/2) or more of the area of land in the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District and not exempt from this special tax;

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District, in regular session assembled on February 13, 1990, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE, DETERMINE AND ORDER as follows:

Section 1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.

Section 2. Written protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, or the extent hereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are insufficient in number and in amount under the Act, and this Board hereby further orders and determines that all protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are hereby overruled.

Section 3. As proposed in the Resolution, a community facilities district is hereby established pursuant to the Act, designated "Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District."

Section 4. The map and legal description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, filed with the Clerk of this Board on January 24, 1990, are hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the boundaries of the Community Facilities District.

Section 5. The Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District, set forth in Exhibit "B" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, shall be the Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District.

Section 6. As provided in Exhibit "B", it is the intention of this Board, subject to the approval of the qualified electors of the Community Facilities District, to levy a special tax sufficient to acquire, construct and improve the Facilities including administrative expenses to be incurred by the District and the Community Facilities District in connection therewith; said tax to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District.

The rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax, in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, is described in Exhibit "A" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.

Section 7. The description of the proposed voting procedure, as set forth in the Resolution, is hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the voting procedure to be used in these proceedings.

Section 8. The special tax has not been precluded by majority protest pursuant to Section 53324 of the Act.

Section 9. The Facilities to be funded from the special tax are identified in Exhibit "B" hereto.

Section 10. In accordance with Section 53340.1 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, this Board shall designate the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District as the office, department or bureau which will be responsible for annually preparing the current roll of special tax levy obligations by assessor's parcel number on nonexempt property within the District and which will be responsible for estimating future special tax levies pursuant to Section 53340.1 of the Act. The name, address, and telephone number of the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District, and the person responsible for administering the District, is as follows:

Director of Fiscal Services
Fiscal Services Department
San Francisco Unified School District
135 Van Ness Avenue, Room 215
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 241-6480

Section 11. In accordance with Section 53328.3 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the

(Continued on next page)
consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, the Clerk of this Board shall record the notice of special tax lien provided for in Section 3114.5 of the Streets and Highways Code. Upon recordation of the notice of special tax lien pursuant to Section 3114.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, a continuing lien to secure each levy of the special tax shall attach to all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District, and this lien shall continue in force and effect until the special tax obligation is permanently satisfied and the lien cancelled in accordance with law or until collection of the tax by this Board ceases.

Section 12. A boundary map of the Community Facilities District has been recorded pursuant to Sections 3111 and 3113 of the Streets and Highways Code at Book 59, Page 182-183 in the Book of Maps of Assessment and Community Facilities Districts in the Office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 13. All prior proceedings taken with respect to the establishment of the District were valid and in conformity with the requirements of the Act.

Section 14. In accordance with Section 53325.7 of the Act, the annual appropriations limit of the District, as defined by subdivision (h) of Section 8 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution, is hereby preliminarily established in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year, and said annual appropriations limit shall be submitted to the voters of the District as hereafter provided. The proposition establishing said appropriations limit shall become effective if approved by the qualified electors voting thereon and shall be adjusted in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 53325.7 of the Act.

Section 15. The Board hereby calls an election and submits the question of levying the special tax, and the establishment of the annual appropriations limit for the District in connection therewith, to the qualified electors within the District, at an election to be held on Tuesday, June 5, 1990, all in accordance with and subject to the Act, the terms of which shall be applicable to such election.

Section 16. The Board hereby further directs that the election at which the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith is submitted to the qualified electors within the District shall be consolidated and shall be combined in one ballot proposition, all as provided by the Act; and the Board further directs that notice of the consolidated election on the combined proposition of authorizing the levy of the special tax and of establishing an appropriations limit be published as required by law.

Section 17. If two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax are cast in favor of levying the tax, as determined by this Board after the canvass of the returns of such consolidated election, the Board may levy the special tax within the territory of the District in the amount and for the purposes as specified in this resolution. The special tax may be levied only at the rate and may be apportioned only in the manner specified in this resolution, subject to the Act, except that the special tax may be levied at a lower rate.

Section 18. The Clerk of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution, a certified map of the boundaries of the Community Facilities District, a sufficient description to allow the election official to determine the boundaries of the District, and the assessor’s parcel numbers for the land within the District to the Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco within three business days after the adoption of this resolution.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 13th day of February, 1990.
President of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District
ATTTEST:
Clay of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District
Recommended by:
Ramon C. Cortines
Superintendent of Schools

EXHIBIT A
RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT BASIS OF SPECIAL TAX LEVY
The annual special tax shall be levied on each separate parcel within Community Facilities District No. 90-1, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco County, California ("CFL 90-1") as shown on the San Francisco County Assessor’s records, subject to the maximum rates specified below, as established by the Board of Education ("Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District ("District").

DETERMINATION OF PARCELS SUBJECT TO SPECIAL TAX
The records of the County Assessor of San Francisco County shall be used to determine the parcels subject to the special tax. The basis for determining the parcels will be the Secured Property Tax Roll. The land use code contained in the Secured Property Tax Roll, in combination with records maintained by the Assessor of the number of dwelling units on each residential parcel in CFD 90-1, will be the basis for assigning the appropriate tax rate to each parcel. If the District determines that the records maintained by the Assessor are incorrect with respect to one or more parcels, the District will assign the appropriate land use code and dwelling unit count based on its review of the property. All special taxes shall be based on parcels established in the County Assessor’s records as of March 1 of each year and all land use categories shall be based on building permits and other relevant development approvals granted by the County and City of San Francisco or any successor jurisdiction as of June 1 of each year.

Using the records of the County Assessor, the District shall prepare a list of the parcels subject to the tax. The District shall establish the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.

1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which, supported publicly-owned and non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that leasehold/possession interests shall be taxed.

2. From the parcels remaining, identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor’s data, and the District’s review of building permits issued, and other changes in development status:
   a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
   b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
   c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
   d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on that parcel will be classified based on the uses that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX
The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $32.20 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CFD 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CFD 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the deter-
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B (Continued)

mination of the parcels subject to the tax and their special tax assignments.

SENIOR CITIZEN EXEMPTION

A property owner may apply for a Senior Citizen Exemption which would provide an exemption from the special tax for the applicable tax year on dwelling units occupied by senior citizens, if the following conditions are met:

1. The applicant must show evidence that the dwelling unit is owned or rented by a citizen who is at least 65 years of age.

2. The applicant must show evidence of ownership of the property subject to the Exemption.

3. The Senior Citizen Exemption must be applied for annually.

4. If the applicant is a landlord, then he or she must certify that the entire tax exemption will be reflected only in the rent for the exempted dwelling unit(s).

EXHIBIT B

COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 — Description of Facilities to be financed:

(i) Repair, restoration, and/or replacement of District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), to the extent that (A) such repair, restoration, or replacement is outside the scope of work approved by federal and state agencies for assistance from such agencies; (B) costs incurred in such repair, restoration, or replacement are ineligible for federal or state assistance; or (C) insufficient federal or state funds are appropriated, obligated, or approved to pay for repair, restoration, or replacement which would otherwise be eligible for federal or state assistance. Pending receipt by the District of disaster assistance from federal and/or state agencies, the Community Facilities District may advance funds to the District to pay costs eligible for federal or state disaster assistance; provided that upon receipt by the District of federal or state disaster assistance relating to such costs, the District shall promptly reimburse the Community Facilities District for any such advances.

(ii) Seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other District facilities.

(iii) Correction of fire safety violations of District facilities.

(iv) Deferred capital maintenance of District facilities. Incidental expenses, including the cost of planning and designing the Facilities and the cost of environmental evaluations thereof; all costs associated with the creation of the proposed Community Facilities District, the determination of the amount of and collection of taxes, the payment of taxes, and costs otherwise incurred in order to carry out the authorized purposes of the Community Facilities District; and any other expenses incidental to the construction, completion, and inspection of the Facilities and permitted under the Act.
PROPOSITION C

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277  NO 278

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City obtains computers, telephone systems and other equipment by paying for it all at once or by leasing it until it is paid for, which is called "lease financing." The City may not enter into long-term leases for financing equipment unless (1) the voters approve it, or (2) the lease requires the Board of Supervisors to approve the payments each year. When the Board of Supervisors must approve the lease payments each year, interest rates are higher than when the lease payments are not subject to annual approval. Also, interest rates charged by for-profit companies are generally higher than interest rates charged by non-profit corporations.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment. Under Proposition C, the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval, could authorize the lease financing of equipment without the lease payments being subject to annual approval. A non-profit corporation would be created to buy the equipment and would issue tax-exempt debt to pay for it. The City would lease the equipment from the non-profit until it was paid for. The total principal of the debt issued by the non-profit corporation could not be more than $20 million in the first year. This limit on the outstanding principal would increase five percent each year. The Board could approve this type of lease financing only if the Controller certified that the interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application, costs could be increased or decreased in presently indeterminate but probably not substantial amounts."

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would allow the City to lease finance needed equipment at the lowest possible interest rates. The City would establish a non-profit corporation, which would buy equipment approved by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors and lease it to City departments.

The charter currently requires the voters to approve lease financing if done through non-profit corporations. Financing through a non-profit is the less expensive method because interest rates are tax-exempt. The City has had to occasionally use the more expensive method because it is not always possible to delay purchasing critical equipment until an election is held.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Saves the City money by allowing current and future leases for equipment to be financed at lower interest rates (currently 6% to 7%) than must now be used with private corporations (ranging 9% to 16%).

By simply refinancing existing leases, the City could save over $500,000.

Additional money could be saved on any future leases.

Gives the City the option to pay cash for equipment or to finance it expeditiously at a low cost to the City.

Allows quicker replacement of inefficient and outdated equipment, which will reduce maintenance costs, decrease downtime, and increase productivity for equipment which has outlived its economic useful life.

Provides restrictions to insure prudent use of this financing mechanism.

Requires the Controller to certify that the lease is the least costly financing method.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Officer.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

7.309 Voter Approval of Lease Financing
(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purposes of this section, “lease financing” occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.

Remember to VOTE on Election Day, Tuesday June 5, 1990. Your polling place is open from 7:00 in the morning to 8:00 in the evening.
Recycling is not only easier than you might think, it's a simple way you can do your part for environmental conservation—and feel good about it, too.

All you need is an ordinary brown paper bag.

Each time you set up your kitchen garbage, place an extra brown bag or two out for recycling. Then every day just drop your newspaper into a recycling bag—a week's worth of papers fits perfectly (and your newspapers will stop piling up on the floor!).

When you're finished with an aluminum soda or beer can simply pop it in a separate bag. The same goes for bottles: just put them in a bag, labels and all. Then when you're on the way to the supermarket or heading out for the day, drop off the bags at a Recycling Center near you. Or, you can tie your newspaper with string and the garbage company will collect it free of charge.

That's it. When you think about it, isn't recycling almost as easy as not recycling?

And it really is the right thing to do.

For a free Recycling Guide and a list of Recycling Centers near you, call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL
554-6193
PROPOSITION D

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no special City fund to pay for neighborhood beautification projects or graffiti clean-up. Money can be spent for this purpose only when the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors approve it in the City's budget.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is an ordinance that would create a "Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund" ("the Fund") to pay for cleaning up graffiti on public buildings and beautifying the neighborhood.

The Chief Administrative Officer would manage the Fund. Businesses could pay up to one percent of their payroll or business taxes into the Fund. Grants or money donated for graffiti clean-up would be deposited in the Fund. The goal of the ordinance is to produce for the Fund $1,000,000 each year, adjusted annually for inflation. The Controller would change the percentage of taxes businesses could pay into the Fund to produce $1,000,000 in the fund each fiscal year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this fund.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, General Fund revenues could decrease by as much as $1.4 million in fiscal 1990 and as much as $1 million per year, adjusted for inflation, thereafter."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker.

Arguments for and Against this Measure and its Full Text Immediately Follow This Page.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D asks the voters to make the revitalization of our neighborhoods and the wiping out of graffiti a top city priority without raising taxes.

Proposition D will permit those employers currently eligible in San Francisco to earmark up to 1% of their payroll or gross receipts tax bill to establish The Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

The fund will be used to award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city. The Budget Analyst has estimated that approximately one million dollars would be available every year.

Proposition D creates a unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers to keep our city attractive. It will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting and graffiti clean-up.

Also, Proposition D will fund public information and education campaigns to combat litter, and instill in our youth the old-fashioned virtue of respect for public and private property.

The fund created by Proposition D will be administered by the Chief Administrative Officer with public input from environmental organizations and neighborhood committees.

Proposition D was authored by Supervisor Jim Gonzales and has been submitted to the voters with the support of the Sierra Club, San Francisco Beautiful, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

According to their ballot argument, the Board of Supervisors wants to create a “unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers” to reduce graffiti. What’s stopping them from doing that now?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

The supervisors also say they want to provide “seed money” for planting trees and improving street lighting. Well, why haven’t they placed items in the city budget to do so?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

In their rebuttal argument, the supervisors claim that “many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle.” Whose fault is that, if not their own?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

Finally, the supervisors have the temerity to state: “With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark” funds for graffiti. What would be “fair” is if San Francisco businesses paid lower taxes. But no one should be “earmarking” tax dollars except elected representatives of the people!

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

There’s no question that graffiti is a serious problem demanding serious solutions. But what good is it to divert $1,000,000 a year from other city programs? That’s robbing Peter to pay Paul! It’s bad government!

Why do we need Proposition D? We don’t.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

I know something about graffiti.
I wrote the city ordinances prohibiting the sale of spray paint and large, felt-tip pens to minors. I also authored the state law to allow police officers greater latitude in arresting juveniles who deface public transit vehicles. This year, I’m pursuing a bill to revoke for one year the driver’s license of any person convicted of graffiti vandalism.

Proposition D is not about graffiti or “neighborhood beautification”. It’s about diverting millions from the city’s General Fund. It’s about depriving existing city programs of critically needed revenue. Proposition D is a financial shell game.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Proposition D would allow any city business to designate up to 1% of its payroll tax check for deposit in a special fund. According to the supervisors’ Budget Analyst, Proposition D could divert up to $1,440,260 from the General Fund in the program’s first year. Thereafter, annual diversions would approximate $1,000,000, plus inflation.

That’s over $1,000,000 per year which cannot be spent on police services, fire protection, libraries, and public health.

As you can plainly see from my legislative record, I’m no soft touch when it comes to graffiti prevention and clean-up. But Proposition D is the wrong approach. “Special funds” and “segregated accounts” have no place in our city budget.

Graffiti programs deserve adequate city funding, and the Board of Supervisors and Mayor should move promptly to appropriate such funds in the next regular budgetary cycle.

The voters, meanwhile, should move promptly to reject Proposition D on June 5th!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We need a city plan that invests in the quality of our neighborhoods... Now. It’s obvious laws banning the sale of spray paint and felt pens have done nothing to stop the sprawl of graffiti or create a climate of cooperation between city officials and neighborhood groups to find real solutions.

Proposition D is about beautifying our neighborhoods consistently. Proposition D is about wiping out graffiti permanently. With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark a mere one-hundredth to be poured back into the neighborhoods.

Out of a greater than two billion dollar annual budget, the city can afford a guaranteed million dollars to help keep our city beautiful, clean, and graffiti-free. Year in and year out, many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle. Proposition D will provide a solid foundation for the revitalization of our neighborhoods, which no one can tamper with and that requires no new taxes.

Over the last few years, individual Supervisors have spent many weekends planting trees and removing graffiti with neighborhood groups. Working with groups such as SF ALIVE, San Francisco Conservation Corps, 24th Street Revitalization Committee and the West Portal Merchants Association to make our neighborhoods shine has taught us one thing... neighborhood environmentalists and city departments working together as partners will be a winning combination for San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

When City Hall and neighborhood organizations work together, problems can be solved. Vote YES on D.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

There is a reason that the San Francisco Beautiful, the Sierra Club and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, along with dozens of neighborhood groups support placing PROPOSITION D on the ballot.

San Franciscans are united in wanting to preserve and enhance our city’s attractiveness and keep San Francisco one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

Our Supervisors put PROPOSITION D on the ballot for your approval because they realize that a more attractive city starts with people like you and me and our neighbors who truly care about San Francisco.

YES ON PROPOSITION D creates a working partnership between our neighborhoods and city government;
YES ON PROPOSITION D means a more beautiful city and enhancement of your neighborhood and mine;
YES ON PROPOSITION D accomplishes this with NO NEW TAXES, allowing large employers to earmark up to 1% of their current payroll tax for beautification and graffiti cleanup;
YES ON PROPOSITION D pays for neighborhood-generated projects, giving residents a say in how these reserved funds are spent;
YES ON PROPOSITION D is the first step to guaranteeing more beautiful and attractive neighborhoods.
Join your neighbors, business owners and environmentalists by voting YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Al Pross, Chair
COMMITTEE FOR BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBORHOODS

The quality of life in our neighborhoods will truly become a top city priority with the passage of Proposition D.
- Proposition D will provide over a million dollars a year from the business community to stop neighborhood decay (through a voluntary checkoff on their payroll or gross receipts tax bill).
- Proposition D will award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city.
- Proposition D will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting, and graffiti clean-up.
- Proposition D will fund an educational campaign to teach our youngsters a new respect for public and private property.
Let's protect our city's special livability. Let's foster civic pride. Let's invest in the long term health of San Francisco's residential neighborhoods. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Supervisor Jim Gonzales

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

Graffiti is a blight on the beauty of San Francisco. We strongly encourage the continued generosity of grants and donations to eradicate this problem. However, during the current deficit-ridden period, it is irresponsible for the City to direct at least $1,000,000 a year from the General Fund for this purpose.

The San Francisco Republican Party urges you to vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley
William E. Grayson

Anna M. Guth
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”
Why add more government to your taxes.
$1 million per year to be funded from Payroll taxes which has a sunset clause to expire in 1990.
Then who pays the tab? You do.
If the police would assert their powers and nab the violators, instead of the City offering to pay to clean up their “works of art” this ordinance would not be necessary.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Marguerite Warren

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

[Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund]

AN ORDINANCE, ADDING SECTIONS 10.98 AND 10.98-1 TO THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO ESTABLISH A NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND AND SPECIFYING THE PURPOSES THEREOF AND AMENDING PART III, SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, BY ADDING ARTICLE 12B-1 THERETO, TO PROVIDE THAT ANY BUSINESS WHICH OWES A PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX OR BUSINESS TAX MAY ELECT TO DESIGNATE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE TAX FOR DEPOSIT IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND.

NOTE: All sections are new.

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Sections 10.98 and 10.98-1 thereto, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.98. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: FINDINGS AND INTENT.

(a) Findings.
The proliferation of graffiti on public buildings and other public property has created a blight which offends both citizens of and visitors to San Francisco. The removal of such graffiti will enhance the beauty of the city in which we live and will encourage others to visit and to relocate here. Removal will thus both reflect and renew our civic pride and contribute to our economic viability. Providing a source of funds for the promotion of neighborhood beautification projects will support the efforts of local residents and businesses to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and the local economy, and assist in reducing the amount of graffiti in San Francisco.

(b) Statement of Intent.
The Board of Supervisors wishes to address the above concerns by establishing a neighborhood beautification and graffiti clean-up fund which will promote neighborhood beautification projects, including projects designed to improve the environmental quality of neighborhoods, and finance the clean-up of graffiti on public property.

SEC. 10.98-1. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: ESTABLISHMENT; ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS; DUTIES.

(a) Establishment of Fund. There is hereby established a special fund for the purpose of receiving all donations of money which may be collected by the City and County of San Francisco for the purposes enumerated in Section 10.98(b). Monies deposited in the fund shall only be expended for the purposes enumerated herein, provided that such expenditures shall include reimbursement to City and County departments for expenses incurred in the administration of the fund. The special fund shall be known and designated as the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

(b) Acceptance of Gifts. All donations of money which may be offered to the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund are hereby accepted for such purposes. Any grants, gifts and bequests from private sources for this purpose shall be deposited into said special fund.

(c) Duties of the Chief Administrative Officer.
1. The Chief Administrative Officer, or his or her designee, shall be responsible for the administration of the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund, and shall have all such authority as may be reasonably necessary to carry out those responsibilities.
2. The Chief Administrative Officer shall promulgate such rules and regulations as he or she may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Section and Section 10.98. Before issuing or amending any rules and regulations, the Chief Administrative Officer shall provide a thirty (30) day public comment period by providing published notice in an official newspaper of general circulation in the City of the intent to issue or amend the rules and regulations. The rules and regulations shall be approved by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. Such rules and regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the qualifications of applicants and factors to be considered in the award of grants to fund programs to help remove graffiti and promote neighborhood beautification projects, including preference for the following projects: youth programs and innovation, projects that are neighborhood generated, and projects designed to benefit areas of San Francisco that are economically disadvantaged.
3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall submit a semiannual report to the Board of Supervisors setting forth an accounting of the amounts disbursed and the uses for which said funds were made.

(d) Budgetary and Fiscal Provisions of the Charter. The monies in this fund are subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter and may be expended only when authorized by appropriation ordinance of the Board of Supervisors.

(e) Interest. Interest earned from the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund shall become part of the principal thereof, and shall not be expended for any purpose other than that for which said fund is established.

(f) Accumulation of Monies in Fund. The balance remaining in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Charter Section 6.306 and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said fund for the purposes recited herein.

Section 2. Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code is hereby amended by adding Article 12B-1 thereto, to read as follows:

ART. 12B-1
NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND TAX

OPTION.
SEC. 1030. Initial Option. Commencing in tax year 1990, any business, as defined in Section 1002.1 of this Code, that is subject to the Payroll Expense Tax or the Business Tax may elect to designate up to one per cent (1%) of its tax liability for deposit in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

SEC. 1031. Amount of Fund Annually. It is the intent of the voters of the City and County of San Francisco that one million dollars ($1,000,000.00), derived from tax proceeds designated by the taxpayers pursuant to Section 1031, shall be deposited annually into the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund. The Controller shall annually adjust this figure for inflation to reflect changes in the most recently available U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose Metropolitan Area, or its successor index.

SEC. 1032. Subsequent Option. For each tax year after 1990, the Controller shall determine the amount of fund revenues actually generated in the prior year, including the interest thereon and the balance, if any, remaining at the close of the tax year. On the basis of the prior year's experience of taxpayer contributions and total revenues generated by the payroll expense and business taxes, the Controller shall calculate a percentage ceiling of total tax liability which taxpayers may designate for deposit in the fund the following tax year. The Controller shall set the percentage ceiling so that the revenues produced thereby are most likely to generate a total of one million dollars (adjusted for inflation) in the fund for the forthcoming tax year. The Controller shall transmit his or her calculation to the Board of Supervisors, which shall adopt a new tax designation ceiling, if necessary, in advance of the tax year to enable the Tax Collector to perform his or her collection duties.

SEC. 1033. Severability. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective. In addition, the voters declare their intention that should any portion of this initiative ordinance or all of it be declared invalid in whole or in part, such invalidity shall have no effect upon the continued validity of the Payroll Expense Tax and Business Tax.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PROPOSITION F
Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 254
NO 285

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Fire Commission has the authority to decide the number and staffing of fire companies and the number and location of fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors may change the number of firefighters. The Fire Commission may close or move fire stations or reduce the number of fire companies if it decides they are no longer needed. A fire company typically consists of a fire engine or other emergency vehicle and the firefighters needed to operate it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would specify a minimum number of fire stations and fire companies and minimum levels of staffing for those fire companies. Proposition F would increase the number of firefighters assigned to some types of fire companies. This means that the number of firefighters on duty at all times would increase from 297 to 322. Where necessary, Proposition F’s minimum level of staffing would be met by firefighters working overtime. Overtime pay for firefighters is one and one-half times their normal salary.

Proposition F would limit the power of the Fire Commission, Mayor and Board of Supervisors to set the number of fire stations and staffing levels.

Before closing any fire station or reducing the number of fire companies or units required by Proposition F, the measure would require (1) a recommendation by the Fire Chief; (2) approval by the Fire Commission, after public hearings; (3) approval by the Board of Supervisors; and (4) approval by the voters.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current salary rates and staffing levels of the Fire Department, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $4.9 million per year."

How “F” Got on the Ballot
On March 2, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition F to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,485* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 21 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 56,364 of the signatures submitted were valid, 15,879 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WHAT IS PROP F?

PROPOSITION F IS A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WILL ESTABLISH A MINIMUM LEVEL OF FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS FOR SAN FRANCISCO. IT GIVES THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE FIRE CHIEF THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MANAGE THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITIZENS.

SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT BECAUSE IT WILL:

(1) GUARANTEE THAT THE PRESENT 41 FIRE STATIONS STAY OPEN

(2) GUARANTEE FULLY-STAFFED FIRE TRUCKS AT ALL TIMES

(3) GUARANTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BEFORE ANY FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED

(4) GUARANTEE THAT YOUR FIREBOAT WILL BE STAFFED WITH A FIREFIGHTING CREW OF TWO

THE 7.1 QUAKE OF OCTOBER 17 WARNED US AGAIN — WE MUST BE PREPARED!

ITEM A — MAYOR AGNOS CUT THE FIRE DEPART-

MENT ON-DUTY STAFFING BY 19 PERSONS A DAY IN 1989.

PROP F RESTORES THOSE CUTS.


ITEM C — PROP F DOES NOT REQUIRE "GUARANTEED OVERTIME" AND, IN FACT, BY JULY 1992 NO OVERTIME WILL BE NEEDED FOR THE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS OF PROP F.

(Overtime is now caused by large numbers of vacant positions. New hiring will eliminate all vacancies and overtime by July 1992. Prop F will safeguard this full-staffing.)

PROP F IS A COMMON SENSE MEASURE TO GIVE ADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION TO ALL CITIZENS.

VOTE YES ON F!

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F;

COMMITTEE FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS

JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN

JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

It is clear that Proposition F is not a Fire Safety Issue. It is clearly an issue to guarantee overtime.

1. This Mayor and Board of Supervisors have never closed a single fire station and have no intention to close firehouses.

2. Most major cities in America considers five firefighters per truck to be fully-staffed. More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire.

3. Proposition F will not restore cuts in firefighters. We are mandated by law to provide 90 new firefighters this year. Proposition F only guarantees overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day, $3.5 million per year.

Our firefighters do a tough job! But we compensate them well! We need new equipment — not more overtime. Following the earthquake, a fire truck had to be taken from the fire museum to fight fires. Let's not waste money which could be used for new firefighting equipment.

San Francisco voters rejected a similar proposal in 1987 and it should be rejected again in 1990.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will waste millions of your tax dollars. Just look at the facts.

Fact: Proposition F does not hire new firefighters. The Federal Consent Decree already sets hiring standards — 90 new firefighters will be hired this year without Prop. F.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that Assistant Chiefs and Battalion Chiefs will continue to have chauffeurs.

Fact: Proposition F is not needed to save fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors have no intention of closing any fire stations.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that 18 current firefighters will get daily time-and-a-half overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day . . . or more than $3.5 million extra per year.

Fact: Proposition F is not a fire safety issue. Virtually every major American city deploys five or fewer firefighters on fire trucks. A sixth firefighter is featherbedding, not firefighting.

More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire. That’s enough people to raise ladders, ventilate rooftops and carry out lifesaving tasks.

FACT: Our firefighters do a tough job. But they are well-compensated already and do not need additional guaranteed overtime . . . especially when there are so many other pressing needs in San Francisco.

FACT: Firefighters in San Francisco are currently paid $300 more per month than the average salaries of firefighters in the four largest California cities. But the other firefighters work 15 percent more hours than San Francisco.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters already receive 23 percent more vacation, sick and holiday leave than other city workers. A recent study by the Controller shows that increased overtime results in increased sick leave and disability.

Study the facts and you’ll agree. Proposition F is nothing more than $7 million per year in unnecessary guaranteed overtime.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

FACT: PROP F does:
• Guarantee that the 90 new firefighters cannot later be eliminated by politicians.
• Require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people before cutbacks can be made to the minimum staffing.
FACT: The Mayor DID cut back Fire Department staffing in August 1989 from 315 to 296.
FACT: Assistant and Battalion Chiefs DO NOT have "chauffeurs." They DO have an operations and communications assistant.

FACT: Prop F IS needed to guarantee public review and input before any fire station can be closed.
FACT: SIX fire stations have been closed by the Mayor’s office since 1972 without any public review.

FACT: Prop F DOES guarantee that the 19 on-duty firefighters cut by the Mayor in 1989 will be restored. When sufficient new firefighters are hired, NO OVERTIME will be required.

FACT: PROP F IS A FIRE SAFETY ISSUE!
FACT: San Francisco firefighters ARE REQUIRED to work overtime because previous policies of politicians allowed large numbers of vacant positions to occur.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters DO NOT get a paid health plan for dependents, nor do they get longevity pay or other benefits enjoyed by firefighters in the four largest California cities.

FACT: ALL city employees, including firefighters, receive EXACTLY THE SAME vacation, sick and holiday leave. This is a city Charter requirement.

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON
PROPOSITION F
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

I STRONGLY SUPPORT PROP F!
Prop F will benefit all the people of San Francisco. Over 71,000 voters from every part of the City signed the petition to put Prop F on the ballot. They expressed enthusiastic support for a stronger Fire Department.

The City is becoming increasingly built-up, causing greater congestion. This means that fire hazards are increasing and adequate fire protection will be even more important to us than ever.

The October 17th earthquake was an urgent reminder of how fragile our city is and how important our Fire Department is to all of us.

When you, the people, call for help, whether it is for a medical emergency, a rescue, or fire, the firefighters come.

PROP F MAKES SENSE FOR ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!
It allows you to participate in fire safety decisions that affect your neighborhood.

Our neighborhoods are the “heart” of San Francisco. OUR FAMILIES, HOMES, CHURCHES, FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS NEED SATISFACTORY FIRE PROTECTION.

PROP F WILL MAKE SAN FRANCISCO A SAFER PLACE TO LIVE IN.

VOTE YES ON F!

Bill Maher, Member
Board of Supervisors

I STRONGLY SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
They provide vital services to our citizens. Last year, our firefighters answered a record-breaking 58,000 alarms and saved thousands of lives. The greatest number of calls came from the Tenderloin, the Inner Mission, the Fillmore, Civic Center/Hayes Valley, Hunters Point and Visitation Valley. I WANT TO BE SURE YOU GET THE HELP YOU NEED — WHEN YOU NEED IT!

Over the past 20 years, unlike other city departments, Fire Department staffing has been slashed by 40%! THREE FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT AGREE THAT THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY ARE TOO FEW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS! THEY AGREE THAT NO MORE FIREHOUSES SHOULD BE CLOSED.

We NEED Proposition F. It will:
• Put firefighters back on the ladder trucks
• Put firefighters back on our fireboat
• Bring daily staffing up to an adequate level
• Guarantee that any proposed closings of fire companies will be subject to a public review and vote by the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people
• Guarantee the SFFD the funding it needs

THE COST OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT IS ONLY 2 CENTS A DAY FOR EACH OF US! That 2 cents could easily save a life — maybe yours, or that of a loved one. PROP. F WILL BENEFIT ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

We depend on our firefighters to protect our families, homes, and businesses. Our narrow streets, steep hills and rows of wood frame buildings make firefighting very difficult. SAN FRANCISCO HAS SPECIAL FIREFIGHTING AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL NEEDS! We are different from other California cities with their wide streets, flat terrain and detached buildings!

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING FOR PROPOSITION F. THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL BENEFIT ALL OUR CITIZENS.

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

I STRONGLY SUPPORT IMPROVED FIRE PROTECTION IN SAN FRANCISCO!
I SHARE THE CONCERNS OF THE 71,000 VOTERS WHO PUT THIS PROPOSITION ON THE BALLOT. Fire Department daily staffing has been forced so low that our safety is threatened. WE MUST KEEP OUR FIREHOUSES OPEN AND FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED.

In addition to fighting fires, our firefighters perform many services for our elderly, disabled and low income families that no one else does. FIREFIGHTERS RESPONDED TO OVER 58,000 EMERGENCIES LAST YEAR, INCLUDING 26,000 MEDICAL CALLS.

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

WENDY NELDER, Member
Board of Supervisors
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

STOP REDUCTIONS IN CITY FIRE PROTECTION! VOTE YES ON F!

Over 71,000 San Francisco voters from every neighborhood, ethnic group and economic level joined to put PROPOSITION F on this ballot. They are concerned because politicians have reduced daily staffing to a dangerous all-time low while emergency calls reached an all-time high of 58,000 last year. People want their neighborhood firehouses to stay open and their fire engines, aerial ladder trucks and fireboat fully staffed to meet their emergency needs. They want a Charter amendment to take politics out of fire safety decisions.

Remember October 17! We learned that we need a strong Fire Department to fight fires, perform rescues and coordinate civilian volunteers. When both bridges are down, we need a strong SFFD!

THIS IS A COMMON SENSE PROPOSITION — IT IS SUPPORTED BY 3 FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT!

Join your friends and neighbors! VOTE YES ON F!

John L. Molinari
Former member of the Board of Supervisors

ONLY YOU CAN STOP FURTHER DANGEROUS CUTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

Over the years, the San Francisco Fire Department has assisted hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans in time of great personal need. The people understand how important the SFFD is in their lives, and OVER 71,000 OF THEM SIGNED THE PETITION TO PLACE PROPOSITION F ON THE BALLOT. The citizens want to be heard!

SFFD EMERGENCY RESPONSES ARE INCREASING DRAMATICALLY EVERY YEAR: Fiscal year totals have gone from 28,000 in 1970 to over 58,000 in 1989, while politicians have slashed daily on-duty staffing from 482, when I was Fire Chief, to today's all-time low of 296. Department resources are being stretched thinner and thinner despite greater and greater needs. THIS DANGEROUS TREND MUST BE STOPPED!

The Department must be able to meet the complex and highly varied needs of today's San Francisco. These include fighting structural fires, providing medical assistance, performing cliff and water rescues, responding to BART and MUNI fires and accidents, controlling hazardous materials emergencies, assisting victims of industrial accidents, and responding to many other emergency needs.

Many seniors, low income families and handicapped people rely on the SFFD to help them. THE PERSONAL ATTENTION THAT THE SFFD PROVIDES CAN NEVER BE CONVERTED TO SELF-SERVICE OR AUTOMATED! Firefighters, not machines, put out fires, perform rescues and meet all the other emergency needs of our city. You need these firefighters! THE NEXT CALL HELP MAY BE YOURS!

The need for Fire Department services crosses all social, ethnic and economic strata. We can all get behind this quality of life issue. Proposition F will strengthen your Fire Department and take politics out of fire safety.

William F. Murray
Chief of Department, SFFD, Retired

VOTE YES ON PROP F!

It takes teamwork to put out a fire. Without it, lives and property can be lost. Without it, firefighters can pay a hard price, for their lives, when in danger, may depend on having a buddy to lend a hand or go for help. As much a part of their job as hose, ladders, and water is that firefighters work in pairs when possible. It can be critical where dense smoke obscures vision or — as so many San Francisco neighborhoods well know — when trying to maneuver on a steeply pitched roof.

Current staffing of aerial ladder trucks leaves one firefighter without a buddy, the team short one vital hand. Proposition F will restore the balance that a fire — and time-tested system needs.

It also will mean two firefighters ready to move out with the fireboat when it has a job to do. Because they weren't readily available, the fireboat was delayed in pumping bay water to put out the disastrous Marina fire after last October's earthquake.

That's why I'm voting "Yes" on Prop F and am urging all San Franciscans to do the same.

Edward J. Phipps
Chief of Department, SFFD (Retired)
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I OWE MY LIFE TO THE QUICK AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS STATIONED AT MY LOCAL FIREHOUSE

Over 26,000 San Franciscans received emergency medical assistance last year by the SFFD. Many lives were saved because firefighters were on the scene in 3 minutes of less. The neighborhood firehouse is an essential part of San Francisco’s complex fire protection system.

The October 17th earthquake and the great Marina fire showed us how vital it is to have our Fire Department maintained at an adequate level. There were no firefighters on board the Fireboat Phoenix when it arrived in the Marina, and for over 1 1/2 hours firefighting and search and rescue operations were hindered by a lack of firefighters, as well as by a lack of water. UNDERSTAFFING CAN CAUSE FIRE DEATHS.

Proposition F will answer these critical needs by restoring funds for adequate staffing of fire companies, including the fireboat, and it will require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission and Board of Supervisors before any further cutbacks in fire protection can be made.

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING YES ON F!

John Barbagelata

---

PENNY-POWER! LOOK — HOW CAN YOU BUY SOMETHING PRICELESS FOR ONLY PENNIES A DAY?

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F!
FOR ONLY 2 CENTS PER DAY, YOU WILL:
• KEEP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIREHOUSE OPEN
• KEEP FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED
• KEEP YOUR FIREBOAT IN SERVICE AND STAFFED WITH FIREFIGHTERS
• GUARANTEE THAT NO FIREHOUSES OR FIRE COMPANIES WILL BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT
• REMOVE POLITICS FROM FIRE SAFETY
THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL COST EACH OF SAN FRANCISCO’S 732,000 RESIDENTS JUST PENNIES A DAY:

YEAR 1 — COST $5.3 MILLION = 2 CENTS PER DAY!
YEAR 2 — COST $2.8 MILLION = 1 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 3 — COST $0.8 MILLION = 1/2 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 4 — NO ADDITIONAL COST!
THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE POLICY YOU WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY.
DON’T MISS THE CHANCE!
VOTE YES ON F!

W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

---

WE STRONGLY SUPPORT PROPOSITION F!

No one worries more about costs than working people. For their hard-earned dollars, breadwinners demand value in return.

Value is what Proposition F is all about. It restores adequate staffing of engine and ladder truck companies, staffs the fireboat, and assures that you and I will have a voice in any proposed closing of a fire company or firehouse.

Proposition F is an insurance policy that is clearly a benefit to all San Franciscans. And, there is no question that the benefits greatly exceed the cost — to each of us, just 2 cents a day for the first year, 1 cent a day for the second year, and no cost thereafter.

Without adequate fire protection, San Francisco has too much to lose.
VOTE YES ON F!

Walter L. Johnson
San Francisco Labor Council

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

SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
THEY PROVIDE ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL SERVICES FOR OUR CITIZENS, AND NO ONE ELSE CAN DO THEIR JOB! We have 500 high rise buildings, BART and MUNI tunnels, and large business, school and hospital complexes where firefighting requires many firefighters.
On October 17, we were lucky! It was just a warning.
THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY IS TOO LOW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR

VOTE YES ON F!
SAN FRANCISCO IS A FRAGILE CITY. OVER 90% OF ALL STRUCTURES ARE OF WOOD FRAME CONSTRUCTION. YOUR HOMES ARE BUILT IN SOLID BLOCKS OF WOODEN BUILDINGS. THIS SITUATION PRESENTS THE POSSIBILITY OF A DISASTEROUS FIRE OR CONFLAGRATION OCCURRING, ESPECIALLY FOLLOWING AN EARTHQUAKE.
THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS THE LIFELINE FOR ALL OF US WHO LIVE IN THIS CITY. THE EARTHQUAKE ON OCTOBER 17TH AND THE GREAT FIRE IN THE MARINA SHOW HOW IMPORTANT THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS TO SAN FRANCISCO.

VOTE YES ON F!
Fire protection is vital for our families and businesses.
Prop F will stabilize protection and prevent further cuts in the Fire Department.
Protect our city. Vote Yes on F.

DISASTER NEEDS!
Let’s all get behind Proposition F! It will assure stability in Department funding, guarantee adequate staffing for our firehouses and apparatus, and permit long-range planning and improvements. Our firefighters need your vote!

James A. Hood
Chairman
San Franciscans for Fire Safety

VOTE YES ON F!

• ESTABLISHES THE PRESENT 41 NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS AS A MINIMUM STANDARD
• PUTS A FIREFIGHTING CREW ON THE FIREBOAT
• REQUIRES PUBLIC HEARINGS AND APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE CITIZENS BEFORE A FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED.

THESE ARE COMMON SENSE MEASURES THAT PROVIDE A MINIMUM LEVEL OF PUBLIC SAFETY FOR OUR FAMILIES AND CITY.

PLEASE JOIN ME, AND THE 70,000 OTHER SAN FRANCISCANS WHO SIGNED THE PETITIONS TO PUT PROP F ON THE BALLOT, AND VOTE YES ON "F!"

FRANK T. BLACKBURN
ASSISTANT FIRE CHIEF

Robt. E. Donohue
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
Charles D. Cresci
Deputy Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Charles H. Lee
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T TAKE YOUR FIREFIGHTERS FOR GRANTED!
San Francisco firefighters answered a record 58,000 calls for help last year. Of these, 26,000 were for medical emergencies. Heart attacks, auto accidents, building collapses, childbirths were just a few. BUT EVERY YEAR THERE ARE FEWER AND FEWER FIREFIGHTERS TO HELP YOU! In 1970 there were 482 firefighters on duty each day — in 1990 there are only 296! Six firehouses and 12 fire companies have been closed.

FIRE SAFETY DECISIONS MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE HANDBS OF POLITICIANS! Only a Charter amendment will assure that your Fire Department is adequately staffed to meet San Francisco's special needs — now and in the future. FOR JUST 2 CENTS A DAY, WE CAN KEEP OUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS OPEN AND OUR FIRE APPARATUS ADEQUATELY STAFFED.

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE WE WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON'T MISS THE CHANCE! VOTE YES ON F!

Walter G. Jebe
John J. Figoone
Caesar A. Churchwell
Alessandro Baccari
Virgil Caselli
Marsha Garland
Tom Creedon
Ed Farrah
Michael Salerno

NEIGHBORHOOD FIREFIGHTERS
Pride, trust, reliance. They’re all wrapped up in a San Francisco institution. The neighborhood fire station turns out to be more — it’s a rock, an anchor, a point of reference in people’s lives.

City residents have said so loud and clear in endorsing Proposition F. Besides setting a minimum number of firefighters to be on duty each day, the June ballot measure guarantees a public hearing in the area concerned and a vote of the people, if needed, before any fire station may be closed.

Seventy thousand people petitioned to put F on the ballot. Their reasons all had a common core. It’s not THE fire station but OUR fire station, they said — a place to expect and get help in a fire or medical emergency, a place the local community can turn to and rely on if the earth shakes, buildings fall, and other resources break down.

Neighborhoods and fire stations. The one requires the other, San Franciscans say.

John W. Flaherty
Mark L. Kaplan
Robert L. Barisone
Elvira Jane Barisone
William A. Roberts Jr.
Maureen Porter
William Porter Jr.
Homer G. Miles
Dorothy L. Miles
Peter C. Gardner
Joan M. Gardner
John Daly
Lucia R. Flaherty
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T BE MISLED BY MAYOR AGNOS! PROPF IS A LIFE AND DEATH ISSUE!
FIRE, INSURANCE AND EARTHQUAKE EXPERTS AGREE: SAN FRANCISCO FACES THE HIGHEST RISK OF CONFLAGRATION OF ANY CITY IN THE UNITED STATES! FIRE RISK IS HIGHER THAN IN 1906!
SAN FRANCISCO'S FIRE PROTECTION NEEDS ARE DICTATED BY THE NATURE OF OUR CITY, WITH ITS:
- Blocks and blocks of adjoining wood frame buildings
- Steep hills
- Narrow streets
- Traffic congestion
- Network of overhead electrical, trolley and telephone lines
- Prevailing winds
- 500 high rise buildings
- High density residential areas
- Large population of seniors and low-income families
- High vulnerability to severe earthquake damage
- Isolation from outside help in time of disaster
SAN FRANCISCO IS IN TROUBLE BECAUSE THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY. Former SF Fire Chief Emmet Condon in his book "Denial of Disaster":
"THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT IS BELOW THE DAILY MANNING LEVEL THAT ANY EXPERIENCED CHIEF OFFICER KNOWS IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SERVICE TO THE CITY." Condon continues:
"I WOULD AGREE THAT THE HAZARD OF FIRE TO THE CITY AFTER A SIMILAR DISASTER TODAY IS MUCH GREATER THAN IN 1906." And,
"SYNTHETIC MATERIALS HAVE GREATLY INCREASED THE FIRE RISK IN MODERN BUILDINGS AND WILL MAGNIFY THE FIRE PROBLEM IN THE MULTIPLE FIRES THAT WILL BREAK OUT AFTER A SERIOUS EARTHQUAKE."
At least 400 of the city's 500 high rise buildings do not have modern life-safety systems! HIGH RISE FIRES CAUSE A HUGE DRAIN ON FIRE DEPARTMENT RESOURCES.

PROPF IS STRONGLY SUPPORTED BY INDIVIDUALS, CITIZEN, BUSINESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS, FIRE SAFETY EXPERTS, AND A BROAD SPECTRUM OF KNOWLEDGEABLE CIVIC LEADERS.
There is no significant opposition to Prop F.
PROTECT YOURSELF, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR FRIENDS — YOU HAVE A LOT TO LOSE! VOTE YES ON F!

GERRY LONG
Concerned Citizen

WHY VOTE YES ON F? WHY A CHARTER AMENDMENT?
City politicians have been consistently unresponsive to your fire safety concerns. It is the duty of the City to provide its citizens with adequate fire protection and earthquake preparedness. Instead, Fire Department staffing has been cut to a dangerous level.
THE POLITICIANS SAY, "TRUST US!"
We can see that this has not worked, and a Charter provision is necessary. YOUR EMERGENCY NEEDS ARE TOO VITAL TO BE LEFT VULNERABLE TO POLITICAL GAMES.
You hear the sirens every day — BUT HAVE YOU COUNTED

THE FIREFIGHTERS? Fewer firefighters means greatly reduced firefighting capacity. FIRE DEPARTMENT STAFFING IS NOW AT AN ALL-TIME LOW AND CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO FALL FURTHER!
WE NEED A STRONG FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

John Flaherty
Battalion Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Past President, S.F. Fire Chiefs Assn.

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

HIGH RISE BUILDINGS AND BART AND MUNI UNDERGROUND FACILITIES MAKE SPECIAL FIRE PROTECTION DEMANDS

Today, San Francisco has over 500 high rise buildings. Fires in these buildings require many firefighters because equipment must be carried by hand to the fire — often up many flights of stairs.

In 1988 in Los Angeles, a fire on three floors of a high rise building required 383 firefighters to bring it under control. In San Francisco, our entire on-duty force would be required, leaving the rest of the city completely unprotected. Mutual aid from neighboring communities would be totally inadequate to cover our needs.

BART and MUNI underground facilities present special fire and rescue problems. Large numbers of firefighters are required to fight these fires and perform rescue and evacuation operations.

In July 1989, Mayor Agnos forced reductions in truck company staffing — the key players in rescue and ventilation operations. Now these aerial ladder teams can no longer function properly.

Building ventilation is delayed, greatly increasing the risk of deadly backdrafts.

The Department’s daily staffing has fallen to 296 firefighters, the lowest in history, while fire, medical and other emergencies are higher than ever. Proposition F will bring SFFD staffing up to 320. This is critically needed to meet these ever-increasing demands.

In the past, some Fire Chiefs have thought that you could safely relocate or close a firehouse, but I now recognize that this is dangerous. The SFFD can now get to most emergencies within 3 minutes, but if we close a firehouse we lose that prompt response. With our rows of wood buildings, our large population of elderly citizens, we must get there quickly.

The SFFD is your lifeline. Protect it! I strongly urge all citizens to vote YES on F!

James P. Olson, President
San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

Any firefighter responsible for any racist act or statement on duty, after due process, should be disciplined. Repeat occurrences must result in severe penalties.

Expensive overtime can be largely eliminated by adding more firefighters.

Differences between the union and the mayor should be resolved through good faith negotiations, not through the election process. Maintaining high morale is the only way to insure efficiency.

The neighborhood service cuts need to be restored.

Vote YES on F.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Becoming a victim in another major earthquake or runway fire in one of San Francisco’s densely populated neighborhoods continues to be a hazard for all of us.

Nonetheless, because the Firefighters Union did not endorse him, Mayor Agnos has seen fit to reduce the staffing levels of the Fire Department in any twenty-four hour period from 315 to 296. The San Francisco Republican Party believes these cuts are penny-wise, pound-foolish, and politically motivated.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. DO NOT let the Mayor’s political vendetta jeopardize public safety.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bukley

William E. Grayson
Anna M. Guth
Tina H. Frank
Christopher L. Bowman
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition F. This proposition, if passed, will require twenty-five extra firefighters to be hired each day — five of these firefighters will have no specific functions — their daily assignment will be at the discretion of the Chief of Department. It will also require that daily truck staffing be increased from five to six persons and the fireboat staffing be increased by another two firefighters daily. These increases are unnecessary and are not required — fire suppression units are now staffed to provide effective and efficient fire service for San Francisco.

Proposition F will take management control and responsibility away from the Chief of Department by requiring organizational changes to be approved by the voters at a regular election. This would not allow the Chief, through the Fire Commission, to respond to the changing demands placed on the Fire Department. Fire protection decisions can’t wait until an election. To provide for and maintain the most cost effective and efficient fire department, I urge you to vote NO on Proposition F.

Frederick F. Postel
Chief of Department

Overtime pay is bleeding the Fire Department’s budget dry!
Over 92 percent of the budget goes for personnel costs. In 1988-89 uniformed personnel were paid salaries totaling $53,567,000 plus mandatory fringe benefits of $53,543,000 and still another $11,893,000 for overtime!

Proposition F would increase that bleeding by creating new positions not necessary for the safety of San Franciscans despite the scare statements made by the firefighters’ union.

Proposition F would cost $4,900,000 in overtime thereby siphoning away money needed to make major improvements!

We already have excellent protection but we want to upgrade it by developing a comprehensive earthquake program, by improving our response to emergency medical calls (over 4 1/2 times the number of fires) and by purchasing more modern fire equipment.

During the October quake 522 off-duty firefighters reported back immediately yet there were not enough engines and trucks for them; in fact, one old piece had to be taken out of the Fire Museum to help fight the Marina District fire.

Our firefighters work nine days out of 31 in shifts of approximately 24 hours on and 48 off.

Many are “double-dippers” holding down well paid outside jobs such as contractors, lawyers, plumbers and electricians. They still put in overtime because the Charter provides for such generous pay.

Overtime pay for a firefighter is $585 per shift, for a Captain $776 and for an Assistant Chief $1077! Last year the average firefighter’s cost to the City was $90,000, including salary, fringe benefits and overtime.

Do not pay out more money just for overtime.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

James Jefferson
President, Fire Commission

Frank Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission

Henry Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Sharon Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Ted Soulis
Commissioner, Fire Commission
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

San Francisco has the finest fire protection in California. Now is not the time to jeopardize it with Proposition F. Proposition F is an ill-advised and wasteful measure.

First, it would wrest management of the Fire Department away from the Fire Commission and the Chief, where management properly and historically belongs.

Management of the Fire Department should remain accountable to the citizens of San Francisco, through its appointed Fire Commission. This principle is violated when rigid language is placed in the Charter.

Second, Proposition F would unnecessarily increase the Fire Department’s budget by approximately $4.9 million a year.

The San Francisco Fire Department already has staffing levels on its fire engines and aerial ladder trucks that are equal to the best in California.

To overstaff the engines and trucks would be counterproductive as well as wasteful, especially in a time of limited resources and ever-increasing demands for City services.

Let life and death decisions of fire protection in San Francisco remain in the control of the Fire Commission and the Chief.

Vote No on Proposition F.

Proposition F has little to do with fire protection and earthquake preparedness and a lot to do with unnecessary Fire Department staffing.

Vote No on Proposition F. Don’t tie the hands of the Chief and Fire Commission, preventing them from managing the department and our tax dollars. Proposition F will take $6 million a year from health services, libraries, homeless programs and other vital city services. Why? Because Proposition F will require the city to pay more overtime to firefighters who already receive higher salaries than those in Los Angeles, San Jose, Long Beach or San Diego.

Let the buck stop where it has always stopped — with the Fire Commission and the Chief. And let San Francisco’s first-rate fire protection continue.

We can’t afford to play around with fire, or with Proposition F. A similar Proposition was defeated in November, 1987. Vote NO on this Proposition in 1990.

Vote NO on Proposition F.

James D. Jefferson
President, Fire Commission

Frank A. Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission

Henry E. Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Sharon L. Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Ted N. Souls
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Employment of unnecessary personnel is called “featherbedding.” Proposition F is just that — at a cost of $6 million.

San Francisco has the best fire protection services in the country. We already pay more per person for that service than any other city in California.

Stop a $6 million raid on the City Treasury. Vote No on Proposition F.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Like all San Franciscans, we want a safe and healthy city. But Proposition F could jeopardize our safety and health.

By spending more than $7 million on unnecessary overtime, Proposition F will take money away from other vitally needed services like fire equipment, police protection, health care and children’s programs.

The annual fire department budget is already $150 million. Firefighters are already getting a pay raise of almost 10%. That’s more than most city workers — and most of us.

San Francisco already has more firefighters per thousand residents than any other major Western city.

Yet San Francisco has fewer fire and emergency alarms than other cities. In 1986, San Francisco had 78,000 emergency calls. Oakland had 95,000.

We appreciate the job that our firefighters do. But we cannot support this multi-million dollar attempt to win back overtime for just 18 firefighters per day.

Susan J. Bierman
Agar Jaicks
Mauri Schwartz
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Sunset Democratic Club
Margaret Brodkin, Director Coleman Advocates for Children
Carole Migden, chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

I respect and admire the work done by San Francisco’s firefighters.

It’s a dangerous job.

That’s why they’re paid more than firefighters in any other large city in California, even though our firefighters work 15 percent fewer hours.

But today our average cost per firefighter has hit $96,000 per year.

We have been reducing this amount — and improving fire service at the same time — by hiring more new firefighters and reducing costly overtime payments.

That overtime runs as much as $585 per day for a fourth-year firefighter, and up to $1077 per day at the higher ranks.

When they argue for Proposition F, the union avoids mentioning this fact. They raise a false alarm about closing down firehouses, when in reality we are adding new firefighters as quickly as we can train them.

Ninety new firefighters are being hired this year alone. We have full classes in the Fire Academy for the first time in years.

Prop F asks you, the voters, to put an unnecessary sixth firefighter back on every fire truck, in order to give current firefighters millions in guaranteed overtime.

There’s no need for it. Even a one-alarm fire in San Francisco draws 30 firefighters in response.

It’s easy, when you think about the heroic work firefighters do, to justify giving them whatever they ask for.

I made the same mistake myself three years ago, before I was mayor. As a State Assemblyman and a strong union supporter, I lent my name to a measure that was similar to Proposition F.

But no group, however much we appreciate their work, is entitled to millions of taxpayer dollars a year in guaranteed, unnecessary overtime — especially when they are trying to feather their own nests by keeping out women and minorities.

With all the pressing needs facing our city, we can’t afford to give away $7 million and get nothing in return. Please vote No on Proposition F.

Mayor Art Agnos

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: This entire section is new.

The Proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

NEW CHARTER SECTION: 3.548:
MINIMUM LEVELS OF FIRE
PROTECTION FOR THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Notwithstanding any other section of this
Charter, the minimum levels of fire protection for
the City and County of San Francisco shall be
specified as follows:

A. The MINIMUM level of Fire Protection for
the City and County of San Francisco, in fire
suppression, effective July 1, 1990, except as
specified in Section C shall be as follows:

1. Engine Companies 41
   Truck Companies 18
   Rescue Companies 2
   Fireboat Companies 1
   Battalion Districts 10
   Divisions 3
   Service Units 1
   Bureau of Equipment 2
   High Pressure System
   Tank (staffed)
   (Jones St. Tank) 1
   Assigned Firefighters
   (At Chief's Discretion) 5

2. Fire station: The minimum number of sta-
tions shall be 41, at locations listed on the SFFD

B. MINIMUM daily staffing of Fire Compa-
nies and other Units:

1. Engine Companies: 1 Officer and 3
   Firefighters
2. Truck Companies: 1 Officer and 5
   Firefighters
3. Rescue Company: 1 Officer and 3
   Firefighters
4. Fireboat Company: 1 Officer, 1 Pilot,
   1 Marine Engineer and 2 Fire-
   fighters
5. Service Units: 1 Firefighter
6. Bureau of Equipment: 2 Firefighters

7. Battalion District: 1 Battalion Chief,
   1 Chief’s Aide
   1 Assistant Chief
   1 Chief’s Aide
   1 qualified person
   to operate gates,
   valves and commu-
   nications equip-
   ment of the High
   Pressure System.

Required minimum staffing shall be main-
tained on a constant basis, 24 hours per day.
Sufficient personnel and positions shall be au-
thorized and funded to maintain MINIMUM re-
quired staffing levels established in this section.
When assigned personnel are not available, then
staffing shall be maintained by working of
overtime.

C. CLOSURE AND RELOCATION OF FIRE
STATIONS, DEACTIVATION OF FIRE
COMPANIES OR OF UNITS REQUIRED BY
THIS SECTION:

1. Fire Stations, Fire Companies or other
   Units required by this section may be closed or
deactivated only when each of the following
   procedures is completed:
   a. It is recommended by the Chief of De-
      partment and approved for consideration by the Fire
      Commission.
   b. The Fire Commission shall hold at least two
      public hearings on the matter so that affected
      citizens may appear to express their views.
   c. At least one of the public hearings shall be
      held in the neighborhood of the Station, Com-
      pany, or Unit to be closed or deactivated. Such
      meeting to be held at a time and place most
      suitable for maximum public attendance.
   d. Except as provided by this section, other
      facilities or units may be closed or deactivated by
      majority of the five members of the Fire Com-
      mission upon recommendation by the Chief of
      Department.
   e. Upon conclusion of public hearings and
      approval by a majority of the five members of the
      Fire Commission for the closure or deactivation
      of a Company or Unit, the Fire Commission shall
      forward its recommendation to the Board of Su-
      pervisors within 30 calendar days.
   f. Upon receipt of the Fire Commission rec-
      ommendation, the Board of Supervisors may
      hold public hearings on the matter and they may
      approve or disapprove of the recommendation of
      the Fire Commission for closure or deactivation
      of a Station, Company or Unit. Such approval or
disapproval shall be by majority vote of the
Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors
approves of the Fire Commission recommenda-
tion, then they shall direct the Clerk of the Board
to have the matter put on the ballot of the next
regular election for final determination by the
voters of the City and County.

D. DEFINITIONS — EQUIPMENT

1. ENGINE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying
   hose and a pump to pump water of at least 1,500
gallons per minute.
2. TRUCK COMPANY: A tractor-trailer ve-
   hicle carrying ladders and rescue equipment with
   a 100-foot aerial ladder or equivalent device to
   reach upper floors of buildings.
3. RESCUE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying
   rescue equipment capable of heavy rescue and
   diving equipment for underwater rescue.
4. FIRE BOAT COMPANY: A boat equipped
   with pumps, hose, monitor nozzles and able to
   navigate San Francisco Bay for firefighting and
   rescue duty along the shorelines of the City and
   County.
5. SERVICE UNIT: A vehicle carrying spare
   supply of air and equipment for self-contained
   breathing apparatus and resuscitators.
6. HIGH PRESSURE SYSTEM PUMP STA-
   TION: A facility capable of pumping at least
10,000 gallons per minute from San Francisco
Bay or other water source into the mains of the
high pressure water system.
7. BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT: A vehicle
   capable of carrying equipment for emergency
   repairs or towing of fire apparatus under emer-
   gency conditions.
**Former Supervisor Health Benefits**

**PROPOSITION G**
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?  
YES 288  NO 289

---

**Analysis**
by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Health Service System provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Supervisors may not continue to receive health insurance from the Health Service System after they leave the Board of Supervisors.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Board of Supervisors could allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

**A “YES” VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

**A “NO” VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System.

---

**Controller's Statement on “G”**
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “G”**
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


**NO:** None of the Supervisors present voted no.

---

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G will allow former Supervisors to buy health insurance coverage from the City’s Health Service system, when they leave office. THERE WILL BE NO COST TO THE CITY.

The Health Service System now provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Proposition G simply allows former Supervisors to buy continued health coverage in the City’s Health Plan, at their own expense.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition G
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "G"
Former supervisors are either those who have decided not to run; or those the electorate voted out of office.
Even as it claims they will pay their own health plan benefits, why continue to have them in the system.

Cut bait.
Vote NO.

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.425 Persons Covered

Each plan may make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system by the dependents of members, retired city and county employees, temporary city and county employees, such other dependents of deceased and retired city and county employees as the board of supervisors may authorize by ordinance, teachers and other employees of the San Francisco Unified School District retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees of the city and county and resigned teachers and employees of the school district whose resignations occur after June 15, 1955, and within 30 days immediately prior to the date on which, but for their resignations, they would have become retired members of the said retirement system, on whose relinquishment of retirement allowances as permitted by the charter occurs after such date and resigned employees of the San Francisco Unified School District not otherwise included. A resigned employee or teacher is one whose employment has terminated other than by retirement, discharge or death or who has relinquished retirement allowances. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system to the aforementioned resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District is to enable them, subject to the health service board's exercise of its power, to participate in the benefits of the system after transferring to the State Teachers' Retirement System from the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for participation in the benefits of the system by the aforementioned resigned employees of the city and county and other resigned employees of San Francisco Unified School District is to permit the health service board to have power to treat them the same as it treats resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District.

As used in this section, and for the purpose of this section, the terms "city and county employees" and "employees of the city and county" shall include officers and employees of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco.

The board of supervisors may also provide by ordinance for the continuation in any plan by former supervisors who agree to and do pay the full cost of such benefit.
Fire Inspector and Engineer Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION H
Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City? YES 290 NO 292

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers belong to the City's Retirement System. Under the charter, the Board of Supervisors may contract with the State's Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) to allow certain safety employees to be members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, if there is no additional cost to the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, if there would be no additional cost to the City.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want these employees to continue to be covered by the City's Retirement System.

Controller's Statement on "H" 
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This Charter Amendment would provide for safety retirement for eighteen civilian Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers employed by the San Francisco Fire Department, at no additional cost to the City.

Fire Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers are classified by the State of California as safety personnel and properly belong in a safety retirement program that is not offered by the City’s Retirement System for non-uniformed employees. Instead, the City contracts with the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) for its public safety officers who are not police officers or firefighters.

Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers, along with their counterparts in the uniformed firefighter ranks, provide the professional expertise necessary for the City’s fire prevention program. Proposition H provides a retirement plan for this small group of civilians equivalent to the retirement plan for their uniformed firefighter counterparts, at no additional cost to the City.

Voters approved similar measures in recent years that provided for safety requirement for probation officers, investigator groups and various other safety personnel.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition H
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.506-2 Miscellaneous Safety Employees
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the board of supervisors or the community college board shall have the power to contract with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System of the State of California to provide that the probation officers, airport police officers, district attorney
and public defender investigators, coroner investigators, juvenile court counselors, and institutional police, fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers who are not members of the Section 8.506 plans, shall be members of the public employees' retirement system, and the board of supervisors, the community college board and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such contract.

The power to contract created herein shall be limited to a contract with no net increase in cost to the city and county or the community college district.

Any person who shall become a member of the public employees' retirement system pursuant to such contract shall have the right to be a member of the health service system and the health board shall make provision for the participation in the benefits of the health service system by such persons.

Out of town on June 5, 1990? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
THANKS, SAN FRANCISCO
Residents are recycling in record numbers!

Nearly 70,000 homes in the southern and eastern parts of the City have curbside recycling. By 1991, every resident will have curbside collection service.

Until curbside reaches your neighborhood, you can recycle at our many community recycling centers.

For a free Recycling Starter Kit and information on where to recycle call:

San Francisco Recycling Program
CITY HALL
554-6193
PROPOSITION I

Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?  

YES 293  
NO 295  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the State Retirement System are allowed to work for the San Francisco Unified School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. Retired San Francisco teachers in the City Retirement system are not allowed to do so.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow retired teachers who are members of the City’s Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. While they are consultants they would not make retirement contributions or earn additional retirement credits.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the City’s Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, costs could increase, the amount of which, being dependent upon the dollar amount and the number of personal service contracts executed, cannot be determined, but should not be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Jim Gonzalez and Richard Hongisto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is necessary to correct an inequity that exists between teachers in the State Teachers' Retirement System and those in the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. Teachers in the state system can retire up to three years early and supplement their reduced retirement income by serving as consultants to the school district developing curriculum, orienting new teachers, substituting for absent teachers, tutoring students, etc. The Charter denies the right to the four hundred teachers in the city retirement system to continue serving students and schools in these ways. Proposition I would correct this inequity by extending the same right to teachers in the city retirement system.

Proposition I will save taxpayers' money by encouraging teachers at the top of the salary scale to retire early. New hires at the low end of the salary scale will earn little more than half as much as those at the top.

Proposition I will also improve education in San Francisco schools by continuing to take advantage of the experience and expertise of retired teachers. It will also help to solve the shortage of qualified substitute teacher.

Vote YES on Proposition I for equity, economy, and educational excellence.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition I
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition I
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will bring equity and fairness to retired teachers, save the taxpayers money and improve the educational system in San Francisco.

Assemblyman Willie Brown Jr.  
Assemblyman John Burton  
Supervisor Wendy Neider  
Supervisor Tom Hsieh  
Supervisor Doris Ward  
Supervisor Jim Gonzalez  
San Francisco Democratic Party  
Fred Rodriguez, President of the Board of Education

United Educators of San Francisco, Joan-Marie Shelley  
Judy Dellamonica  
Joanne Miller, vice-president of the San Francisco Board of Education  
Thomas Ammiano  
Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council  
Larry Martin, Transport Workers of America  
Robert Barnes  
James Wachob  
Jose Medina  
Harry G. Britt, President of the Board of Supervisors

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the charter on February 1, 1969, and persons who become miscellaneous officers and employees after February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fifths vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under Section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under Section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(a) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

"Retirement allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payments is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workers’ compensation laws of the State of California, shall mean all remuneration, whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the retirement board, which would have been earned by the member had he worked, throughout the period under consideration, the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police department as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under Section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System as created in Section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in Section 3.670 of the charter.

"Charter" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural; and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(b) Any member who completes at least 20 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 50 years, or at least 10 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 60 years, said service to be computed under Subsection (g) hereof, may retire from service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after reaching the age of 60 years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of two percent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of 65 years, if the allowance available to such member, pursuant to the provisions of Subsection (f) of this section, shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this Subsection (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this Subsection (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said Subsection (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of 60 years, after rendering 20 years or more of such service and having attained the age of 50 years, computed under Subsection (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under Subsection (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/4</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/2</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-3/4</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-1/4</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51-1/2 1.1500
51-3/4 1.1750
52 1.2000
52-1/4 1.2250
52-1/2 1.2500
52-3/4 1.2750
53 1.3000
53-1/4 1.3250
53-1/2 1.3500
53-3/4 1.3750
54 1.4000
54-1/4 1.4250
54-1/2 1.4500
54-3/4 1.4750
55 1.5000
55-1/4 1.5250
55-1/2 1.5500
55-3/4 1.5750
56 1.6000
56-1/4 1.6250
56-1/2 1.6500
56-3/4 1.6750
57 1.7000
57-1/4 1.7250
57-1/2 1.7500
57-3/4 1.7750
58 1.8000
58-1/4 1.8250
58-1/2 1.8500
58-3/4 1.8750
59 1.9000
59-1/4 1.9250
59-1/2 1.9500
59-3/4 1.9750
60 2.0000

In no event shall a member’s retirement allowance exceed 75 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or Subsection (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of 65 years may elect, without right of reversion, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system, and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of Sec-

(Continued on next page)
tion 8.514 of this charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $100 per month upon retirement after 30 years of service and after attaining the age of 60 years, and provided further that as to any member within 15 years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of 65, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $100 per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied on full-time service and compensation in the calculations of retirement allowances.

(c) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least 10 years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in Subsection (g) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in Subsection (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds 40 percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age 60, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed 40 percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earnable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one year immediately preceding his retirement. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied as full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

(d) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

(e) If a member shall die, before retirement, (1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of 12 months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(2) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired from service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated-beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under Subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) shall be paid in lump sum as follows:

(A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there be no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election, but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 years, may make the election herein provided, and the benefit provided under this Subsection (e), for, and on behalf of such children if, in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this Subsection (e), any allowance payable under this Subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

(j) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least 10 years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed $1,000, he shall have the right to elect, without loss of retirement and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service

(Continued on next page)
(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation paid to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to 7-1/2 percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of Subsection (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members, and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this Subsection (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, whihc shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), Subsection (h), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement, and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made even-numbered year, and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this Subdivision (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition thereof submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debts against the city and county.

(i) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said Subsection (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(j) Exception as otherwise provided. In section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(l) Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsections (b), (c), (f), and (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and
PROPOSITION J

Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?  

YES 296  

NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Human Rights Commission was created by an ordinance. Under that ordinance, the Human Rights Commission has 15 members.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment that would make the existing Human Rights Commission a charter commission; it would reduce the number of members from 15 to 11.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you want to reduce its size to 11 members.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you do not want to reduce its size to 11 members.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government in an amount not to exceed $4,200.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Thomas Hsieh.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Let us make human rights a fundamental part of the fabric of San Francisco.

San Francisco is the birthplace of the United Nations and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, our Human Rights Commission is not even a part of our constitution — the Charter. Proposition J will make the Human Rights Commission a charter commission. Proposition J will take the position of the Human Rights Commission out of politics and ensures its place in the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Please vote in favor of Proposition J to recognize the importance of human rights to San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition J
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition J
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department and a candidate for Municipal Court Judge I urge you to vote for Ballot Measure J. The Human Rights Commission has been a positive voice for 25 years. Thousands of San Franciscans have directly benefited from the Commission’s efforts. Its mandate will be greatly strengthened by extending Charter status through this measure. Please join me and vote yes on J!

James Harrigan
For Municipal Court

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “J”

We have a Human Rights Commission NOW, appointed by the Mayor. A new one in the charter would have the same appointing officer. We don’t need a confirmation of said committee. It will not take it out of politics. No reason for this. Just another layer of government — for what. Vote no on “J”.

Marguerite Warren
NOTE: This entire section is new.

PART TWENTY-FOUR: HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
3.699-5 Commission; Composition
A human rights commission is hereby established. The human rights commission shall consist of eleven members broadly representative of the general public to be appointed by the mayor. Three of the members who are first appointed shall be designated to serve for terms of one year, three for two years, three for three years and two for four years from the date of their appointments. Thereafter, members shall be appointed as aforesaid for a term of office of four years, except that all of the vacancies occurring during a term shall be filled for the unexpired term. Members of said commission shall be compensated for each commission or committee meeting actually attended by said members in an amount as may be established and amended, from time to time, by ordinance of the board of supervisors, but not less than $50 per meeting provided, however, that no member shall be paid for attending more than two commission or committee meetings in any one calendar month.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

TEXT OF PROPOSITION J (Continued from page 86)

County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except re- fused of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system, an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1954 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation for the basis of which his pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) A retired person, who is a certified employee, may enter into a consultation contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certified employee who enters into such a consultation contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

8.584-10 Limitation on Employment During Retirement
(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.584 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.584, he shall re-enter membership under Section 8.584 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.584. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for service or disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 60 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he held the position which he held at the time of his retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he held the position from which he was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
Seven Member Commissions

PROPOSITION K
Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?

YES 298  NO 299

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department, Fire Department, Social Services Department, Port of San Francisco, Public Utilities Commission, Board of Permit Appeals, Civil Service Commission, Airports Commission and Parking and Traffic Department are managed by a board or commission. Each of these boards and commissions has five members appointed by the Mayor.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K is a charter amendment that would increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the size of these boards and commissions to stay the same.

Controller’s Statement on “K”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $18,800 annually beginning January, 1991.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh, Bill Maher, and Wendy Nelder.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K expands the opportunity for San Francisco’s varied communities to participate in City government. Proposition K increases, from five to seven, the membership of the Board of Permit Appeals and seven City commissions: Police, Fire, Social Services, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports, and Parking and Traffic. It also includes the Port Commission, subject to amendment of state law to authorize such an increase.

Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities. Only five members of these crucial commissions is insufficient to address the diversity of concerns in our City; seven members will provide greater representation and greater leadership from a variety of communities. The expansion of the size of these commissions enhances the possibility for all San Franciscans to be part of decision-making and policy-making processes at every level.

The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions. Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor, but instead of the many under-represented voices in San Francisco.

Proposition K would make these commissions representative of the interests of more San Franciscans, while maintaining the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants. San Franciscans want accessible, responsive, and active commissioners. We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns, and Proposition K is a method for achieving these goals.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

You need a decoder ring to read the Supervisors’ argument in favor of creating 18 new commissioner slots. Here’s what the Board says, and here’s what they really mean.

The Board says: “Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities.”

The Board means: All you interest groups out there, it’s time to get yours.

The Board says: “The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions.”

The Board means: With 18 more political appointments, a mayor won’t offend as many supporters by passing them over for city jobs.

The Board says: “Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor.”

The Board means: Adding 18 new city commissioners isn’t really a boon to the incumbent mayor — unless he’s re-elected.

The Board says: “Proposition K would . . . maintain the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants.”

The Board means: Increasing commission memberships by 40% isn’t that big a deal.

The Board says: “We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns.”

The Board means: A fair hearing before city commissions isn’t enough; we want guaranteed results!

Let’s stop speaking in code and talk plainly. Proposition K is based on the notion that people should be treated as groups — not individuals — in the political process. That’s offensive, and so is Proposition K.

Please vote NO on K!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is a textbook example of what’s wrong with contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K demeans us because it lumps city residents into groups, rather than respecting their rights as individuals.

Proposition K divides us because it stresses what such interest groups (the polite euphemism is “communities”) disagree about, rather than what all San Franciscans share in common.

Proposition K debases us because it is premised on a “quota system” for city boards and commissions. There shouldn’t be “white seats” or “black seats”, “gay seats” or “straight seats” on city commissions. There should be but two qualifications for service as a city commissioner: San Francisco residency and individual ability!

Vote NO on Proposition K!

San Francisco is indeed a polyglot and richly diverse community. City residents come from all corners of the country and the globe. Their political opinions range from radical to reactionary and all points in between.

It’s impossible for each point of view, each ethnic group, each political persuasion, each neighborhood to be represented on city commissions. Increasing the membership on those bodies from five to seven persons is like buying a bigger umbrella in a hurricane. It won’t make a bit of difference.

It is possible, however, for city commissioners from all walks of life to represent views and interests other than their own. It happens at all the time in countless actions by city boards and agencies. And if we want to encourage consensus and better understanding among San Francisco’s many “communities”, we must resist attempts — such as Proposition K — to make the labels we all wear easier to read.

Three years ago, Mayor Agnos campaigned on the slogan, “One City, One Future”. The supporters of Proposition K have failed to heed those words.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The opponents of Proposition K are clearly on the wrong page of the textbook of contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K values us because it gives city residents greater ability to be heard, individually and as a community.

Proposition K unites us because it reinforces what we all share in common: respect for democracy. If, as the opposition claims, the ability to have more access to representation is divisive, democratic ideals such as checks and balances must therefore also be divisive and undesirable.

Proposition K elevates us because it originates from that respect for democracy. This does not limit or allocate, but reasonably expands available seats on the commissions. Proposition K effectively dilutes the influence of special interests in favor of more broad-based views.

San Francisco is an extremely diverse city and that diversity should be reasonably represented. Democracy requires the opportunity for representation of all points of view. Good government demands that the number of appointed officials be limited so that debate can be functional. Proposition K addresses these two needs: increased citizen participation, and reasonable size to facilitate getting work done.

If you take the opposition’s argument — that it is not meaningful to have representatives from different neighborhoods, ethnicities, political persuasions — to its logical extreme, you could have one member commissions achieving a consensus at the price of democracy.

Proposition K is good government, since it integrates the multiplicity of voices into a united future for the residents of San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition K!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

We need to create an open, democratic, and participatory local government.
This measure will encourage more participation.
Vote YES on K.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Individuals and community groups strongly support K. Increasing the membership on these bodies expands the opportunity to participate for all San Franciscans.
Vote YES on K!

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaacks
Robert McCarthy
Ruth Picon
President, Latino Democratic Club
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead, Pres.
Bernal Heights Community Foundation
Jake McGoldrick
Arnie Scher
Natalie Berg
Sudonia Wilson,
San Francisco Board of Education
Alma Jackson
Margaret Brady
Reverend Amos Brown
Yori Wada

Mayor Art Agnos
Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John L. Burton
State Senator Milton Marks
Fr. James Goode
Carole Migden
Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes
Political Action Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Catherine Baccari
Bob Dockendorff
Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

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

Vote No on Proposition K.
Proposition K unnecessarily tinkers with our commission system for managing city departments.

Many of the most important city functions — police and fire services, libraries and health care — are governed by five-member city commissions. Proposition K would increase the size of these commissions to seven members. The Planning Commission would be expanded to nine members.

For what reason? The supporters say that the commissions cannot reflect our diverse community unless we allow the mayor to appoint more commissioners. They miss the point of the commission system.

Commissioners are not advisors or members of a community-wide study panel. They are managers. They set city policy, recommend hundreds of millions of dollars in spending, and hire and fire key departmental personnel.

Preserve our system of citizen management. Don’t make city commissions debating societies.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Are not seven Deputy Mayors at the rate of $94,000 a year a sufficient number of political plums for the Mayor? Does he really need eighteen more commissioners to achieve good government in San Francisco?

Do not give the Mayor additional tools to promote his re-election efforts. The San Francisco Republican Party urges voters to Vote No on Proposition K.

San Francisco Republican Party
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Anna M. Guth

William E. Grayson
Honor H. Bulkley
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Brian Mavrogeorge
Ronald G. Kershaw
Sam T. Harper
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

No sound arguments have been presented which support the need for Proposition K. Enlarging Boards and Commissions would increase city costs without improving productivity. Indeed, extra members may impede efficiency and result in protracted proceedings.

Don’t give the Mayor additional opportunities for patronage. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw

Brian Mavrogeorge
Paul Kavouksian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence
Martin Keller

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K
PROP. K WILL ADD TO BUREAUCRACY
Proposition K will hinder quick and fair response to citizen concerns. Larger commissions do not mean better commissions; on the contrary, they mean a less efficient, more cumbersome process.
PROP. K WILL NOT MAKE COMMISSIONS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INTERESTS OF SAN FRANCISCO
Present commissions serve a diverse San Francisco by appointment of individuals who reflect and possess sensitivity, respect for different backgrounds and points of views.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

Sharon Bretz
Susann L. Danielson
Jean Kalil
Victor Makras
Esther Marks
Beverly Prior

Larger commissions and larger support bureaucracy are not the answer to better representation. The answer is less political patronage and more appointments based on experience and knowledge. This proposal only makes government more cumbersome and less effective.

... Vote NO on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Proposition K is not about democracy. It is about patronage. It is about creating many new commission positions to hand out as political plums. To whom? For what? And why should the taxpayers be forced to pay for it?

No one, not even the author, Supervisor Ward, claims that it will improve the efficiency of the government, yet it will certainly add to the costs. The true costs will include trips, staff time, expenses, etc., with no discernable benefit to the public.

This measure will lead to longer meetings, more arguments, divisiveness and politics while providing less management oversight.

Proposition K is an insider’s game. They gain and the voters pay. It is a costly bad idea and should be soundly rejected by the voters.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Bill Maher

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”
If qualified commissioners were appointed who understood they represented ALL of San Francisco this charter amendment would not be necessary.

There are nine commissions listed for additional members — 18 more appointments. Just another avenue for political appointments.

Vote No on Proposition “K”.

Marguerite Warren
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

PART FOUR: POLICE DEPARTMENT
3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, police force, an office of citizen complaints and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of five seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission to seven members, shall continue to hold the respective positions, subject to the provisions of this charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the police department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the police commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-2 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The police commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

PART FIVE: FIRE DEPARTMENT
3.540 Fire Department

The fire department shall be under the management of a fire commission, consisting of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor; and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years of 1948, 1949, and 1950, respectively, two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The chief of department shall have power to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for fire-fighting purposes.

The commissioners shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the fire department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the fire commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-2 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter.

Positions of officers and employees of the fire department legally authorized shall continue, and the incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall continue as the officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments, and except as in this charter otherwise provided.

PART EIGHT: SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
3.570 Composition of Department; Commission

There is hereby established a social services department. This department shall consist of a social services commission of seven members, a director of social services, and such employees and assistants as may be necessary to carry out the work and functions of said department.

The members of the social services commission shall be appointed thereto by the mayor and shall be selected for their respective positions on the basis of their interest in and understanding of the problems of public welfare. The members of said commission shall serve without compensation, and no person shall be eligible to serve on said commission while holding a salaried public office, position or employment.

The term of office of the members of the said commission, subject to the provisions hereof relative to removal and the terms of the first mem-

(Continued on next page)
The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3.590 Commission; Composition

A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o'clock, on the 8th day of January, 1932, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of two other commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936. The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992, and on the expiration of these and successive terms, the mayor shall appoint their successors for four years. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS

3.650 Board Composition

The mayor shall appoint five seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $5,000 $7,000 per year. One such term shall expire at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934 and 1935, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936, and two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January 1996, and upon these and successive expiration the mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART NINE: PORT COMMISSION

3.580 Commission; Composition

The San Francisco Port Commission shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, their appointment being subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors. Each of said members shall serve for a term of four years. Vacancies on the commission shall be filled by the mayor for the unexpired portion of the term. Initial appointive members of the commission shall consist of the incumbent members of the San Francisco Port Authority, who shall serve as commissioners for a term corresponding to the unexpired portion of their tenure as members of the port authority. Subject to amendment of state law to authorize an increase in membership, the port commission shall consist of seven members. The two additional members shall be appointed by the mayor after the eighth day of January, 1992. The initial term of office not to exceed four years shall be fixed by the mayor to insure that the term of office shall be a majority of the commission shall not expire in the same year. In addition, the director of finance and secretary of agriculture and services, or their designated representatives, shall be ex-officio members of the commission. Persons appointed to the port commission shall be subject to recall, suspension and removal in the same manner as an elected official.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

3.651 Functions, Powers and Duties

Any applicant for a permit or license who is denied such permit or license by the department authorized to issue same, or whose license or permit is ordered revoked by any department, or any person who deems that his interests or property or that the general public interest will be adversely affected as the result of operations authorized by or under any permit or license granted or issued by any department, may appeal to the board of permit appeals. Such board shall hear the applicant, the permit-holders, or other interested parties, as well as the head or representative of the department issuing or refusing to issue such license or permit, or ordering the revocation of same. After such hearing and such further investigation as the board may deem necessary, it may concur in the action of the department authorized to issue such license or permit, or, by the vote of four five members, may overrule the action of such department and order that the permit or license be granted, restored or refused.

The board of permit appeals shall have and exercise the following powers:

(a) To hear and determine appeals where it is alleged there is error or abuse of discretion in any order, requirement, decision or determination made by the zoning administrator in the enforcement of the provisions of any ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors creating zoning districts or regulating the use of property in the city and county.

(b) To hear and determine appeals from the rulings, decisions and determinations of the zoning administrator granting or denying applications for variances from any rule, regulation, restriction or requirement of the zoning or setback ordinances, or any section thereof. Upon the hearing of such appeals said board may affirm, change, or modify the ruling, decision or determination appealed from, or in lieu thereof, make such other additional determination as it shall deem proper in the premises, subject to the same limitations as are placed upon the zoning administrator by this charter or by ordinance.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SEVENTEEN: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county.

The civil service commission shall consist of seven seven members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the 1st day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and, provided further, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall be as follows; one shall expire on June 30, 1996 and one on June 30, 1998, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. No less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this

(Continued on page 128)
PROPOSITION L

Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Candidates for elective office and members of charter boards and commissions must be San Francisco residents and electors. For other boards, commissions and advisory bodies, the law creating them may set residency requirements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L is a charter amendment that would require the members of all boards, commissions and advisory bodies to be San Francisco residents and electors.

This rule would not apply where a non-charter board, commission or advisory body requires a person with specific qualifications, and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found. Also, this rule would not apply to the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Fine Arts Museums, the Asian Arts Commission, the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission and the elected members of the San Francisco Retirement Board and Health Service Board.

Proposition L would delete the current requirement that candidates and members of charter boards and commissions be residents and electors for a certain length of time before assuming office, which courts have found unconstitutional.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “L”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh and Bill Maher.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

This charter amendment provides that all individuals serving on city boards and commissions and committees with few exceptions, must be citizens of voting age of San Francisco.

Members of boards and commissions and committees often have policy making and regulatory responsibilities. Clearly, San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco. With a population of 750,000 residents, surely we have enough qualified and talented San Franciscans who can get the job done.

This charter amendment offers the appointing officer with some flexibility. If a qualified candidate for a public post requiring specialized skills cannot be found in our city, then, following such a declaration, the appointing officer may search elsewhere.

Let’s open up more opportunities for our residents to serve San Francisco. VOTE YES FOR THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERSHIP ON CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I was mistaken in one of my objections to Proposition L. Some years ago, a court decision invalidated the voter-adopted Charter requirement that a person be a San Francisco resident for five years before appointment to a city commission. I disagree strongly with that decision, for the reasons cited in my ballot argument appearing on the opposite page. The inoperative language remained in our Charter, however, and Proposition L disingenuously removes it — like pruning a dead branch from a tree.

But, there are still plenty of reasons to vote against Proposition L.

(1) Proposition L eliminates the requirement that a commissioner be an “elector” of San Francisco (a voter, meaning also a U.S. citizen) for at least one year. This Charter provision has not been altered by a court, but Proposition L would strike it from the books.

A person could move into town, register to vote, and be appointed that day to a city post.

(2) Proposition L exempts three city commissions — Health System, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board — from any residency requirement whatsoever.

(3) Proposition L would allow non-residents to serve on any board or commission created by the Board of Supervisors. In fact, Proposition L could even be interpreted to allow the appointment of non-citizens to such posts!

Don’t be misled or confused. If you want San Franciscans to make decisions about San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition L!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

If you want San Francisco residents to serve on all city commissions established by the charter, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you think San Franciscans should serve on boards and committees created by the Board of Supervisors, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you favor city residents serving on the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees, vote NO on Proposition L.

The Board of Supervisors says "San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco." I agree completely. Trouble is, Proposition L weakens the existing residency requirement in our City Charter.

Charter Section 8.100 states that no person "shall be appointed as a member of any board or commission unless he shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years." Proposition L eliminates the five-year residency requirement! Proposition L also exempts from any residency requirement whatsoever members of the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees.

The idea behind the five-year residency rule is that city commissioners should have first-hand knowledge and personal experience of San Francisco’s people and neighborhoods, its problems and possibilities. City commissioners should not just rely on staff reports and statistical abstracts. Proposition L would destroy this sensible safeguard. Instead, a person could move into town and be appointed, that day, to a city post!

Finally, Proposition L purports to extend the Charter’s residency rules to advisory boards and committees established by the Board of Supervisors. But the residency requirement can be waived for a person “with specific experience, skills, or qualifications”. That’s a loophole big enough to drive a truck through!

San Franciscans should make decisions about San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition L.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for most advisory panels of the City.

Under Proposition L, panel members MUST be residents of San Francisco.

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for membership on the Health System Board, Retirement Board and War Memorial Board.

Under Proposition L, there is no change. Membership on the Health System Board and Retirement Board is by DIRECT ELECTION of city employees. The Health Fund and Retirement Fund are operated by and for city workers. Because employees are not required to live in the city, there are serious constitutional problems with denying a worker the right to be a candidate for trustee of a fund controlled by employees.

The way things are now, the courts have thrown out San Francisco’s five-year residency requirement. Reports the City Attorney:

"In the years since Charter Section 8.100 (residency rule) was originally adopted, the California courts have struck down all durational residency requirements applicable to candidates for elective or appointive office."

Most Supervisors like the durational requirement. But even Supervisors cannot overrule the Supreme Court.

The bottom line: Proposition L does not cover everything. Just most things. It’s time San Franciscans were making the decisions about San Francisco. Proposition L is a major start in the right direction.

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE. YES ON PROPOSITION L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

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

San Franciscans deserve to be represented by commissioners who live within San Francisco, not by employees filling in for their ex-officio bosses. Vote for San Francisco commissions made of San Francisco voters.

... Vote Yes on Proposition L!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

---

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Don’t clutter the Charter with unnecessary provisions. Vote No on Proposition L.

Proposition L would require almost all commissions and advisory board members to be city residents. That makes sense — so much sense that, for most commissions, it is already the law.

This is one more example of a needless Charter amendment. If the Board of Supervisors wants to require members of any advisory body to be city residents, they can pass an ordinance to accomplish it.

Adding an unnecessary provision to a Charter that is already too long and complicated is not the answer.

Vote No on Proposition L.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.100 Qualifications

(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she is shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years and in city thereof for at least one year immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retirement system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.680, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.

Notwithstanding this requirement, in the case of boards, commissions or advisory bodies established by legislative act, the residency requirement may be waived by the appointing officer, or entity upon a finding that the board, commission or body requires the appointment of a person with specific experience, skills or qualifications and after exercising due diligence, an eligible and willing appointee residing within the city and county could not be located.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 7 through Tuesday, June 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease. Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals it’s less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be TOXIC FREE 554-4333

HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR YOUR HOME'S TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday
8 am. to 4 pm. 554-4333
Commission Gender Composition

PROPOSITION M
Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by the Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?

YES 302
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter requires some City boards and commissions, such as the Police and Fire Commissions, to have at least one woman member. However, the charter does not have a general policy on balancing the number of men and women on City boards and commissions.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a charter amendment that would create a City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex. This charter amendment does not apply to the Commission on the Status of Women.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex.

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

Controller’s Statement on “M”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “M”

On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Bill Maher and Wendy Nelder.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
The 1990s are here — but you would never know it by the few women serving on City boards and commissions. In fact, of ten major commissions — Police, Fire, Airports, Ports, Public Utilities, Parking Authority, Social Services, City Planning, Elections, Housing Authority — women hold just 18 percent of the seats. And only one woman serves as a president of these commissions.

Women do not fare much better on other key commissions. For instance, women hold just two seats on the seven-member Recreation and Park Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission. Three women serve on the eleven-member Small Business Advisory Commission.

Despite the enormous influence and regulatory controls most commissions have over the lives of all citizens, women’s voices and leadership on city panels do not equal their numbers in society.

These gloomy statistics aside, women have begun to make gains during the past two years. Women are now being regularly considered and appointed to boards and commissions. But, clearly, much more needs to be done.

Proposition M will emblazon into the Charter a policy goal of gender equality on all boards and commissions. This amendment, authored by Supervisor Richard Hongisto, is a simple measure of justice.

Only the Commission on the Status of Women is excluded from the provisions of this charter amendment, since its sole purpose is to serve as an advocacy forum for women.

Increasingly, communities and groups are instituting gender parity provisions in their constitutions with much success. For instance, the Democratic Party has dramatically brought about near gender equality of delegates to its national and state conventions.

Let’s start the 1990s off with a renewed commitment to fairness and equality.

VOTE YES ON THE GENDER PARITY AMENDMENT.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition M
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition M
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M moves San Francisco into the 1990s.
It is stunning to review the composition of our city boards and
commissions and see just how few women are serving. Women
comprise 18 percent of the seats on ten major commissions. This
is an untold tragedy. Women have been making gains in recent
time. We can do even better.
Proposition M is about fairness and equality. Iowa enacted a law
in 1987 to require greater gender balance on all boards, commis-
sions, committees, and councils.
Vote Yes for Gender Justice. Yes on Proposition M.

SF Chapter, National Organization for Women
Legal Advocates for Women
San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Judiciary Project/California
TJ Anthony
Mary C. Dunlap
Ruth Picon, President, Latino Democratic Club
Helen Grieco, Director, SF NOW
Laura Campbell
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Agar Jaicks, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Greg Day, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Jean K. Harris
Geraldine Johnson
Joyce Newstat, Chair, Lesbian Caucus, Harvey Milk Lesbian &
Gay Democratic Club
James Harrigan

Creating political leadership opportunities for women will
strengthen the public policy decision-making process.
Vote YES on M.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

As a predominately lesbian and gay Republican volunteer organ-
ization we believe it is a travesty that after fifteen years of three
liberal Democrat mayors only 38% of the city’s Commissioners are
women. This negligence has prompted the need to enact gender-
parity. We support Proposition M.
In the future, the provisions of Proposition M should be amended
to apply to the Commission on the Status of Women. Women and
men must actively dialogue so that our city begins to address the
concerns of all.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw
Paul Kavouksarian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence

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

Requirement that any commission be comprised of a certain number of persons of any gender is as inappropriate as requiring a certain number of persons who have red hair or blue eyes. Please vote to maintain the mayoral prerogative to appoint the best San Franciscans for the job.

Vote No on Proposition M.
Like Proposition L, but only more so, Proposition M does not belong in the City Charter.
The power to make appointments to boards and commissions rests with the Mayor. Proposition M would write into the Charter a non-binding policy statement urging the Mayor to fill not more than 50% plus one of any commission with members of the same sex.
The City Attorney advised the Board of Supervisors that the Constitution prohibits the city from adopting a quota for male and female appointments. Instead, the Board of Supervisors proposes to clutter up the Charter with a non-binding, legally unenforceable policy statement.
If the Board of Supervisors wants to send a message to the Mayor it should be done by resolution, not costly and unnecessary Charter amendments.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “M”
There is nothing in the charter NOW that prevents the Mayor or Board of Supervisors to appoint more women to achieve gender parity now.

Why now does it have to be written in concrete.
Vote NO on “M”.

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION M

NOTE: Entire section is new.
3.503 Composition of Boards and Commissions.
It is the policy of the city and county, which
shall be considered a goal when filling vacancies
on boards or commissions appointed by the
mayor, or otherwise provided by this charter,
except for the Commission on the Status of
Women, to achieve gender parity on these boards
and commissions by limiting to a simple majority
of board and commission membership the num-
ber of members who are of the same sex.

***************

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be
Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 24.

***************
MISSING SOMETHING IN YOUR LIFE?

If your life seems to be missing that special warmth that comes from having a pet, come and see us at the new San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department. We have a wide variety of dogs, cats and other animals available for adoption.

A waggly tail, a sweet meow or a gentle squeak - it'll make you glad to come home at night.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PROPOSITION N

Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?

YES 305
NO 307

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter does not limit the number of consecutive terms a person may serve on the Board of Supervisors. A full term on the Board of Supervisors is four years.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a charter amendment. Under Proposition N, no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors. After two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, a person must wait four years before serving again. Any person appointed to the Board of Supervisors to complete more than half a four-year term would be considered to have served one full term. A member of the Board of Supervisors who resigned with less than half a four-year term remaining would be considered to have served a full term. This charter amendment would go into effect July 1, 1990. Each Supervisor holding office on that date would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when his or her current term ends.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the charter so that no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors and you want to prohibit persons who served two consecutive four-year terms from serving on the Board of Supervisors again until four years after their second consecutive term in office.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to limit Supervisors to serving two consecutive terms.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On January 25, 1990, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition N to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,151* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 45,408 of the signatures submitted were valid, 5,257 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is a non-partisan, reasonable, fair and democratic measure to reform our government and improve the present city-wide system for electing supervisors. Neighborhood, civic leaders, current and former elected officials, community activists, business owners, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, unionists, and minorities all support Proposition N.

Limiting politicians' consecutive terms is not radical or extreme. In fact, it helps to prevent political corruption and power grabbing. More than 150 cities, towns and counties in the United States have laws limiting politicians terms. Governors in 30 states can only serve two terms. San Mateo county limits supervisors terms and for more than 30 years San Francisco's mayors have been limited to two consecutive terms.

Proposition N is a very modest and reasonable proposal.

Proposition N does not recall or force any current member of the board from office. Proposition N allows supervisors whose terms expire in 1991 to serve until January 1995 if they are reelected. Supervisors whose terms end in 1993 may serve until 1997 if reelected. Former supervisors may run for office again after 4 years.

The current system favors incumbent politicians and denies experienced newcomers a fair chance to serve. Since 1973, only 3 newcomers have been elected to the city-wide board. 5 supervisors have already served 10 years. By 1995 most board members will have been in office 14 years or more.

We know that a lake or pond will stagnate unless its waters are replenished from time to time. So too will an elected body grow stale without a regular infusion of fresh faces and new ideas.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Richard Bodisco  
Chairman, San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
Steve Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu
Harold Hoogasian
Joseph L. Powell
Raymond Chalker
Robert A. Reveles
Robert C. Sanchez
Joel Ventresca
Barry Lastra
Daniel Willsan

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N backers have misrepresented the facts to get you to vote for N. Since just 1982 three non-incumbent supervisors have been independently elected to the Board. Proposition N is not true reform — it only tinkers with the citywide election process. It is not democratic — it takes power away from the people. It is not a solution — it’s an additional problem.

Supervisors are elected to carry out the will of the people. When they fail to serve, they are unelected — by vote of the people. Appointed department heads, who are not supposed to have their own political agendas, are balanced only by the Mayor’s and the Board’s overseeing eyes.

With the Mayor already limited to two terms, the Board must not consist only of rookies and lame ducks, or department heads can consolidate their power and hide their time, waiting until watchdog Supervisors are automatically thrown from office. Proposition N threatens accountability and increases the chances for bureaucratic corruption.

Uninformed actions are foolish actions — closely examine the facts, and you’ll agree that blindly forcing change is a bad plan. If Proposition N passes, nothing can stop department heads from installing power bases immune to voter inspection. Voters have the right to choose — this measure permanently limits that right.

PROTECT YOUR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Two years ago, San Francisco voted on Proposition O, a recall of the Board of Supervisors thinly disguised as a ‘good government’ initiative. San Franciscans saw through this scheme, and sent the measure down to defeat.

Last year, the same group attempted to offer a similar proposal to the voters, but failed to collect enough signatures to qualify it for the ballot.

Now they’re at it again.
They say that Supervisors have lost touch with the people of San Francisco, and should automatically be thrown from office after they’ve served two terms — but by bringing up this rejected issue again and again, they’re proving that THEY are the ones who are out of touch.

San Francisco doesn’t need a two-term limit. When supervisors stop working for the people, they stop getting elected. If Board members are prematurely removed, more power falls into the hands of civil servants and department heads, who are unaccountable to the voters. These unelected officials who already hold great power must be balanced by supervisors free to do their jobs, or citizens lose their representation.

The diversity of our City is one of our greatest strengths. San Franciscans have always individually evaluated our city’s varied issues, judging each on its specific merits. The Board of Supervisors is similarly diverse, and should also be evaluated selectively. Citizens should use the election process to tell their representatives when they’re not doing their jobs — not by acting blindly and installing an arbitrary time limit. San Franciscans are smart enough to tell the difference between voting an incompetent out of office and firing a valuable employee without cause.

Proposition N denies San Franciscans the right to vote for legislators of their choice, and that’s not fair.

Vote NO on Proposition N.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Let’s talk about what WE want City Hall to do for US, not the politicians.

Politicians will tell you anything to advance their political careers.

They won’t tell you the TRUTH about the Two Term Limit. The politicians say we failed to collect enough signatures last year to qualify for the ballot.

But here’s what their appointee, the city’s Chief Administrative Officer says:

“Last year’s Proposition removal was forced by an error, one which we admitted, apologized for and tried to repair . . .”

(Letter to Two Term Limit — Chairman — Richard Bodisco, dated February 7, 1990.)

We need new leadership in City Hall.

We have some hard and serious problems to solve in San Francisco and we can’t solve them with political rhetoric and name calling.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N removes experienced supervisors from the Board.

FACT:

Proposition N insures that San Francisco will always have 5 or 6 supervisors with seniority and experience on the Board. Proposition N also gives experienced and concerned citizens an opportunity to serve without needing to become professional, career politicians.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N will take away your right to vote for a legislator of your choice.

FACT:

Proposition N gives you more choices because it removes the current system which favors incumbent politicians.

The politicians have spoken too long for themselves. It is time City Hall spoke for us.

Vote YES on Proposition N!

Submitted by San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Richard Bodisco

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

This citizen’s initiative is a good government reform measure which will guarantee change, encourage competition, improve the chances of electing new political leadership, and curtail the influence of special interests.

Vote YES on N.

SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

Change is the driving force in our economy, our lives… and our government! Eight years on the Board of Supervisors is enough time to initiate changes espoused in any candidacy. Our City government is in desperate need of change. Vote for new life in San Francisco government.

… Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

The longer supervisors remain in office the more likely they become captives of special interests who bankroll their costly campaigns.

Entrenched incumbent politicians often end up working against the public interest, rather than for it.

Only two supervisors have been defeated at the polls since the end of 1980.

New faces, new ideas, new leaders, and new directions are needed at City Hall.

Vote YES on N.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

The Two-Term Limit is an idea whose time has come!

The United States Constitution limits the President to two terms in office. Similarly, the San Francisco Charter limits our Mayor to two terms.

Incumbent San Francisco Supervisors, however, continue to win re-elections year after year. This has made many of them less accountable to the voters.

Eight years is enough! Let’s bring new people, new ideas, and new energy to our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Citizens for a Better San Francisco

It works for executive offices, let’s put a limit on the terms of service for our supervisors. As Thomas Jefferson called it, “rotation in office”. Let’s have some healthy competition for these positions, let’s take advantage of the many experienced people around who are willing to serve. Let’s vote YES on Proposition N for reasonable reform.

John and Carol Maerske

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will ensure that we have a Board of Supervisors of concerned citizens, not career politicians.

For almost forty years, San Francisco has limited its Mayor to eight years in office. Many cities around the Bay Area, such as San Jose, Richmond, Mountain View and Redwood City, limit terms in office for their city councils. Yet we have had supervisors serve up to 16 years in office. Why? Because by raising large sums of money and using the power of incumbency, supervisors face little chance of defeat when running for re-election.

Proposition N will not remove any member of the Board of Supervisors from office. It is a fair proposal that allows each current supervisor to run for one more four year term. But in the future, each supervisor will be limited to eight years in office.

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will give the city fresh leadership on the Board of Supervisors. It will open up the city’s political processes, reversing the trend in recent years towards full-time professional politicians. Most importantly, it will mean that our elected representatives put the city’s needs and interests ahead of their desire for re-election.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

---

I’m supporting Proposition N because of my concern about the status of women and children in San Francisco.

As a long time supporter and treasurer of a shelter for battered women in the City, I have had the opportunity to closely observe how our City government works. I think there are more important things than politics.

San Francisco needs leaders in government who will show more compassion and concern about peoples’ lives as opposed to their reelection campaigns.

I don’t feel that every member of the Board of Supervisors is bad, but the two term limit will improve the current system and help our Supervisors do a better job for us.

That is why I am voting YES on Proposition N.

Millie Favetti

---

Over the past 20 years women have made enormous gains in electoral politics. The situation is far, far from ideal but some positive changes have taken place. Therefore, we think it is important to encourage and support the entry of women into elective politics.

We’re supporting Proposition N because it ensures that more women will have the opportunity to assume leadership roles in City government. The two year experiment with district elections produced more women supervisors than at any other time in San Francisco’s history.

The gains women have made could be easily lost under the current city-wide system. Proposition N will prevent the clock from being turned back because it allows newcomers a fair chance to compete without always having to run against entrenched incumbents.

Proposition N is equitable and fair to everyone. Join us and vote YES on Proposition N.

Helen Dawson
Miriam Smith

---

As a small business owner and long time resident of San Francisco, I’m supporting Proposition N because it makes good sense for our City.

Limiting Supervisors’ terms will create a Board of Supervisors more accountable to the needs of San Franciscans. Under the current city-wide system, to many Supervisors see service on the Board as a career.

They worry more about keeping their seats than about doing the job they were elected to do. As a result, politics is all to often put ahead of the City welfare.

Let’s get politics out of City Hall.
Vote YES on Proposition N.

Zdenka Bodisco
Mike Salerno
Harold Hoogastian
Small Business Owners

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

We're supporting the Two Term Limit because San Francisco needs new political leadership. The Two Term Limit will open the "Door of Opportunity" for new candidates to serve on the Board of Supervisors.

The Two Term Limit will allow a new generation of civic leaders to represent our City. It is a fair and democratic way to reform the current system and to restore citizens' confidence in City Hall.

San Francisco's government should reflect the diversity of the people who live here. This is the meaning of a Democratic and free system. The Two Term Limit insures that new people with new ideas will have a fair chance to serve the City.

Don't be fooled by arguments of professional, career politicians. The Two Term Limit is good for our community and it is good for San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Steve M. Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu

WHY DIDN'T WE GET TO VOTE ON THE TWO-TERM LIMIT LAST YEAR?

Because Louise Renne found a legal loophole to get the measure thrown off the ballot after the Registrar of Voters had certified that it qualified for submission to the electorate.

Never mind that when Renne violated a number of election laws several years ago she got everyone to overlook the "technicality."

But what do you expect?

This is the same Louise Renne who sued the Olympic Club because it had no female members conveniently "overlooking" the fact that her husband Paul belongs to the all-white, all-male San Francisco Golf Club.

Say "No" to Renne's legal machinations!
Vote "Yes" on "N."

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

WHAT ARE THEY AFRAID OF?

Why are the Supervisors and their contributors fighting the two-term limit so hard?

Why did City officials use a legal loophole to get this same measure thrown off the ballot last fall?

Are they afraid they won't be able to give away another city street worth $9 million to the Rockefellers for free like they did in 1987?

Are they afraid that the people might vote to turn them out?

Clean up City Hall! Yes on N!

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic Senate Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman
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Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The Two-Term Limit is a reform whose time has come! At the Federal, State, and Local levels, political reformers agree that the powers of incumbency virtually preclude incumbents from being defeated at the polls, and that term limitation is the only way to ensure turnover in legislative bodies. Even Attorney General John Van de Kamp has proposed a twelve-year limit for State legislators.

Since the return to City-wide elections in 1980, only two incumbent Supervisors have been defeated at the polls. They were replaced by Wendy Nelder and Angela Alioto — the daughters of a former Police Chief and Mayor, respectively. Because of this trend, Supervisors have become burned-out, complacent, less accountable to the voters, and more beholden to the special interests who contributed to their re-election campaigns.

New blood is badly needed in any legislative body to keep it healthy and alive. Many non-incumbents have an agenda, new energy, and fresh approaches to governing. If they are allowed to be elected and they are competent, they should be able to translate their agenda into legislation in eight years and then move on to higher office. If they aren’t able to enact their agenda, either they are incompetent or their agenda is out-of-step with the sentiments of the City. In either case, there is no need for Supervisors to serve on the Board more than eight years.

Proposition N will remedy stagnation on our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on N.

Harold M. Haagastian
Christopher L. Bowman

Proposition N would limit San Francisco supervisors to two consecutive terms of office, just like the mayor. It’s a modest reform that deserves your vote.

Proposition N would not force any incumbent out of office. All current supervisors could run for one more term after their present term expires. And after four years, they could run again and hold office for two more terms.

The President of the United States has been limited to two consecutive terms of office since 1951. The Mayor of San Francisco has been limited to two consecutive terms since 1953. San Mateo County has a term limit for its board of supervisors. Proposition N is not a new or radical idea; it’s an overdue reform for a stagnant system.

The founders of our city charter envisioned supervisors as part-time citizen legislators, not full-time professional politicians. Proposition N respects and revives that tradition.

A bit of fresh air never hurt anybody — even two-term supervisors!

Please vote YES on Proposition N.

Senator Quentin Kopp

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

The current system of electing supervisors in San Francisco badly needs reform. But Proposition N is not the answer. The Board of Supervisors is not accountable to the people, largely because of the pernicious influence of large monetary contributions. A two-term limit would only exacerbate the problem. All supervisors would either be rookies or lame ducks, resulting in a tremendous shift of power to the bureaucracy, without lessening the powerful influence of money in campaigns.

What San Francisco needs is real campaign reform — limiting the ability of supervisors to vote on the pet projects of their major contributors, and district election of supervisors. Both would greatly reduce the enormous sums of money needed to run for office citywide.

Proposition N is a false promise of reform. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N!

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943 and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and a public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, 11 members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected to a term of four years, from the commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the eighth day of January, 1981, shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on said date and the 11 persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said eighth day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms. Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the eighth day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the eighth day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor, or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

The effective date of this section as amended is July 1, 1990. All supervisors holding office on that date shall be deemed to have served one full four year term upon the expiration of their then current terms of office.
Hypodermic Syringes

PROPOSITION O
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?

YES 309
NO 310

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law regulates the sale, distribution and use of hypodermic syringes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

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

Controller’s Statement on “O”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

"Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted it would not affect the cost of government."

How “O” Got on the Ballot
On September 15, 1989 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,173 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,774 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.
Hypodermic Syringes

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

The connection between AIDS and unclean needles is unchallenged. Virtually every authority on the subject agrees that sharing needles increases the chances of contracting AIDS. San Francisco has an estimated 13,000 IV drug users, each of whom is at risk of contracting AIDS and spreading it to their sexual partners or their unborn children. Tens of thousands of people are being directly threatened with contracting AIDS because it is illegal to obtain clean, safe needles.

Some groups are trading clean needles with addicts for their dirty ones. This removes contaminated needles from circulation and can dramatically cut the infection rate among drug users and their partners. But these groups face up to a six months in jail and a $1,000 fine. One member of this group, who lost her mother to AIDS, contracted through a dirty needle, said, "I lost a parent to this because this bureaucracy sits around and talks while lots of people are dying." Dr. John Newmeyer of the Haight Ashbury Free Medical Clinics said, "People are dying because of our institution's resistance to AIDS risk reduction methods."

In an attempt to stop this disease from being spread to drug users and their partners AIDS prevention workers are risking legal persecution. Jerry DeJong, who works with substance abusers and is a member of the Mayor's Narcotic's Task Force, said "... with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what's sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives." But in a sane, free society it shouldn't be necessary to break the law to save lives.

The only way this deadly policy can be changed is for the state legislature to change the law. These State laws should be repealed.

Pamela Williard Pickens
Secretary San Francisco Libertarian Party

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition O
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition O
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 0

Dr. John Watters of the Urban Health Study says that, "The middle class have access to clean needles." Poor people can't get clean needles, because they are illegal. Black and Latino IV drug users have a more difficult time finding clean needles and are thus more likely to be infected with AIDS. Because minorities are more likely to be infected with AIDS a higher proportion of their sexual partners or unborn children are being infected. AIDS is likely to become the leading cause of death in young Blacks and Latinos if things continue as they have. Legal clean needles will help save their lives.

Christina Groth

The San Francisco Department of Health estimates that there are 13,000 IV drug users in the city. If clean needles remain unavailable to them the AIDS infection rate can easily reach over 60%. If these 60% infect just two other people either through shared needles or sex, the total number of infected people can reach 23,400. San Francisco can't afford the financial burden it is under today from AIDS cases. Prevention through clean and legal needles can save us millions of tax dollars without costing us a cent. Legal needles make financial sense.

Isaac Klein

The San Francisco Chronicle has reported on the use of needles for IV drug use in Scotland. The newspaper said that in Edinburgh police launched a crackdown on the availability of clean needles. Within 18 months of the crackdown 50% of all IV drug users were infected with AIDS. Soon their sexual partners and unborn babies were infected with the disease. But 30 miles away in Glasgow the police took no action against the availability of clean needles and only 4 to 7 percent of needle users were infected. Dr. Roy Robertson, Edinburgh's leading authority on AIDS said, "Making needles available to addicts is not the only answer to the problem of AIDS among drug users but certainly, it has to be part of the solution."

VOTE YES!

George Meyer

WHAT IS CANADA DOING RIGHT?

In Canada, fewer than 1% of AIDS cases are from needles!

In the United States, about 50% of new cases now involve needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners and babies, (up from about 20-30% in the beginning of the epidemic).

What is Canada doing right?

The AIDS epidemic has hit here many times worse than there. Why?

In Canada, drug-users can buy sterile needles in drugstores.

GRASSROOTS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 0

SURGEON GENERAL KOOP ON CLEAN NEEDLES
“One of the strongest advocates of making needles legal is Surgeon General Koop who addressed that issue last November (1987):
“...I’m asked about clean needles everywhere I go. I’ve always said the same thing. **If clean needles will do anything to contain a part**
of the epidemic, we should not have any foolish inhibitions about so doing.**”
(S.F. Sentinel 1/22/88)
Wm. Schwartzman, M.D.

Clean needles cause no diseases.
Legal needles are clean needles.
Vote Yes.

William Schwartzman, MD

Does this initiative “condone drugs”?
If you vote Yes, that could be interpreted as condoning drugs.
But if you vote No, that could equally well be interpreted as **condoning the spread of AIDS** (and hepatitis, and many other diseases).
The present state law is like the “death penalty” — not just for drug abusers, but also their spouses, their babies, transfusion recipients and others. Who can “condone that”?
GRASSROOTS

The AIDS epidemic was caused by a combination of germs, working together to collapse the immune system.
N.Y.’s health department has concluded that the HIV epidemic already existed among New York addicts in the 1970’s.
That epidemic existed only because New York has laws against addicts buying clean needles.
If we keep these deadly laws, no one can predict what future epidemics might result.
GRASSROOTS

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
ENCOURAGES STERILE NEEDLES
The National Academy of Sciences, the country’s most prestigious scientific organization in 1986, issued a major study titled “Confronting AIDS”. Many lives could have been saved if California had promptly implemented the conclusion drawn by America’s leading scientists:
“IT IS TIME TO BEGIN EXPERIMENTING WITH PUBLIC
POLICIES TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF STERILE NEEDLES AND SYRINGES BY REMOVING LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS TO THEIR POSSESSION AND USE.”
Wm. Schwartzman, MD
Wm. Steinsmith, MD

The issue is not “free needles”.
Some of us believe that mass giveaways of clean needles is best.
Others of us believe it would be enough if doctors and pharmacies were allowed to sell needles, as with diabetes.
Legal needles are as cheap as ballpoint pens, so cheap that price
would be no barrier.
This initiative takes no position on “free needles” programs, only
for legalization — a prerequisite for either approach.
GRASSROOTS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Under present California law, even doctors aren’t allowed to provide needles except for approved purposes. So far “stopping AIDS” is not an approved purpose.

Under “legalization”, needles are a medical question, not a police question. A doctor’s prescription could still be required, as with diabetes. Whatever controls are adopted, needles will be better controlled under legalization than they are now.

William Steinsmith, M.D.

Dr. Don Francis, an epidemiologist with the Centers for Disease Control said, “We can’t overstate the threat of AIDS among addicts in the minority population in the inner city.” Dr. Francis says that there is no evidence that legal, clean needles increase the use of drugs. The only thing stopping clean needles is the law. It’s time for Sacramento to repeal the law and save lives.

Will Wohler

According to the New York Times a new, rare virus known as HTLV-II is spreading through the IV drug community because of needle sharing. Spread in the same manner as AIDS, this virus “could cause leukemia or other serious diseases and may exact a rising toll in future years.” Surveys have found that 20% of addicts in New Orleans were infected and in San Francisco a preliminary survey of blood donors showed this new disease has a higher rate of incidence than the AIDS virus. Because it can take as long as 20 years to develop no one can know for sure how many people have been infected. Clean, legal needles will stop the transmission of this disease. VOTE YES!

John Whisman

Clean needles save the lives of innocent victims of AIDS. Not everyone who gets AIDS because people share needles is an addict. Some are small babies. The Centers for Disease Control says 314 babies were born in 1988 with AIDS because their mothers used infected needles. Dr. James Buehler of the CDC said “We need to do what we can to prevent the sharing of dirty needles. Sharing dirty equipment is the worst problem.” In California it is illegal to obtain clean needles so addicts share. Because they share, babies are born with AIDS. Save lives. Legalize needles. VOTE YES!

Mark Pickens

Illegal needles, which force IV drug users to share unclean needles, is now the cause of over one-third of all AIDS cases in the United States according to the federal government’s Centers for Disease Control. In 1988, 10,747 people contracted AIDS because of sharing unclean needles. Some of these people never used needles themselves. 226 were men who had sex with women who used needles, 623 were women who had sex with men who used unclean needles and 314 were unborn babies. Over 1,000 people who don’t use drugs were infected because clean needles are illegal. VOTE YES FOR LEGAL, CLEAN NEEDLES!

Pamela Williard Pickens

Proposition O was endorsed by the Central Committee of the Democratic Party of San Francisco on March 21, 1990. VOTE YES!

John Whisman
Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Clean, legal needles will save lives. Jerry DeJong of the Mayor's Narcotics Task Force said, "The bottom line is that this is not a moral or legal issue. Unfortunately with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what's sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives." Something is very wrong when its

Ron Dorsey

Illegal needles are the primary means of spreading AIDS to minority communities. Most of the IV drug users and their partners who have been infected with AIDS are Black or Latino. Most of the babies born with AIDS because of needle sharing by their mothers are also Black and Latino. Blacks and Latinos are now more likely than ever before to become infected with AIDS because clean needles are illegal. Legal, clean needles will slow down the infection rate and decrease the number of deaths in minority communities. Illegal needles hurt Blacks and Latinos more than they hurt others. Support legal needles.

Jim Peron

Prof. Ethan Nadelman, in the Washington Post, reported that "The governments of England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, the Netherlands and several other countries have actively attempted to limit the spread of AIDS by removing restrictions on the sale of syringes..." Dr. Nadelman notes that there is growing evidence that legal needles do not increase the use of drugs but they do save lives.

George O'Brien

A former prosecutor of high-level drug dealers, Ben Clark, said in The Daily Recorder, a law newspaper, that legal restrictions on clean needles "have had the disastrous effect of forcing drug users to share syringes. Over half the addicts in New York State are infected with AIDS, and the rate of infection among intravenous drug users in Illinois is growing dramatically."

While some people may say addicts deserve to die, Clark notes, "... the issue is not simply whether society should sit back and watch addicts kill themselves off: AIDS transmitted by needles does not stay within the druggie population. Unborn children of AIDS-infected female users may become infected. The sex partners of persons with AIDS are exposed to the disease. Needle-sharing prostitutes interact with the drug-free heterosexual community on a daily basis." Clark says that clean, legal needles have never been proven to increase drug use but they do save lives. VOTE YES!

Sam Grove

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

There is no scientific evidence that unlimited and uncontrolled availability of hypodermic syringes/needles will stop the spread of AIDS. Proposition “O” would open the floodgates to the purchase and distribution of hypodermic syringes, without prescription, in drug stores, supermarkets and in the streets without medical supervision under the guise of stopping the spread of AIDS. Addicts will continue to commit crimes to pay for the dope since possession and sale of drugs, such as crack cocaine and heroin, will still be illegal.

Latest statistics show that over 80 percent of inmates in our already overcrowded jails are there for illegal drug offenses.

Who will protect the public against the careless disposition of these used needles by addicts?

Black communities in San Francisco are under siege from the sale of illegal drugs and the crime this produces. Approval of Proposition “O” by the voters permitting use of unprescribed legal needles and illegal drugs could leave the City open to millions of dollars in lawsuits for unsupervised use of a medical procedure by intravenous drug addicts from death and other causes.

WE URGE A “NO” VOTE ON PROPOSITION “O”. It should not be City policy to support the removal of all restrictions in the distribution, sale and use of hypodermic syringes.

Rev. Amos Brown
Hon. Naomi Gray
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Senator Quentin Kopp
Dr. Raye Richardson
Lulann McGriff
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Melvin Miles

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of $100.

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such a time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission after the regular daily working hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

This amendment shall become operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY: AIRPORTS COMMISSION

An airports commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall expire at 12 o’clock noon on September 1, 1996. On the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

All rights, claims, actions, orders, obligations, proceedings and contracts relating to the airport department under the public utilities commission existing prior to the effective date of these amendments shall not be affected by the adoption thereof, and shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the airports commission.

This amendment shall be operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY-TWO: PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION

3.698 Commission — Composition

A parking and traffic commission and the department of parking and traffic are hereby established. The parking and traffic commission shall consist of five seven members. If not in conflict with state law, members of the parking and traffic commission shall serve ex-officio as members of the parking authority.

The term of each member shall be for four years; provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section shall, by lot classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided further, that terms of the two commissioners created by the amendment of June, 1990 shall commence at 12:00 o’clock noon on the fifth day of December, 1992; and on the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month. Any person may serve concurrently as a member of the San Francisco parking authority and the parking and traffic commission.
Did you know that you can vote before Election Day? Vote absentee in person at City Hall (Room 158) starting May 7 or by mail — fill out the application on the back cover.
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IS GOING TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON ELECTION DAY A PROBLEM?

If you are unable to go to your polling place to vote on Election Day (Tuesday, June 5, 1990), you may vote by absentee ballot in one of two ways:

1. **Vote at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.** Starting on May 7 through June 5, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., you can vote in Room 158 at City Hall.

2. **Vote by mail.** Complete the application for an absentee ballot on the back cover. Tear or cut off the back cover, fold it in half with the address of the Registrar of Voters on the outside, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated, and mail the form.

Voters who have specified disabilities may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Please refer to page 24.

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside
(do not cut or tear off)

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
158 CITY HALL
Registrar of Voters
Germine C. Wong

RETURN ADDRESS
**LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE**

MAILING ADDRESS

**DO NOT REMOVE LABEL**

**BALLOT TYPE**

R6  43  90

**REPUBLICAN**

17th Assembly District
5th Congressional District

**PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:**
4400's, 4500's, 4800's, 5700's, 5900's

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside

**(do not cut or tear off)**

**ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION**

Must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990

June 5, 1990 Consolidated Primary Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>MIDDLE INITIAL</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX OR MAIL DROP ADDRESS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER AND STREET</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (if different from above)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.O. BOX OR STREET</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I HAVE NOT AND WILL NOT APPLY FOR AN ABSENTEE BALLOT BY ANY OTHER MEANS.

X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE (DO NOT PRINT)</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVENING PHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒⇒ I understand that voters with specified disabilities may qualify as Permanent Absent Voters. See page 24.

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 5, 1990

ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on
which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.
1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and
marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for
which you wish to vote.
2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the
ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the
numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked
in this booklet.

(Continued next page)

Sample Ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUNCH OUT THE DOT ON THE NUMBERED BOX ON THE BALLOT
CARD THAT IS THE SAME AS THE NUMBER OF YOUR CHOICE OF
CANDIDATE, OR "YES" OR "NO" ON MEASURES.

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.
中文说明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990. Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the "Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places" in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT

I authorized ____________________________________ , my __________________________________ (name) (relationship) to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name __________________________________________________________ Signature _________________________________

Date __________________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOBERNADOR / Governor</td>
<td>JEROME “JERRY” MC CREADY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrador de Mantenimiento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHUCK MORSAN</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman / Home Appraiser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de Negocios / Tasador de Hogares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICEGOBERNADOR / Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Aviator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aviador Ejecutivo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES ANTHONY F. SZYCHOWSKI</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Party Central Committee member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro Central del Comité del Partido</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Vote Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretario de Estado</td>
<td>Theodore J. Nicholoff</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Edmon V. Kaiser</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Paul Meeuwenberg</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partido Independiente Americano**

**Elections Primarias**

5 de Junio de 1990

**American Independent Party**

**Primary Election**

JUNE 5, 1990
PROCURADOR GENERAL
Attorney General

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Procurador General en este distrito)

本區無人登記提名，競選檢察官

COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS
Insurance Commissioner

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR INSURANCE COMMISSIONER IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Comisionado de Seguros en este distrito)

本區無人登記，候選為保險委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</th>
<th>Member, State Board of Equalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Electrical Foreman / Capataz Electricista Jubilado</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)

本區無人候選為聯邦衆議員

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

本區無人競選州參議員

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

本區無人候選為州衆議員

A 01, 03, 04 & 06
(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON
THE BALLOT FOR COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para
aparecer en la balota como Miembro del Comité Central del Condado
en este distrito)

本區無人登記，候選為縣中央委員會委員
| 州教育司 |
| SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA |
| State Superintendent of Public Instruction |
| 選一人 |
| Vote por Uno |
| Vote for One |

| MARK ISLER |
| Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios |
| 132 → |
| CAROL S. KOPPEL |
| Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador |
| 134 → |
| SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ |
| College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria |
| 135 → |
| BILL HONIG |
| State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública |
| 137 → |

| 高等法院法官, 第三號辦事處 |
| JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3 |
| Superior Court Judge, Office #3 |
| 選一人 |
| Vote por Uno |
| Vote for One |

| ALEX SALDAMANDO |
| Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal |
| 141 → |
| J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY |
| Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal |
| 143 → |

| 高等法院法官, 第五號辦事處 |
| JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5 |
| Superior Court Judge, Office #5 |
| 選一人 |
| Vote por Uno |
| Vote for One |

| CARLOS BEA |
| Incumbent / Titular del Cargo |
| 147 → |
| KAY TSENIN |
| Attorney / Abogada |
| 149 → |

| 高等法院法官, 第十五號辦事處 |
| JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15 |
| Superior Court Judge, Office #15 |
| 選一人 |
| Vote por Uno |
| Vote for One |

<p>| JEROME T. BENSON |
| Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior |
| 153 → |
| DONNA HITCHENS |
| Attorney / Abogada |
| 155 → |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

107
YES 185
NO 187

PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

108
YES 189
NO 190

GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

109
YES 192
NO 193

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

110
YES 195
NO 197

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

111
YES 200
NO 203
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990.
Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cierto cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluya: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos que han perdido sus viviendas que tienen las necesidades específicas de ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viviendas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa a quienes compran casa por primera vez.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ciento treinta millones de dólares ($30,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desembolsos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rodantes para ferrocarriles enteros o piezas. Sólo se vendrán en lotes como se indica a continuación: Todas las oficinas autorizadas deberán venderlos a partir de 7 sin importar si son días de pago o no.

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN PUEDE SER VINCULANTE PARA LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto basado en viviendas para reemplazar a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatales o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos por $1 millón a $2 millones por año.

ACTA PARA EL DECONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMPEÑOS DE 1990. Esta medida establecerá un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito del estado para el año 1990. A la altura de la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatales y locales para refiar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondrá nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, o instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecerá un aumento del 55% en los cobros por uso de caminos y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1 de agosto de 1990, y un censo adicional del 1 de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día la limitación en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuara disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciban al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES 211</td>
<td>NO 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands &quot;peace officer&quot; definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226</td>
<td>NO 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230</td>
<td>NO 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependerían de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.


ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la definición de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expanda la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Define los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los daños otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectúa significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce como se pondría en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,990,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requerirá el Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1,6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $100 millones).

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohibe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STATUTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Código</td>
<td>Acta</td>
<td>País/Descripción</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de las votaciones legislativas y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la redistribución pública y la posible redistribución por la corte. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN POR COMISIÓN, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos ostalectales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Riego &quot;Hastings,&quot; la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusivo. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejorías para la salud y seguridad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aditamentos a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aditamentos a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aditamentos a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 259   | NO  | ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

A

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

B

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

C

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and clearing up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

D

WITHDRAWN

E

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contratar una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que sean propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disposición del asiento, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se contrate más de $55,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $322,400,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEDA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (o los choques subsiguientes), y (ii) la mejora sísmica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iii) la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos varios relacionados a los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recogido durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual (d) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46,80 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32,20 por parcela durante los calores (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con uno o más usos residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $23,80 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16,10 por unidad de vivienda durante los calores (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles relevantes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, ciertos terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se dispone con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 02-13-B1 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990; y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

¿Tendrá el Concejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin líneas de crédito, sin el Contralor certifique que el costo no le interese a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

¿Crear la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vocadario y Limpieza de las Escenas en las Parques para pagar por ambulancias los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escenas de los parques, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un uno por ciento de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

ELIMINADA

¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 40.7 horas (después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de un porcentaje no más del 10% de los bomberos, deben de poder poner en alerta a los bomberos, sea de a uno solo o a todos, para que puedan desaparcar y tener un tiempo de respuesta de 24 horas que comiencen a las 8 a.m.?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288 → NO 289 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290 → NO 292 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293 → NO 295 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296 → NO 297 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298 → NO 299 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300 → NO 301 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302 → NO 304 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305 → NO 307 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309 → NO 310 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
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PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

288 SI 贊成 ¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Servidores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?

289 NO 反對

290 SI 贊成 ¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?

292 NO 反對

293 SI 贊成 ¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?

295 NO 反對

296 SI 贊成 ¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?

297 NO 反對

298 SI 贊成 ¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?

299 NO 反對

300 SI 贊成 ¿Será un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen los regalos a los miembros de los consejos y comisiones, y que los residentes de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos nombrados, o a los cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o habilidad y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?

302 SI 贊成 ¿Se enmenderá la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuestos por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?

304 NO 反對

305 SI 贊成 ¿Se prohibirá que alguien presté servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona presté servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?

307 NO 反對

309 SI 贊成 ¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?

310 NO 反對

N 51, N 52 & N 53
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Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
☆ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

☆ Write your residence address where indicated.

☆ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONS APPEAR ON THE FRONT PAGE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfírlo los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquellos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentaron una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRUINADA O DAñADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuelva la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.
ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)

Sample Ballot

President
CANDIDATE A
CANDIDATE B
CANDIDATE C

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.
中文说明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

**SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT**

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

**BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY**

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

**PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING**

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

---

**AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT**

I authorized ________________________________ , my ________________________________,

(name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name ________________________________ Signature ________________________________

Date ________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNOR</td>
<td>JEROME &quot;JERRY&quot; MC CREADY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrador de Mantenimiento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>CHUCK MORSA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman / Home Appraiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de Negocios / Tasador de Hogares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICEGOVERNOR</td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Aviator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aviador Ejecutivo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>副州長</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>副州長</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Party Central Committeemember</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro Central del Comité del Partido</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>専務委員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECRETARIO DE ESTADO  政務卿
Secretary of State

THEODORE J. NICHOLOFF
Business Executive
Ejecutivo de Negocios  商業行政人員

29

CONTROLADOR  市計官
Controller

EDMON V. KAISER
Doctor of Chiropractic
Médico Quiropráctico  骨椎醫生

36

Tesorero  財政部長
Treasurer

PAUL MEEUWENBERG
Marketing Consultant
Consultor de Mercadeo  市場顧問

45
PROCURADOR GENERAL  檢察長
Attorney General

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Procurador General en este distrito)
本區無人登記提名，競選檢察官

COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS  保險委員
Insurance Commissioner

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR INSURANCE COMMISSIONER IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Comisionado de Seguros en este distrito)
本區無人登記，候選為保險委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY</th>
<th>PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF</td>
<td>Retired Electrical Foreman / Capataz Electricista Jubilado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)

本區無人候選為聯邦衆議員

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Senador Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人競選州參議員

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人候選為州衆議員

A 02, 05 & 07
NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE IN THIS DISTRICT

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro del Comité Central del Condado en este distrito)

本區無人登記，候選為縣中央委員會委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Education Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior Court Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>William J. O'Connor</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Chaitin</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Tang</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Harrigan</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>Jerome A. de Filippo</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lillian K. Sing</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Ronald G. Kershaw</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Schwenger</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990**  
**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td><strong>HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td><strong>PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.</strong> Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.</strong> Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990.</strong> This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE**

**CUIDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990**

**PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Voto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDA Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone de una emisión de bonos por ciento veinte millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para programas de vivienda que incluyan: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias individuales sin vivienda. (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenan los requisitos específicos de los ancianos, infravalores y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone de una emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desembolsos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rodantes para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en rías. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone de una emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desembolsos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rodantes para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en rías. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone de una emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($100,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desembolsos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rodantes para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en rías. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto basado en propiedad a personas severamente incapacitadas, Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto basado en propiedad a personas severamente incapacitadas, Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para respender mejor la necesidad de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, caminos y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para respender mejor la necesidad de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, caminos y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para respender mejor la necesidad de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, caminos y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para respender mejor la necesidad de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, caminos y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 51, N 52 &amp; N 53</td>
<td>15-1N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 211 SI | 赞成 | 加州高级公务员、道德行为标准。设立最高其他道德行为标准法律。设立委员会来调整州选高级公务员的职位。设立立法法会。影响财政：政府支出增加不显著。期望委员会制定的薪酬和福利制度，州政府支出委员会实施措施的费用较低。 |
| 213 NO | 反对 |

| 215 SI | 赞成 | 保护州检察官的立法，立法修正案的初步提出。改善州检察官的法案。须在产生本月内签订。反对法案者将受加重的惩罚。对财政的影响：在1989-91年度，增加州检察官的薪酬。对州政府支出不显著。 |
| 217 NO | 反对 |

| 218 SI | 赞成 | 公共治安员的谈案，刑事惩罚。立法修正案的初步提出。重新定义，扩大公共治安员的名称和功能。对财政的影响：由于州政府支出不显著。 |
| 220 NO | 反对 |

| 222 SI | 赞成 | 刑事法律，修宪法及法规的初步提出。依照联邦宪法的规定，限制被告的宪法权利。此刑事法律是属于法规的转变。对财政影响：实施结果不显著，有可能增加或减少政府支出，因此其影响是难以估计。 |
| 224 NO | 反对 |

| 226 SI | 赞成 | 铁路交通工具公债法案。法律的初步提出。批准发行“普通义务公债”$1,900,000,000，主要是为发展乘客及市内铁路交通工具系统。对财政影响：偿还公债期超过20年，估计“一般经费”须付本金约：20亿元，利息约16亿元。平均每年摊销一至二亿元。 |
| 228 NO | 反对 |

| 230 SI | 赞成 | 野兽的保护，法律的初步提出。转移三千万元给保护野生动物基金。主要是为保护栖息地。限制捕猎活动。对财政影响：估计每年转移给野生动物基金的费用约一至二亿元。除此立法局还将下设其他款项的转移。合计每年物管管理的费用为150万元。 |
| 232 NO | 反对 |
LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.

YES 236
NO 238

REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STATUTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.

YES 240
NO 242

NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.

YES 243
NO 245

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.

YES 248
NO 250

EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.

YES 254
NO 256

1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 258
NO 259
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Resumen</th>
<th>N°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Legislatura, redistribución, ética, enmienda y estatuto constitucional de iniciativa.</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la votación pública y la posible redistribución por la corriente. Así, los costos son probablemente menores.</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN por comisión. Enmienda y estatuto constitucional de iniciativa.</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hecho, a cargo de la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS para la construcción de nuevas prisiones de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la autoridad de menores por medio de nueva construcción.</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1990年所監獄建築の公債法案。此法案將發行公債$450,000,000 以提供資金來建築新監獄，改善目前州監獄，青少年底教所過度擠壓的情況。</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS para instalaciones de educación superior de junio de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los colegios superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes “Hastings,” la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salubridad y seguridad.</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1990年6月的高等教育建築物公債法案。此法案將發行公債$450,000,000 以提供資金來建築或改善州公共高等教育機構的建築物，包括以下：加州的9個大學、州立大學的20個校區、州社區大學的71個校區、希斯汀（HASTINGS）法律學院、州海洋研究院及州立大學董事會於1990年7月1日或之前所通過批准的該州校建築物。此法案所批准資金的用途，將包括但不限于，課室、實驗室、圖書館、興建或改善及安全改善防震，其他健康或安全的設備。</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS para seguridad contra sismos y rehabilitación de edificios públicos de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiciones a prueba de sísmos, reparación, reemplazo y reubicación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1990年防災安全設施及公共建物重建公債法案。此法案將發行公債$300,000,000 以提供資金來重建、改善防災安全設施、修補、替換及搬遷那些因地震災損而變為危險的州及市府建築。</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS para instalaciones escolares de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolsos de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1990年學校建築物公債法案。此法案將發行公債$800,000,000 以提供資本支出來興建或改善學校的建築物。</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990

**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>WITHDRAWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contrar a una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la eliminación del asbesto, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se contrate más de $65,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $332,400,000 se vaya reduciendo por la cantidad de las reparaciones de los daños causados por terremoto desde el 17 de octubre de 1989. El porcentaje de la cantidad que se contrate se determinará según lo que establezca el FEMA del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

1990年公益安全改善公債。發行公債$332,400,000，用於補償、限制或改進三藩市及縣所擁有的建築，包括用於地震後的修建，減少地震危害的建築，清除石棉、建築物的銅器。只要每年於公債發行的數目不超過$65,000,000，並且從FEMA（聯邦緊急事務管理署）獲得的補貼金或是加州地震後修建及減少地震危害。補貼所得的補貼金將會減低為$332,400,000公債發行的數目。

三藩市聯合校區的建築物及建築物的第90-1號應著有無同意？於1990年10月17日地震後，聯校所造成的三藩市聯合校區的建築物損壞的修理，裝修或重建；已改良或中心及三藩市聯合校區其他建築的防火設施；已改良或防火及災害安全的三藩市聯合校區的建築物；因三藩市聯合校區校園的維修工程及其他建築的臨時費用將從一項特別稅，稅收總期為20年。a. 每間一室一廳住宅，每間一室一廳住宅及非住宅地皮在最初六年內，每年每間微幅$46，餘下的14年期間，每年每間微幅$32。b. 建築地面的住宅（設有一樓以上住宅單位在加一樓以上的公義用途）及數個家庭的住宅地面，每間住宅單位在最初六年內，每年每間微幅$23。餘下的14年期間，每年每間微幅$16。c. 住宅、數個家庭的住宅，混合用途及非住宅地皮的地面，分配方式及政府規定的詳細規定。d. 住宅議決第63之B條之宣佈，由市府規定於$12,000,000之內。

市議會是否通過選民投票之前及在某些指數債務的限制範圍內，有必要此非牟利公司交付股票租金，只須要計算時能保證市政府所付的淨利息比其他各種租賃計劃為低？

市府是否著力建立美化市街坊及清潔街屋的基金來美化三藩市街坊及清潔街屋的費用，讓商業及私有他們的資本來的百分之某一級基金，每年此百萬金會被動用來維持一百萬元基金？

否撤消

市議會是否著力建立美化市街坊及清潔街屋的基金來美化三藩市街坊及清潔街屋的費用，讓商業及私有他們的資本來的百分之某一級基金，每年此百萬金會被動用來維持一百萬元基金？
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

288 SI 贊成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?

289 NO 反對

290 SI 贊成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autoridad de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?

292 NO 反對

293 SI 贊成
¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?

295 NO 反對

296 SI 贊成
¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?

297 NO 反對

298 SI 贊成
¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?

299 NO 反對

300 SI 贊成
¿Serán los requisitos para los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional los mismos que los de los miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando el requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos o comisiones, en los cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o aptitudes especiales y no pueda encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?

301 NO 反對

302 SI 贊成
¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?

304 NO 反對

305 SI 贊成
¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos periodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un periodo completo de cuatro años cuando termine su periodo actual?

307 NO 反對

309 SI 贊成
¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?

310 NO 反對

N 51, N 52 & N 53

21-N
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
☆ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

☆ Write your residence address where indicated.

☆ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONS APPEAR ON THE FRONT PAGE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE
Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfora los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquellos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentaron una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRUIÑADA O DAÑADA
Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuelva la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS
Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. **Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.**

2. **O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.**

3. **O BIEN, una persona autorizada (deber ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.**

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.
ABSSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.
1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.
2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

Sample Ballot

President
CANDIDATE A 4
CANDIDATE B 5
CANDIDATE C 6

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.
中文说明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT
If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY
Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.
Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING
Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

______________________________________________________________
I authorized ___________________________________________________, my ________________________________
(name) (relationship)
to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to
☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name ________________________________________________________ Signature ________________________________

Date _________________________________________________________
GOBERNADOR
Governor

CHUCK MORSÁ
Businessman / Home Appraiser
Hombre de Negocios / Tasador de Hogares

JEROME "JERRY" MC CREADY
Maintenance Manager
Administrador de Mantenimiento

STATE

VICEGOBERNADOR
Lieutenant Governor

CHARLES ANTHONY F. SZYCHOWSKI
Party Central Committeemember
Miembro Central del Comité del Partido

MERTON D. SHORT
Executive Aviator
Aviador Ejecutivo

Vote por Uno
Vote for One

選一人
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Theodore J. Nicholoff</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Edmon V. Kaiser</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Paul N. Eeuwenberg</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROCURADOR GENERAL  檢察長
Attorney General

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL IN THIS DISTRICT)
(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL IN THIS DISTRICT)

COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS  保險委員
Insurance Commissioner

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR INSURANCE COMMISSIONER IN THIS DISTRICT)
(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR INSURANCE COMMISSIONER IN THIS DISTRICT)

本區無人登記提名，競選檢察官
本區無人登記，候選為保險委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY</th>
<th>STATE SENATE</th>
<th>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)</th>
<th>本區無人競選州參議員</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO</th>
<th>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</th>
<th>(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)</th>
<th>本區無人競選州參議員</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS</td>
<td>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>(No existe contienda para el puesto de Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)</th>
<th>本區無人候選為聯邦衆議員</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF</td>
<td></td>
<td>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Electrical Foreman / Capataz Electricista Jubilado</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 01, 03, 04 & 06
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY</th>
<th>COUNTY COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMITÉ DEL CONDADO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro del Comité Central del Condado en este distrito)

本區無人登記，候選為縣中央委員會委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name and Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Carol S. Koppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Samuel Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Bill Honig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Mark Isler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Alex Saldamando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>J. Dominique Olcomendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Carlos Bea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Kay Tsenin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Jerome T. Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Donna Hitchens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL Department #1</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL Department #2</td>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL Department #3</td>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL Department #3</td>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL Department #3</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL Department #3</td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASESOR</td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASESOR</td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASESOR</td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASESOR</td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSOR PUBLICO</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

PASSenger RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

GOVERNOR'S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor's time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDA Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990.
Esta acta dispone la emisión de bonos por ciento millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenan las necesidades específicas de ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compren casa por primera vez.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990.
Esta acta dispone la emisión de bonos por doscientos millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desembolsos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rodantes para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en rieles. Asigne dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resumen del cálculo por el Análisis de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatal y locales: Si todos los bonos autorizados fueran vendidos al 7.5 por ciento y pagados durante un periodo de 20 años típicamente, el Fondo General incurriendo en unos $1.6 mil millones para pagar por el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($750 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual de la venta de los bonos sería de $850 millones.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA EL DESCONEGESTAMIENTO DE TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOSSOS DE 1990.
Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para rincones mejores las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos rínditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida estabilizaría un aumento del 55% en los viajeros por peso de los viajeros en un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1er de agosto de 1988, y un costado adicional el 1er de enero de cada año siguiente a partir de ese año, y aumentaría el 10% de los ingresos asignados del estado para que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuará manejando que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciban al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los rínditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
211 SI 贊成
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce los costos al estado que dependerán de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

213 NO 反對

215 SI 贊成

217 NO 反對

218 SI 贊成
ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO, PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redfina y expande la definición de “oficial del orden público” que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expanda la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

220 NO 反對

222 SI 贊成
DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los demencias otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectúa significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondrá en ejecución y se interpretará la medida. Podrá haber un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

224 NO 反對

226 SI 贊成
TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,990,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

228 NO 反對

230 SI 贊成
PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohibe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $16 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

232 NO 反對
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Legislature. Reapportionment. Ethics. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Reapportionment by Commission. Initiative Constitutional Amendment, Statute. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 School Facilities Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

236 SI 贛成

LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/5 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: La abolición de la redistribución podría ser compensada parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la votación pública y la posible redistribución por la corriente. Los costos de las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores.

238 NO 反对

240 SI 贛成

REDISTRIBUCIÓN FOR COMISIÓN, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución. Tras varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.

242 NO 反对

243 SI 贛成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Administración de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

245 NO 反对

248 SI 贛成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes "Hastings," la Academia Martinica de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de junio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salud y seguridad.

250 NO 反对

254 SI 贛成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiciones a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

256 NO 反对

258 SI 贛成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.

259 NO 反对

1990年州监狱建筑的公债法案，此法案将发行公债$450,000,000用以提供资金来建筑新监狱，改良州监狱，青少年管教所过度拥挤的情况。1990年州高等教育建筑的公债法案。

1990年6月的高等教育建筑的公债法案。

1990年学校建筑的公债法案。

1990年防范安全设备及公共楼宇重建公债法案。此法案将发行公债$300,000,000用以提供资金来重建、改善防范安全设备，修缮、替换及更换那些因受地震损害而变为危险的州及市政府楼宇。
### A
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

- **YES 263**
- **NO 265**

### B
Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

- **YES 269**
- **NO 272**

### C
Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

- **YES 277**
- **NO 278**

### D
Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

- **YES 280**
- **NO 281**

### E
Withdrawn

### F
Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

- **YES 284**
- **NO 285**
263 SI 负成

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contratar una deuda en bonos de $322,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios de la ciudad de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del astillero, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando se contrate más de $65,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y si siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $322,400,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

1990年共有公共改善公债。发行公债$322,400,000，用以购买、新建或改建三藩市及所属拥有的设施，包括由于地震而毁损、
减轻地震造成的，设施、湄州省、或灾后通
道。只要在每财政年度发行公债的数量不
低于$65,000,000。并且从FEMA（联邦紧急
援助管理局）所获得的援助金或在加州相关
的财政补贴下建设及减少地震设施，建设所
用的援助金将平均
减低$322,400,000公债的数量。

265 NO 反对

269 SI 负成

¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el remodelado de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (ii) la mejora simétrica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iii) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos variados relacionados a los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recolectado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual: (a) para residencias familiares de parcelas residenciales, $460 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.25 por parcela durante los años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales, un terreno de uso industrial, de uso comercial, y parcelas residenciales de terrenos de uso mixto), $253 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los años siguientes al sexto año, con la excepción de parcelas residenciales de terrenos de uso mixto, $253 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los años siguientes al sexto año, con la excepción de parcelas residenciales de terrenos de uso mixto, $253 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los años siguientes al sexto año, con la excepción de parcelas residenciales de terrenos de uso mixto.

272 NO 反对

¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el remodelado de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (ii) la mejora simétrica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iii) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos variados relacionados a los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recolectado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual: (a) para residencias familiares de parcelas residenciales, $460 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.25 por parcela durante los años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales, un terreno de uso industrial, de uso comercial, y parcelas residenciales de terrenos de uso mixto), $253 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los años siguientes al sexto año, con la excepción de parcelas residenciales de terrenos de uso mixto, $253 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los años siguientes al sexto año, con la excepción de parcelas residenciales de terrenos de uso mixto, $253 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los años siguientes al sexto año, con la excepción de parcelas residenciales de terrenos de uso mixto.

277 SI 负成

¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores, y sujeto a límites de deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por delegada de una empresa sin líneas de servicio, y se adecuará en lo que respecta a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

278 NO 反对

¿Creará la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escuelas en las Paredes por pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las paredes de las escuelas en las zonas de propiedad de la Ciudad, y el fondo se proponer a las empresas que disponen hasta un 20 por ciento de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste semestral de 15 por ciento y un tope de $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

280 SI 负成

¿Se realizará una olla para la Comisión Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48,7 horas (después de lo cual un hombre ganaré un promedio de 48,7 horas extra) y permitirá que la Comisión sigas sin líneas, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración de los horarios y los horarios de comienzo de los días de las instituciones, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comiencen a las 8 a.m.?

281 NO 反对

ELIMINADA

284 SI 负成

SEPARADA

¿Se realizará una olla para la Comisión Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48,7 horas (después de lo cual un hombre ganará un promedio de 48,7 horas extra) y permitirá que la Comisión siga sin líneas, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración de los horarios y los horarios de comienzo de los días de las instituciones, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comiencen a las 8 a.m.?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Número</td>
<td>Propuesta</td>
<td>Traducción</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td>¿El Consejo de Supervisores tendrá la autorización de permitir a los ex-supervisores permanecer en el sistema de salud de la ciudad, si pagan el costo completo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en voz de jefe del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>¿El Consejo de Supervisores tendrá la autorización de celebrar contratos con el sistema de jubilación de empleados del estado para que los inspectores de seguridad, ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la ciudad sean miembros del PERS en esta condición?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el distrito escolar unificado de san francisco o el distrito de colegios comunitarios de san francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td>¿Será la comisión sobre los derechos humanos una comisión de la carta constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 SI</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a seis miembros?</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las comisiones de policía, bomberos, servicios sociales, puerto, servicios públicos, servicio social, aeropuertos y estacionamiento y tránsito, y de consejo de apelaciones de permisos de cinco a seis miembros?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>¿Serán requisitos que los miembros de las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la ciudad y que se enfoque elecciones a los miembros de otras comisiones, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no aplica a ciertos consejos enumerados, o en los que se requiere una persona con experiencia, capacidad o habilidades especiales y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de san francisco que cumple con estas condiciones?</td>
<td>¿Serán requisitos que los miembros de las comisiones de la carta constitucional sean residentes de la ciudad y que se enfoque elecciones a los miembros de otras comisiones, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no aplica a ciertos consejos enumerados, o en los que se requiere una persona con experiencia, capacidad o habilidades especiales y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de san francisco que cumple con estas condiciones?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Comisión Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca de las Mujeres, tenga más de una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la carta constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la comisión constitucional, con excepción de la comisión acerca de las mujeres, tenga más de una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos periodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos periodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el consejo de supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles relevantes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de san francisco solicitar a la legislatura del estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles relevantes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
☆ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

☆ Write your residence address where indicated.

☆ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONS APPEAR ON THE FRONT PAGE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones anteriores a perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perforé los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquéllos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentaron una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíe a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRuinADA O DAñADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuélvala la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el “Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los LUGARES de Votación” para que la balota pueda ser contada.
ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)

Sample Ballot

President
CANDIDATE A 4
CANDIDATE B 5
CANDIDATE C 6

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文说明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the "Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places" in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT

I authorized ________________________________, my ________________________________

(name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name ________________________________ Signature ________________________________

Date ________________________________
GOBERNADOR  
Governor

CHUCK MORSA
Businessman / Home Appraiser
Hombre de Negocios / Tasador de Hogares

JEROME “JERRY” MC CREADY
Maintenance Manager
Administrador de Mantenimiento

VICEGOBERNADOR  
Lieutenant Governor

CHARLES ANTHONY F. SZYCHOWSKI
Party Central Committeemember
Miembro Central del Comité del Partido

MERTON D. SHORT
Executive Aviator
Aviador Ejecutivo

Vote por Uno
Vote for One

21
23
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Vote Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Theodore J. Nicholoff</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Edmon V. Kaiser</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Paul Meeuwenberg</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO**

**ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS** 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

**AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY**

**PRIMARY ELECTION** JUNE 5, 1990
| POSITION                        | Election Date          | Candidates
|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| **PROCURADOR GENERAL**         | 1990-06-05             | (No candidates filed nomination papers to appear on the ballot for Attorney General in this district)
| **Attorney General**           |                        | (Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Procurador General en este distrito)
| **COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS**     | 1990-06-05             | (No candidates filed nomination papers to appear on the ballot for Insurance Commissioner in this district)
| **Insurance Commissioner**     |                        | (Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Comisionado de Seguros en este distrito)

本區無人登記提名，競選檢察官

本區無人登記，候選為保險委員
MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN  
Member, State Board of Equalization

NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON 
THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE 
in THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para 
aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos 
en este distrito)

本區無人候選為聯邦衆議員

THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR 
in this district)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人競選州參議員

NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT 
FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota 
como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人候選為州衆議員

A 01, 03, 04 & 06
(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON
THE BALLOT FOR COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para
aparecer en la balota como Miembro del Comité Central del Condado
en este distrito)

本區無人登記，候選為縣中央委員會委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol S. Koppel</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Rodriguez</td>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Honig</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Isler</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Saldamando</td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Dominique Olcomendy</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Bea</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Tsenin</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome T. Benson</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Hitchens</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The document contains a mix of English and Chinese text, indicating a bilingual election guide. The votes are indicated with arrows pointing to the right.
### CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990

#### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>GOVERNOR'S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>哥斯达黎加安第里安德</td>
<td>初选 1990年6月5日</td>
<td>省提案提交選民投票</td>
<td>超黨派投票</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990.**
   - Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluya: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenan las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

2. **ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990.**
   - Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de uso, desembolsos de capital, y para la adquisición de bienes raíces para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de día, y programas de tránsito en rieles. Asignarán el dinero de la Junta General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resumen del cálculo por el Análisis de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatal y locales. Si todos los bonos están vendidos al 7.5 por ciento y pagados durante un período de 20 años, el Fondo General invertirá en unos $1.5 mil millones para el capital ($1 mil millones) y el intereses ($750 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e intereses en los bonos sería de $90 millones.

3. **REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR, FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.**
   - Este acta extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

4. **EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS.**
   - Esta enmienda constitucional legislativa autoriza la transferencia del impuesto a viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo en los gobiernos estatal o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Junta General a que ponga en ejecución su disposición. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de recaudación de los impuestos probablemente de $1 mil a $2 millones por año.

5. **ACTA PARA EL DESCONEGONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990.**
   - Este acta estableció un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y ponía al día la ley para limitar las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para reflejar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Disponería nuevos rieles para usos para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, caminos locales, y otras instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida estabilaría un aumento de 50% en los cobros por peso de los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1990, y un centavo adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida ponía al día la ley para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, para el tránsito en gran escala, y para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuará disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciban al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y disponiendo que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean retenidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES, ÉTICA. Establishes laws of ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las aseasiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce los costos al estado que dependerán de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.


ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO, PENAS. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la definición de “oficial del orden público” que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

DERECHO PENAL, EMENDIA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectúa significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondrá en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales, o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requerirá del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVestre. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.


PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

PUBLICACIÓN DE LOS ASUNTos. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Simplifica la publicación de los asuntos, la creación de una comisión para la revisión de los asuntos. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos estatales por la creación de la comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>YES 236</td>
<td>NO 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>YES 240</td>
<td>NO 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>YES 243</td>
<td>NO 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>YES 248</td>
<td>NO 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>YES 254</td>
<td>NO 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>YES 258</td>
<td>NO 259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

236 SI 贊成
LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2.0 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la votación pública y la posible redistribución por la corriente. Los costos por las disposiciones para Ética son probablemente menores.

118

238 NO 反對

240 SI 贊成
REDISTRIBUCIÓN FOR COMISIÓN. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1982 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reducirá los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hecho cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.

119

242 NO 反對

243 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

120

245 NO 反對

248 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California. Las cuales incluyen los nueve recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Loyal "Hastings," la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1° de julio de 1990 inclusivo. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clases, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salubridad y seguridad.

121

250 NO 反對

254 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un emisión de bonos por trescientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiciones a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y reubicación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

122

256 NO 反對

258 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolsos de capital para construcción o mejoras de escuelas públicas.

123

259 NO 反對

N 51, N 52 & N 53

17-1N
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263
NO 265

A

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels ( parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269
NO 272

B

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277
NO 278

C

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

D

WITHDRAWN

E

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 284
NO 285

F
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

1990年6月5日

初選

90年公共安全改善公債

UIA, $332,400,000, 用於購買、興建或改擴展福岡市

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PUBLICA, 1990.

Para conterar una deuda en bonos de $323,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que sean propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la eliminación del estrés, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre que no se contraiña más de $50,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y, siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $323,400,000 se vaya reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

1990年公共安全改善公債

$323,400,000, 用於購買、興建或改擴展福岡市及有關所有的建屋，包括用地及建屋的維護、

90年公共安全改善公債

$332,400,000, 用於購買、興建或改擴展福岡市

学区的改善

学区的改善
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290</td>
<td>NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293</td>
<td>NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298</td>
<td>NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305</td>
<td>NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309</td>
<td>NO 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nº</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
<td>Opción 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen electores a los miembros de dichos consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos, comisiones o cuerpos asesores, o en los cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o habilidades específicas y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con esas condiciones?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuerta por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos periodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un periodo completo de cuatro años cuando termine su periodo actual?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Serán las personas de San Francisco sometidas a los cuestionarios de la Legislatura del Estado que tengan todas las preguntas en inglés y que se refieran a la fabricación, el uso o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
☆ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

☆ Write your residence address where indicated.

☆ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONS APPEAR ON THE FRONT PAGE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE
Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfore los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquéllos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentaron una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRUIJINADA O DAÑADA
Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuelva la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS
Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes al Registrador de Electores a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el “Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación” para que la balota pueda ser contada.
CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

Sample Ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>CANDIDATE A</th>
<th>4 ▲</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE B</td>
<td>5 ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE C</td>
<td>6 ▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文说明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT
If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY
Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.
Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING
Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT

I authorized ________________________________, my ________________

(name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name ________________________________ Signature ________________________________

Date ________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>CHUCK MORSA (Businessman/Home Appraiser)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>JEROME &quot;JERRY&quot; MC CREADY (Maintenance Manager)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>CHARLES ANTHONY F. SZYCHOWSKI (Party Central Committeemember)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT (Executive Aviator)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Theodore J. Nicholoff</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Edmon V. Kaiser</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Paul Meeuwenberg</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PROCURADOR GENERAL  
Attorney General |  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL IN THIS DISTRICT)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Procurador General en este distrito)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS  
Insurance Commissioner |  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR INSURANCE COMMISSIONER IN THIS DISTRICT)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Comisionado de Seguros en este distrito)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO</th>
<th>AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECTORAL PRIMARY, JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Electrical Foreman / Capataz Electricista Jubilado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>STATE SENATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT**

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)

本區無人候選為聯邦衆議員

**NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT**

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Senador Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人競選州參議員

**NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT**

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人候選為州衆議員
(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro del Comité Central del Condado en este distrito)

本區無人登記，候選為縣中央委員會委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Seat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Carol S. Koppel</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Rodriguez</td>
<td>College Education Dean</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Honig</td>
<td>State Superintendent</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Isler</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
<td>Alex Saldamando</td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Dominique Olcomendy</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
<td>Carlos Bea</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kay Tsenin</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>Jerome T. Benson</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donna Hitchens</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL DEPARTAMENTO #1</td>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
<td>ASESOR</td>
<td>DEFENSOR PUBLICO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td>Supervisor / Supervisor</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Law Teacher / Abogada / Maestra de Derecho</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>Deputy Assessor / Asesor Asistente</td>
<td>Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogada; Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDICIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASSESSOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDICIAL</td>
<td>JUDICIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUAN HARRIGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff’s Department’s Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

107
YES 185 ➔
NO 187 ➔

PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

108
YES 189 ➔
NO 190 ➔

GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

109
YES 192 ➔
NO 193 ➔

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

110
YES 195 ➔
NO 197 ➔

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

111
YES 200 ➔
NO 203 ➔
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone de emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluya: (1) refugio de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que tienen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados e incapaces del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

185 SI 贊成
187 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone de emisión de bonos por milis millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición del tren y vías ferroviarias para ferrocarriles de alta velocidad y urbanos para transporte de mercancías y pasajeros en los gobiernos estatal y locales. Se utiliza el dinero del Fondo Especial del Estado para amortizar los bonos.

189 SI 贊成
190 NO 反對

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende la vigencia de la ley que el Gobernador puede revisar la ley propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

192 SI 贊成
193 NO 反對

EXENCION DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto base a viviendas de personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatal o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones.

195 SI 贊成
197 NO 反對

ACTA PARA EL DESCONEGOSTAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLOGOS DE 1990. Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestión del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para reducir las peores implicaciones de la congestión de tráfico en las ciudades. Desvendría nuevos ríos de agua permitidos para reducir el tránsito por calles de alta velocidad. Por ejemplo, se establecería un límite de 60 km/h en las áreas urbanas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo para el estado.

200 SI 贊成
203 NO 反對

1990年房屋無家可歸者公義法案。此法案提供公義資金 $150,000,000 資助的房屋計劃包括以下：(1) 無家可歸者及家屬的緊急住房所及變動期房及新出租給個人及家屬的房屋，及符合老年人、殘障者及傷殘者特別需要的房屋及出租屋的修繕及維修給予首次買入者資助援助。

107

1990年房屋交通及空氣清潔法案。此法案提供私房公義資金 $150,000,000，資助獲取政府資金支持的私人車主及導致融資計算的。由加州【一般經費】來支付公義資金。以下為立法局分析報告所使用財政計算的估計。如果所有通過實施的公義資金及以之計量，支付期間為通常的每五年一次，於七十七千元一十八澳元未貼息貼息，七千九百九十九元五十萬公義資金，估計每年公義資金及見的數額為九萬六千澳元。

108

州長對立法的預算。法案的最終日期。立法議案。此法案將會延長立法該議案中立法的時間及改變立法的影響日期。對財政影響：無直接財政影響。

109

極度殘障者處境物業稅的立法修補案。它允許將稅務根據數轉移至極度殘障者自僱的房屋。對財政影響：無直接計提在公義影響。因法案修補案只批准立法局實施其規定。如果通過實施的公義資金，每年僅收不到一百萬至二百萬元之間。

110

1990年減輕交通養路及限制支出法案。此法案將實江。議案減輕交通養路計劃及限制公義城市支出的限制。因財政影響反映預算增加加州人口的需要。它將提供私房公義用來展示城市公義城市及大規模的公共交通設施來減輕交通養路。此法案將增加貨車運載收費百分之五及及由1990年6月1日開始，會增加之費用為每加侖六分。之後四年期間內，由每年1/1日起開始，之費用為每加侖六分。此法案會對加州養路稅款及以獲得資金來減輕交通養路、發展及完善交通道路、健康計劃、老年人及特定其他重要的計劃，同時亦會限制州及市政府支出。此法案將財政為公共教育及社區大學提供至少州「一般經費」預算的百分之三十，亦將規定超過州預算限額的收入會平均分給教育部及納稅人。

111
112 STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.

YES 211 →
NO 213 →


YES 215 →
NO 217 →

114 MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.

YES 218 →
NO 220 →

115 CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.

YES 222 →
NO 224 →

116 RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).

YES 226 →
NO 228 →

117 WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.

YES 230 →
NO 232 →
| N 51, N 52 & N 53 |

| PROPUESTAS A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL |

| 211 SI | 摺成 |
| 213 NO | 反对 |

**FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES, ÉTICA.** Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales elegidos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce los costos al estado que dependerán de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida. |

| 215 SI | 摺成 |
| 217 NO | 反对 |


| 218 SI | 摺成 |
| 220 NO | 反对 |

**ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO, PENAS, ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA.** Redefine y expande la definición de “oficial del orden público” que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado. |

| 222 SI | 摺成 |
| 224 NO | 反对 |

**DERECHO PENAL, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA.** Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectúa significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce como se pondrán en ejecución y se interpretarán la medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatales y locales e podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal. |

| 226 SI | 摺成 |
| 228 NO | 反对 |

**TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL, ACTO DE BONOS, ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.** Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría el Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones). |

| 230 SI | 摺成 |
| 232 NO | 反对 |

**PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE, ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.** Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Reapportionment by Commission, Initiative Constitutional Amendment, Statute. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 School Facilities Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
236 SI  Sí

LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Las ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de al votación pública y la posible redistribución por la corte. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores.

238 NO  No

REDDISTRIBUCIÓN FOR COMISIÓN, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, cuyos enredos de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la distribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.

240 SI  Sí

ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

242 NO  No

243 SI  Sí

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes "Hastings," la Academia Martílna de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1° de julio de 1990 inclusivo. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejorías para la salubridad y seguridad.

245 NO  No

248 SI  Sí

ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aditamentos a prueba de sismos, reparación, reconstrucción y modernización de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros en caso de terremotos y mejorarán la seguridad y la salud.

250 NO  No

120

121

254 SI  Sí

256 NO  No

258 SI  Sí

122

123

17-1N
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

**A**

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

**B**

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

**C**

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

**D**

**E** WITHDRAWN

**F** Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

263 SI 赞成

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PUBLÍCA, 1990. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción, y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del asbesto, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando se contralga más de $65,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $332,400,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

265 NO 反对

1990年公共安全改善公仪。发行公仪 $332,400,000，用于购买、建设或修缮三藩市及所属市的建筑，减少地震危害的设施，消除石棉的危险，并提供无障碍设施；如果每年的财政年度内发行的债券金额超过 $65,000,000，且能从FEMA（联邦紧急事务管理局）获得的补贴或加州地震后修复及其他联邦资金的补贴，债券的发行金额减少至 $332,400,000。

269 SI 赞成

Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (o los choques subsiguientes); (ii) la mejora o acondicionamiento de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco; (iii) la reubicación de las instalaciones de seguridad pertinente en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco; y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos relacionados con los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recolectado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual: (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.20 por parcela durante los siguientes cuatro (4) años, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una, o más unidades residenciales y otras usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los siguientes (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y que cumplan con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, la excepción para parcelas de uso mixto y no residenciales de dicho distrito, y las demás condiciones de la resolución No. 02-13-81 adoptada por el Conselho Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990; y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias.

272 NO 反对

277 SI 赞成

¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin límites de lucro, si el Contralor certifica que el costo neto a intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el costo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

278 NO 反对

280 SI 赞成

¿Creará la Ciudad un fondo de Empleo de la Escuela y Limpieza de las Escuelas en las Parques para pagar a los empleados de la Ciudad y limpiar las escuelas en los parques, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un umte porcentaje de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

281 NO 反对

ELIMINADA

284 SI 赞成

¿Se realizará una onmillada a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48.7 horas (después de la cual un bombero ganas hora extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de cambio de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 6 a.m.?

285 NO 反对

五 撤消

286 SI 赞成

市参议会议员未通过选民投票之前及在某些提案具有相关限制的前提下，根据批准的租赁设备，只要主可将能证明市政府所付的利息比其他租赁设备计划的利息少？

287 NO 反对

E F

市府应否设立美化市街坊及清洁街面的基金来支付美化三藩市街坊及清洁街面的费用，并由商行家付他的营业税的百分之一做此基金，每年此百分比将按市议定以维持一百万元基金？
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Descripción</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 SI</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 SI</td>
<td>¿Será un requisito que los miembros de las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se encarguen de funciones de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos enumerados, o en los cuales se requiera a una persona con experiencia, capacidad o aptitudes especiales y no presente ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que algunos preste servicio durante más de dos periodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que cada persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 SI</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
★ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

★ Write your residence address where indicated.

★ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfore los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquellos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentan una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si falta alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRUINADA O DAÑADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuelva la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.
CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:

This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT
If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY
Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.
Absence ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,
2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,
3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING
Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT

I authorized ____________________________________________, my ________________________________, to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name ______________________________________________ Signature ____________________________________________

Date ______________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOBERNADOR</td>
<td>CHUCK MORSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman / Home Appraiser</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEROME &quot;JERRY&quot; MC CREADY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance Manager</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICEGOBERNADOR</td>
<td>CHARLES ANTHONY F. SZYCHOWSKI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Party Central Committeemember</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Aviator</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Office          | Name               | Party               | Vote
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|------
| Secretary of State | Theodore J. Nicholoff | Business Executive | 29   
| Controller      | Edmon V. Kaiser    | Doctor of Chiropractic | 36   
| Treasurer       | Paul Meeuwenberg   | Marketing Consultant | 45   

**Notes:**
- **PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO**
- **AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY**
- **SECRETARIO DE ESTADO**
- **TESORERO**
- **Contador**
- **Estado**
- **Estado**
- **State**
- **5 de Junio de 1990**
- **Election Primarias**
- **Primary Election**
- **June 5, 1990**
- **Election Day**
- **Voting for One**
- **Vote por Uno**
- **Vote for One**
### PROCURADOR GENERAL

**Attorney General**

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Procurador General en este distrito)

本區無人登記提名，競選檢察官

### COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS

**Insurance Commissioner**

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR INSURANCE COMMISSIONER IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Comisionado de Seguros en este distrito)

本區無人登記，候選為保險委員
**MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN**
**Member, State Board of Equalization**

**NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF**
Retired Electrical Foreman / Capataz Electricista Jubilado

---

**NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT**

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)

本區無人候選為聯邦衆議員

---

**THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT**

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人競選州參議員

---

**NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT**

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人候選為州衆議員
(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON
THE BALLOT FOR COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para
aparecer en la balota como Miembro del Comité Central del Condado
en este distrito)

本區無人登記，候選為縣中央委員會委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>JUDICIAL</th>
<th>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>勸選</th>
<th>SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA</th>
<th>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>選一人</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatico de Instrucción Pública</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>勸選</th>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3</th>
<th>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>選一人</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>勸選</th>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5</th>
<th>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>選一人</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>勸選</th>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15</th>
<th>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>選一人</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>William J. O'Connor</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>Jerome A. De Filippo</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Ronald G. Kershaw</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lillian K. Sing</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Schwenger</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

107

YES 185

NO 187

PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

108

YES 189

NO 190

GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

109

YES 192

NO 193

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

110

YES 195

NO 197

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

111

YES 200

NO 203

N 51, N 52 & N 53
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDA Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un empréstito de bonos por ciento setenta y cinco millones de dólares ($750,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluya: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda. (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenan las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya vencidas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

185 SI  贛成
187 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un empréstito de bonos por ciento setenta y cinco millones de dólares ($750,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desmontes de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rápidos para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en rieles. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resumen del cálculo por el Analista de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatales y locales: Si todos los bonos autorizados fueran vendidos al 7.5 por ciento y pagados durante un periodo de 20 años típicamente, el Fondo General incurriría en unos $1.6 mil millones para pagar por el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($700 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos sería de $900 millones.

189 SI  贛成
190 NO 反對

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR, FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO POR LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entrará en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

192 SI  贛成
193 NO 反對

EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto basado en viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatales o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría un pérdida de reúdos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 milión a $2 milión por año.

195 SI  贛成
197 NO 反對

ACTA PARA EL DECONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESDEBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establece un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatales y locales para reflejar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, y estacionamientos para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establece una asignación de $55 millones en los colores por paseo a caminos y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1990, y un aumento de dos centavos cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pondría el día los límites en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios de salud, servicios de salud para los jóvenes, y otros programas estatales de prioridad. La misma medida que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuará disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciban al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

200 SI  贛成
203 NO 反對

1990年房屋与无家可归者公债法案。此法案提供发行公债$ 150,000,000资助的房屋计划，包括以下：(1) 無家可归者及家務的緊急避難所及變動期房屋；新出租给個人及家庭的房屋；來符合老年人、殘疾者及農民的特別需要的舊屋及出租屋的修補及維護；(2) 首次购房人的援助。

1990年改善地铁交通与空气清洁公债法案。此法案提供发行公债$ 150,000,000资助的地铁交通与空气清洁计划。由加州「一般税款」支付公债。以下为立法局分析预算对州府及地方政府财政支出影响的估計：如果所有通过提案的公债以5% 7.5%出售，销售期为通常的20年来计算，「一般税收」将支付约十八亿一千美元，百分之十五现金流，七年九千万元利息，估計每年现金流为息的总和为九千万。

204 SI  贛成
206 NO 反對

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL Gobernador, FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO POR LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entrará en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

208 SI  贛成
209 NO 反對

EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto basado en viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatales o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría un pérdida de reúdos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 milón a $2 milón por año.

215 SI  贛成
217 NO 反對

ACTA PARA EL DECONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESDEBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establece un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatales y locales para reflejar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, y estacionamientos para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecería un aumento del 5% en los colores por paseo a caminos y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1990, y un aumento adicional de dos centavos cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pondría al día los límites en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios de salud para los jóvenes, y otros programas estatales de prioridad. La misma medida que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuará disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciban al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

220 SI  贛成
222 NO 反對

1990年减少交通拥挤及限制支出法案。此法案将实施一项新的交通拥挤及限制计划，以减少州政府支出的限制，使能更有效地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它将提供新的收费来缓解州内公路、市内街道及人行道的公共交通设施以减少交通拥挤。此法案将增加货车重量收费五百元至二千五百元。由于由每年1月1日起，增加汽油税至每加侖一元，之后四年期间，由每加侖一元改为每加侖一元。此法案将规定除州政府支出之以外之州、市等县市支出。此法案将规定公共教育及社区大学提供至少州「一般税收」预算的百分之四十，亦将规定超过州拨款限额的削减会平均分给教育及纳税人。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES 211</td>
<td>NO 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (average annual total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226</td>
<td>NO 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230</td>
<td>NO 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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211 SI 贊成
FUNCTIONARIOS ESTATALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconozcan los costos al estado que dependan de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

213 NO 反对

215 SI 贊成

217 NO 反对

218 SI 贊成
ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la definición de “oficial del orden público” que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Costes estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinato en primer grado.

220 NO 反对

222 SI 贊成
DERECHO PENAL. EMENDIA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida afectaría significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce como se pondría en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

224 NO 反对

226 SI 贊成
TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1,6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

228 NO 反对

230 SI 贊成
PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohibe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

232 NO 反对

N 51, N 52 & N 53
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### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote YES</th>
<th>Vote NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>LEGISLATURE, REAPPORTIONMENT, ETHICS, INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION, INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STATUTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Número</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

注: 每个提案的概要和表决结果根据法令内容和投票结果。
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PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

A

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

B

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

C

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

D

WITHDRAWN

E

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

F

YES 263  NO 265

YES 269  NO 272

YES 277  NO 278

YES 280  NO 281

YES 284  NO 285
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263 SI 贊成
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contraer una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la eliminación del asbesto, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se contrate más de $66,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $332,400,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

265 NO 反對

269 SI 贊成
¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 y los choques sucesivos; (ii) la mejora sismica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iii) la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en los edificios de la instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos varios relacionados a los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a recoger durante veinte (20) años a una tasa anual (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.20 por parcela durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año; y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las delimitaciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, ciertos terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se dispone con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 02-13-B1 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990; y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

272 NO 反對

277 SI 贊成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de las electores y sujeto a límites de doble especificaciones, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por arquitecto de una empresa sin fines de lucro, si el Contralor certifica que el costo neto en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por arquitecto?

278 NO 反對

280 SI 贊成
¿Creará la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escuelas en las Paredes para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escuelas de las paredes, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un porcentaje de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

281 NO 反對

ELIMINADA

284 SI 贊成
¿Se realizará una amnistía a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48,7 horas (después de lo cual un hombre gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comiencen a las 6 a.m.?

285 NO 反對
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>Yes 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>Yes 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>Yes 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>Yes 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong></td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>Yes 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>Yes 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>Yes 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>Yes 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>Yes 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No 310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot
so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar
no later than June 5, 1990.
Postmarks don’t count.
★ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

★ Write your residence address where indicated.

★ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfore los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coincidan con aquéllos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentaron una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su familia, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si falta alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRuinADA O DAÑADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuélvela la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCION Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enrosar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugar de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.
CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990. Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT

I authorized ___________________________________, my _____________________________________ (name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name __________________________________________ Signature __________________________________

Date __________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>CHUCK MORSA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman / Home Appraiser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hombre de Negocios / Tasador de Hogares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>JEROME &quot;JERRY&quot; MC CREADY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrador de Mantenimiento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Governor</td>
<td>CHARLES ANTHONY F. SZYCHOWSKI</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Party Central Committeemember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro Central del Comité del Partido</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERTON D. SHORT</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Aviator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aviador Ejecutivo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECRETARIO DE ESTADO  州務卿
Secretary of State

THEODORE J. NICOLOFF
Business Executive  商業行政人員
Ejecutivo de Negocios

CONTALOR  市計官
Controller

EDMON V. KAISER
Doctor of Chiropractic  脊椎整骨科醫生
Médico Quiropráctico

TESORERO  財政部長
Treasurer

PAUL MEEUWENBERG
Marketing Consultant  市場顧問
Consultor de Mercadeo

Vote por Uno  選一人
Vote for One
PROCURADOR GENERAL 檢察長
Attorney General

(No candidates filed nomination papers to appear on the ballot for attorney general in this district)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Procurador General en este distrito)

COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS 保險委員
Insurance Commissioner

(No candidates filed nomination papers to appear on the ballot for insurance commissioner in this district)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Comisionado de Seguros en este distrito)
| MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN | 程務均衡局委員  
| Member, State Board of Equalization | 選一人  
| NICHOLAS W. KUDROVZEFF | 80  
| Retired Electrical Foreman / Capataz Electricista Jubilado |  

**STATE**

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)

本區無人候選為聯邦衆議員

| PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO |  
| ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS |  
| 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990 |  

**UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE**

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Senador Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人競選州參議員

| AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY |  
| PRIMARY ELECTION |  
| JUNE 5, 1990 |  

**STATE SENATOR**

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人候選為州衆議員
(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro del Comité Central del Condado en este distrito)

本區無人登記，候選為縣中央委員會委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>競選投票</th>
<th>1990年6月5日</th>
<th>州教育司</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>競選投票</td>
<td>1990年6月5日</td>
<td>州教育司</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>競選投票</td>
<td>1990年6月5日</td>
<td>州教育司</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>競選投票</td>
<td>1990年6月5日</td>
<td>州教育司</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3 |
| Superior Court Judge, Office #3 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| ALEX SALDAMANDO | Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal |

| JUZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5 |
| Superior Court Judge, Office #5 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY | Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal |

| JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15 |
| Superior Court Judge, Office #15 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| CARLOS BEA | Incumbent / Titular del Cargo |

| JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15 |
| Superior Court Judge, Office #15 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| KAY TSENIN | Attorney / Abogada |

| JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15 |
| Superior Court Judge, Office #15 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| JEROME T. BENSON | Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior |

<p>| JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15 |
| Superior Court Judge, Office #15 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| DONNA HITCHENS | Attorney / Abogada |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL DEPARTAMENTO #1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vote for One</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</strong></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELLEN CHAITIN</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Law Teacher / Abogada / Maestra de Derecho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULIE TANG</strong></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant District Attorney / Fiscal Asistente del Distrito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAMES HARRIGAN</strong></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff’s Department’s Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL DEPARTAMENTO #3</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vote for One</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</strong></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LILLIAN K. SING</strong></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent/Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ASESOR</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vote for One</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RONALD G. KERSHAW</strong></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Portfolio Manager / Administrador de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WENDY NELDER</strong></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogado; Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</strong></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor / Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAUL SCHWENGER</strong></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Assessor / Asesor Asistente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DEFENSOR PUBLICO</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vote for One</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Defender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JEFF BROWN</strong></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.</td>
<td>YES 185</td>
<td>NO 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.</td>
<td>YES 189</td>
<td>NO 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>GOVERNOR'S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor's time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.</td>
<td>YES 192</td>
<td>NO 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.</td>
<td>YES 195</td>
<td>NO 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.</td>
<td>YES 200</td>
<td>NO 203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acta de Bonos para Viviendas y para Personas sin Vivienda de 1990.
Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por el ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos, incluyendo personas que necesitan viviendas de arriendo que llenen las necesidades específicas de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

Acta de Bonos para Ferrocarriles para Pasajeros y para Aire Limpio de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vías, no fiscales de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rostros para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en riales. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resuelve del cálculo por el Analista de la Industria sobre el impacto fiscal reto en los gobernistas estatales y locales. Si todos los bonos autorizados fueron vendidos al 7.5 por ciento y pagados durante un período de 20 años típicamente, el Fondo General incurre en unos $1.5 mil millones para pagar el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($500 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el cieno anual del capital e interés en los bonos sería de $70 millones.


Exención del Impuesto a la Propiedad para las Personas Severamente Incapacitadas. Enmienda Constitucional Legislativa. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto basado en viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatales o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de recaudación de $1 mil a $2 millones por año.

Acta para el Descongestionamiento del Tránsito y para Limitación en los Desembolsos de 1990. Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatales y locales para atender mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Disponer el nuevo código de estacionamiento de los coches de pasaje de los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1 de agosto de 1990, y un aumento adicional del 1 de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidado de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía disminuye la aplicación de los desembolsos estatales e locales. Esta medida continuaría disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciben al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los recaudos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

1990年房屋与无家可归者公债法案。此法案提供发行公债$150,000,000资助的房屋计划包括：(1)无家可归者在家庭的紧急避难所及变卖期房屋的出租给老年人及家庭的住房来符合老年人、残疾者及家庭的特别需要，(2)新屋及租屋的修整及维护，给予第一次入屋人屋捐款资助。

1990年乘客铁路交通与空气清洁公债法案。此法案提供发行公债$1,000,000,000资助的铁路计划，提供都市市外路轨交通计划的必要资金。以州立交通局分析专家对州立立法会支付公债的估计：如果所有通过施政的公债仅支付5%，出售，付款间距为20年度，一支公债应付月利率15%外，3%支付成本率，7%支付息，支付息共$500,000，估计每年出息约$700,000。

州长对立法的建议：立法的截止日期：立法审查。此提案涉及州长及省长建议中立法的时间及改变立法的立法日期，对财政影响：无直接财政影响。

州长对立法的建议：立法的截止日期：立法审查。此提案涉及州长及省长建议中立法的时间及改变立法的立法日期，对财政影响：无直接财政影响。

1990年减轻交通拥挤及限制出息法案。此法案实行一项减轻交通拥挤计划及修改用以支持政府支出的限制，使州政府能及时反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它将提供并使收入用以州内公路、市内街道及人行道的公共交通设施以减少交通拥挤。此法案将增加货车重量及费用百分之五十五及由1990年4月1日开始，会增加汽油税平均每加仑每生十分，之后两年内，由每年4月1日开始，会增加汽油税每加仑每生十分，使州政府能及时反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它将提供并使收入用以州内公路、市内街道及人行道的公共交通设施以减少交通拥挤。此法案将增加货车重量及费用百分之五十五及由1990年4月1日开始，会增加汽油税平均每加仑每生十分，之后两年内，由每年4月1日开始，会增加汽油税每加仑每生十分，使州政府能及时反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它将提供并使收入用以州内公路、市内街道及人行道的公共交通设施以减少交通拥挤。此法案将增加货车重量及费用百分之五十五及由1990年4月1日开始，会增加汽油税每加仑每生十分，之后两年内，由每年4月1日开始，会增加汽油税每加仑每生十分，使州政府能及时反映日益增加加州人口的需要。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nro.</td>
<td>Propuesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Funcionarios Estatales, Ética.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Práctica de la Quiropráctica. Enmienda Legislativa de Iniciativa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Asesinato de un Oficial del Orden Público. Pena. Enmienda Legislativa de Iniciativa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Derecho Penal. Enmienda y Estatuto Constitucional de Iniciativa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Transporte en Ferrocarril. Acto de Bonos. Estatuto de Iniciativa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Protección de la Vida Silvestre. Estatuto de Iniciativa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Nro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Nro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Nro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Nro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Nro.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**211 SI**

FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES, ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependerán de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

---

**213 NO**


---

**215 SI**

ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDE LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefina y expanda la definición de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Costos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expanda la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

---

**217 NO**

DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDE Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida afecta significativamente en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce como se pondría en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber saldría un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

---

**218 SI**

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

---

**219 NO**

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohibe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

---

220 NO

222 SI

224 NO

226 SI

228 NO

230 SI

232 NO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 51, N 52 &amp; N 53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposiciones a ser sometidas al voto de los electores — Estatal

| N° 236 | SI | 赞成 | LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los volantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de al voto público y la posible redistribución por la corriente. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores. |
| N° 238 | NO | 反对 |

| N° 240 | SI | 赞成 | REDISTRIBUCIÓN FOR COMISIÓN, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los principios por los distritos en los distritos y la elección de 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros. |
| N° 242 | NO | 反对 |

| N° 243 | SI | 赞成 | ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción. |
| N° 245 | NO | 反对 |

| N° 248 | SI | 赞成 | ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen el nuevo recinto de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes “Hastings”, la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California asumidas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 Inclusivo. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salud y seguridad. |
| N° 250 | NO | 反对 |

| N° 254 | SI | 赞成 | ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aduanas a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean insecuros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos. |
| N° 256 | NO | 反对 |

| N° 258 | SI | 赞成 | ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas. |
| N° 259 | NO | 反对 |

| N° 118 |

| N° 119 |

| N° 120 |

| N° 121 |

| N° 122 |

| N° 123 |
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263 ➡
NO 265 ➡

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269 ➡
NO 272 ➡

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277 ➡
NO 278 ➡

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280 ➡
NO 281 ➡

WITHDRAWN

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 284 ➡
NO 285 ➡

N 51, N 52 & N 53
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURO PUBLICA, 1990. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $32,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios de la Ciudad y Condomio de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del desastre, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas, siempre que la cantidad se restrinja a un máximo de $5,697,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal, y particularmente no superando $32,400,000 de su valor en las concesiones de la FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

1990 年公共安全改进债券。发行公债 $32,400,000 用于建筑、重建和改进圣弗朗西斯科市及所拥有的设施，包括为建筑的修复，减少地震风险的设施，以及在地震中为残疾人提供通道。最高价值限制为 $5,697,000,000。具体限制为每年 $32,400,000。超出部分将被 FEMA 或州政府所承诺的救助资金抵消。

Tendrá el Distrito No. 90 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco destruidas por el terremoto el 17 de octubre de 1989, (ii) la mejora técnica de los centros intermedios y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iii) la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iv) la conservación del distrito de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos variados relacionados a los anteriores por medias de la recaudación de impuestos especiales a ser recogidos durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual; (a) por parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46.99 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $38.29 por parcela durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) por parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades viviendas residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16.19 por unidad de vivienda durán el catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los usos referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las excepciones para personas mayores, cierres terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se dispone en el artículo del 12 de octubre de 1990; y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias.

将为由 1989 年 10 月 17 日地震所导致的学校区设施提供资金，包括：(i) 对由 1989 年 10 月 17 日地震所导致的圣弗朗西斯科学校区设施的修复、恢复和更换，(ii) 提高技术标准，对圣弗朗西斯科学校区设施的消防安全进行补救，(iii) 对圣弗朗西斯科学校区设施进行保护，以及与上述相关的一些其他费用。这些费用将从征税中收取，税率为 $46.99/年/每单户家庭和 $38.29/年/每混合用途单位，在头六年，再在接下来的十四年中每年征收 $23.00/年/每单位住宅。这一制备将设立一个上限，每年为 $12,000,000。

¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores, y sujeto a límites de deuda específicos, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento residencial de los fondos de la empresa por alquiler de una empresa que no esté en liquidación, si el Consejo certifica que el costo neto en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

市议会可以不经选民投票而提供资金，前提是该资金必须满足一定的条件，包括：(i) 该资金不会超过特定的债务限额，(ii) 该资金将用于住宅租赁，以确保利息成本低于其他类型的租赁成本。

¿Creará la Ciudad un fondo de Embelección del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escrituras en las Paredes para pagar por embelección los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escrituras de las paredes, permitiendo que las empresas dispensen a sus impuestos comerciales a dicha tasa, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

市政府将设立美化街区和清洁墙面的基金，以支付圣弗朗西斯科市街区的美化及清洁墙面的费用，允许企业通过支付给市府的百分比来支付美化费用，每年的支付比例为 $1,000,000。

ELIMINADA

撤消

¿Se realizará una emisión a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48.7 horas (después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encauce, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comiencen a las 6 a.m.?

市府应否制定消防局的工时制度，包括：(i) 将消防员的正常工作时间从 48.7 小时改为 24 小时，(ii) 允许消防委员会根据具体情况，确定换班时间和起始时间，以替代目前连续 24 小时的轮班制。

N 51, 52 & N 53
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Propuesta</td>
<td>Apoyo</td>
<td>Enmienda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro el sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos con los Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficiados de jubilación?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de una vez a once miembros?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>¿Será un requisito para que los miembros de las comisiones de la Comisión Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen listados a los miembros de otras comisiones, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos nombrados, e en los cuales se requiere que se mantenga con experiencia, capacidad o aplicadas especialidades y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
☆ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

☆ Write your residence address where indicated.

☆ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONS APPEAR ON THE FRONT PAGE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfora los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquéllos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de perforar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentaron una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRUIINADA O DAÑADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuélvala la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el “Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación” para que la balota pueda ser contada.
ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poke you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poke, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

Sample Ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CANDIDATE A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANDIDATE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANDIDATE C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use pin provided to punch out chip on ballot.

Las Instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文说明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT
If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY
Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING
Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

---

AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT

I authorized ____________________________________________, my ____________________________________________, (name) (relationship) to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________ Signature ____________________________________________

Date ____________________________________________
<p>| GOBERNADOR  | F. FRANK WONG | Retired Systems Engineer / Ingeniero en Sistemas Jubilado | 2 |
| Governor    |              |                                                   |   |
| F. FRANK WONG | Retired Systems Engineer / Ingeniero en Sistemas Jubilado | 2 |
| JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT | Political Science Teacher / Profesor de Ciencias Políticas | 4 |
| EILEEN ANDERSON | Singer / Cantante | 5 |
| CHARLES PINEDA JR. | Administrator; Army Veteran / Administrador; Veterano del Ejército | 7 |
| FRANKLIN R. GERATY | Retired Intelligence Agent / Agente Jubilado de Espionaje | 8 |
| FRANK L. THOMAS | Farmer-Electrician-Rancher / Granjero-Electricista-Ranchero | 10 |
| LYDON BYRNE | Entrepreneur / Empresario | 11 |
| DIANNE FEINSTEIN | | 13 |
| CHARLES A. MAHON III | Businessman / Hombre de Negocios | 14 |
| JOHN VAN DE KAMP | Attorney General, California / Procurador General, California | 16 |
| MARK CALNEY | | 17 |
| VICEGOBERNADOR | LEO T. MC CARTHY | Lieutenant Governor of California / Vicegobernador de California | 21 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Mervin Evans</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>March Fong Eu</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Gray Davis</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Wesley Sanders, Jr.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCURADOR GENERAL</strong> 檢察長</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attorney General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **IRA REINER**  
District Attorney of Los Angeles County  
Fiscal del Distrito del Condado de Los Angeles | 54 |
| **ARLO SMITH**  
District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco  
Fiscal del Distrito de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco | 56 |
| **COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS** 保障委員  
**Insurance Commissioner** |
| **LARRY MURPHY**  
Certified Insurance Consultant  
Consultor Titulado de Seguros | 61 |
| **WALTER A. ZELMAN**  
Director, Consumers' Organization  
Director, Organización de Consumidores | 63 |
| **CONWAY COLLIS**  
Member, State Board of Equalization  
Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Compensación | 65 |
| **BILL PRESS**  
Consumer Advocacy Commentator  
Comentarista en Defensa del Consumidor | 67 |
| **JOHN GARAMENDI**  
California State Senator  
Senador Estatal de California | 69 |
| **RAY BOURHIS**  
Insurance Consumers Attorney  
Abogado de Seguros para los Consumidores | 71 |
| **MICHAEL BLANCO**  
Living Trust Attorney  
Abogado Especialista en Fideicomisos | 73 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMIL G. POLLACK</td>
<td>Tax Compliance Specialist / Especialista en Acatamiento Impositivo</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS JOHN PAPAN</td>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD TABASH</td>
<td>Lawyer, Business Consultant / Abogado, Consultor de Negocios</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAD SHERMAN</td>
<td>CPA / Taxpayer's Representative / Contador Público Titulado / Representante del Contribuyente</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BALDWIN</td>
<td>Governing Board Member, Moorpark Sch. Dist. / Miembro del Consejo Gobernante Distrito Escolar de Moorpark</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH G. COLMAN</td>
<td>Equalization Member's Deputy / Asistente de un Miembro de Compensación</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY PELOSI</td>
<td>Member of Congress, 5th Congressional District / Miembro del Congreso, Distrito 5 del Congreso</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL</td>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERAL</td>
<td>Admissions Supervisor / Supervisor de Admisiones</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES R. WACHOB</td>
<td>Senior Personnel Manager / Gerente Superior de Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</td>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.</td>
<td>Speaker, California Assembly / Orador, Asamblea de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JAICKS</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATALIE BERG</td>
<td>Community College Educator / Educadora de Colegios Comunitarios</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIRLEY B. BLACK</td>
<td>President SEIU 790 / Presidente SEIU 790</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT BARNES</td>
<td>Employment Counselor / Consejero de Empleos</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BIERNAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIGDEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES LEGARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD K. CHAN</td>
<td>Civil Engineering Manager / Gerente de Ingeniería Civil</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHATTEN</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL AARON WILLIAMS</td>
<td>Business Consultant / Consultor de Negocios</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE M. RAYA</td>
<td>Fundraising Consultant / Consultor para Reunir Fondos</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE J. DODD</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BELISLE DALEY</td>
<td>Citizen / Ciudadana</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN P. DUNBAR</td>
<td>Educator / Educador</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK GLEASON</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERARD GLEASON</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY GRIFFIN</td>
<td>Union Representative / Representante Sindical</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTOR HSI</td>
<td>Management Consultant / Consultor Administrativo</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE J. IVY</td>
<td>Deputy Sheriff / Bailiff / Asistente al Sheriff / Alguacil</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTOR SEETO</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>JUDICIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>高等法院法官，第三號辦事處</td>
<td>高等法院法官，第五號辦事處</td>
<td>高等法院法官，第十五號辦事處</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5</td>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>高等法院法官，第三號辦事處</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>地方法院法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>高等法院法官，第五號辦事處</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>地方法院法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>高等法院法官，第十五號辦事處</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>高等法院法官，第十五號辦事處</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

YES 185
NO 187

PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

YES 189
NO 190

GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 192
NO 193

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

YES 195
NO 197

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

YES 200
NO 203

N 51, N 52 & N 53
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE  
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 SI  贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que tienen las necesidades especiales de ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compren casa por primera vez.

187 NO 反對

189 SI  贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mille millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, de los trenes y para ferrocarriles dentro de ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viviendas de diario, y programas de transporte en rieles. Asigna tiempo al Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Asume el cálculo por el Analista de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatales e locales: Si todos los bonos autorizados fueran vendidos a 7.5 por ciento y pagados durante un período de 20 años típicamente, el Fondo General incurriera en unos $1,8 mil millones para pagar por el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($750 millones) de los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos sería de $90 millones.

190 NO 反對

192 SI  贊成
REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

193 NO 反對

195 SI  贊成
EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transmisión del impuesto base a viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatales o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 mil a $2 mil millones por año.

197 NO 反對

200 SI  贊成
ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida estaduiría un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatales y locales para reflejar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Distribuiría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida estaduiría un aumento del 56% en los cobros por peso a los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1990, y un centavo adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones de la estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuaria disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad recibán al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y disponiendo que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

203 NO 反對

1990年房屋與無家可歸者公债法案。此法案提供發行公債 $150,000,000 資助的房屋計

1990年乘客捷運交通與空氣清潔公債。此法案提供發行公債十億元，資助獲取新地鐵、

1990年實施州長交通制度的結束日期。立

1990年減輕交通擠塞及限制支出法案。此

1990年議會批准增加州政府支出的限制額，使能更清楚地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它將提供新投資用來

1990年緊縮教育及限制支出法案。此法案將實施州政府緊縮教育及限制支出，使能更清楚地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它將提供新投資用來
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure. YES 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands &quot;peace officer&quot; definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder. YES 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact. YES 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million). YES 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs. YES 230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE  
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990  
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATALES

211 SI 贊成  
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependerán de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la manutención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.  
112

213 NO 反對  
215 SI 贊成  
113

217 NO 反對  
218 SI 贊成  
ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDE LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la definición de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.  
114

220 NO 反對  
222 SI 贊成  
DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectúa significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce como se pondrán en ejecución y se interpretará la medida. Podría haber sometiendo un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.  
115

224 NO 反對  
226 SI 贊成  
TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,990,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).  
116

228 NO 反對  
230 SI 贊成  
PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ambientes Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provienen de la sobretasa al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.  
117

232 NO 反對

N 51, 52 & N 53  
15-1N
LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.

118 YES 236 NO 238

REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION, INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STATUTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.

119 YES 240 NO 242

NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.

120 YES 243 NO 245

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.

121 YES 248 NO 250

EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.

122 YES 254 NO 256

1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

123 YES 258 NO 259

N 51, N 52 & N 53
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, Elecciones Primarias Consolidadas, 5 de Junio de 1990
Proposiciones a ser Sometidas al Voto de los Electores — Estatal

236 SI

Legislatura, Redistribución, Ética, Emienda y Estatuto Constitucional de Iniciativa. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros en la distribución de los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de al costo público y la posible redistribución por la corte. Los costos por las disposiciones para éste son probablemente menores.

238 NO

Redistribución for Comisión, Emienda y Estatuto Constitucional de Iniciativa. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. La función de la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.

240 SI

Acta de Bonos para la Construcción de Nuevas Prisiones de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

242 NO

Acta de Bonos para las Instalaciones de Educación Superior de Junio de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por noventa y cinco millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superiores de Leyes "Hastings," la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1° de Julio de 1990 inclusivo. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salud y seguridad.

243 SI

1990年6月的高等教育建築物公債法案。此法案將發行公債450,000,000以提供資金來建築新監獄，改善目前州監獄，青少年管教所過度擠壓的情況。

245 NO

1990年6月的高等教育建築物公債法案。此法案將發行公債450,000,000以提供資金來建築新監獄，改善目前州監獄，青少年管教所過度擠壓的情況。

248 SI

1990年防震安全設施及公共樓宇重建公債法案。此法案將發行公債300,000,000以提供資金來重建、改善防震安全設施、修繕、替換及改善那些因受地震損害而變為危險的州及市政府樓宇。

250 NO

1990年學校建築物公債法案。此法案將發行公債800,000,000以提供資本支出來興建或改善校舍的建築物。

254 SI

1990年學校建築物公債法案。此法案將發行公債800,000,000以提供資本支出來興建或改善校舍的建築物。

256 NO

1990年學校建築物公債法案。此法案將發行公債800,000,000以提供資本支出來興建或改善校舍的建築物。

258 SI

1990年學校建築物公債法案。此法案將發行公債800,000,000以提供資本支出來興建或改善校舍的建築物。

259 NO

1990年學校建築物公債法案。此法案將發行公債800,000,000以提供資本支出來興建或改善校舍的建築物。
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

A

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

B

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

C

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

D

WITHDRAWN

E

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

F
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA. 1990. Para contrarrestar una deuda en bonos de $323,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del asbesto, el hecho de propiciar la interpretación de las personas que han participado en los eventos, simplemente y cuando se contrate más de $65,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $323,400,000 se vaya reduciendo por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

1990年公共安全改良公債。發行公債 $323,400,000，用於購置、興建或重建舊金山市內各市或所擁有的建築，包括用於地震後的修理、減輕地震等危險。消除石棉，並減少混和。只要在每個會計年度內所發行公債的數目不超過 $65,000,000。並且從FEMA（聯邦緊急事態管理局）等政府援助基金中所得的補助金合計不超過 $323,400,000公債的數目。

¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (o los choques subsiguientes), (ii) la mejora asistencial de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iii) la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos varios relacionados con las anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recogido durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.25 por parcela durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales adicionales de una o más unidades comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y $16.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes al método de distribución y los tasa máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, ciertos torrentes y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se dispone con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 02-13-81 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990; y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

市議會議案是否通過選民投票之前及在某些指定規格的使用範圍內，有權批准非牟利公司使用具體設備，只要主計官能證實市政府所付的金額比其他種類設備計劃為低？

¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin límites de sueldos, si el Contrato certifica que el costo neto al interesado de la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros licencias de financiamiento por alquiler?

市政府議案是否設立美化市坊及清潔衛生的基金，用於美化市坊及清潔衛生之費用，請各商業家修復其店內的商業園的百份之一給此基金，每年此百份率會被調整以維持一百萬元基金？

¿Crear la Ciudad un fondo de Embelezamiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escrituras en las Parades para pagar por embelezar los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escrituras de las parades, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un porcentaje de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

市議會議案是否通過選民投票之前及在某些指定規格的使用範圍內，有權批准非牟利公司使用具體設備，只要主計官能證實市政府所付的金額比其他種類設備計劃為低？

¿Se realizará una encuesta a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48.7 horas (después de lo cual un hombre ganó horas extras) y permite en cambio la Comisión sobre Sindicatos, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establece la duración y los horarios de consentimiento de los turnos de los hombres, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 6 a.m.?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290</td>
<td>NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293</td>
<td>NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298</td>
<td>NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305</td>
<td>NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309</td>
<td>NO 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Propuesta</td>
<td>Apoyo</td>
<td>Obra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Aprobación de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>¿Será un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen a ellos a los miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesoros de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos enumerados, o en los cuáles se requiera una comisión, capacidad o participación especial y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 31 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 51, N 52 & N 53
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Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
☆ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

☆ Write your residence address where indicated.

☆ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfore los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquellos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentaron una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración las fechas de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRuinADA O DAÑADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuélvala la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entrega una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.
ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)

Sample Ballot

President

CANDIDATE A

CANDIDATE B

CANDIDATE C

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文说明在封底

PUNCH OUT THE DOT ON THE NUMBERED BOX ON THE BALLOT CARD THAT IS THE SAME AS THE NUMBER OF YOUR CHOICE OF CANDIDATE, OR "YES" OR "NO" ON MEASURES.

Use pin provided to punch out chip on ballot.
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. **Pull off any hanging chads.**

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the _secrecy envelope_. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your **ballot** inside the _secrecy envelope_, and then put them into the **Absentee Ballot Return Envelope**.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your _signature_, _printed name_, _residence_, and _date_. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and **mail it early**, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. **Postmarks do not count.**

**SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT**

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

**BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY**

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by **8 p.m. June 5, 1990.**

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will **not be counted, regardless of postmark date.**

1. You may **mail** your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. **OR, you may bring your ballot** in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. **OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister)** may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the "Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places" in order for the ballot to be counted.

**PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING**

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

**AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT**

I authorized ____________________________________________, my __________________________, (name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall

☐ a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________________ Signature __________________________________

Date ____________________________________________________
GOBERNADOR  
Governor

DENNIS THOMPSON
President, Computer Company
Presidente, Empresa de Computación

VICEGOBERNADOR  
Lieutenant Governor

ANTHONY G. BAJADA
University Professor
Profesor de la Universidad

Vote for One

2
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L 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 & 27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO LIBERAL</td>
<td>SECRETARIO DE ESTADO/SECRETARY OF STATE</td>
<td>KENNITA WATSON</td>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td>CONTRALOR/CONTROLLER</td>
<td>THOMAS TRYON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Software Engineer</td>
<td>1990年6月5日</td>
<td></td>
<td>City Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ingeniero de Software</td>
<td>軟件工程師</td>
<td></td>
<td>County Supervisor/Rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor del Condado/Ranchero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>縣參事/農場主</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TESORERO/TREASURER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>稅務長</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR TREASURER IN THIS DISTRICT)
(NO CANDIDATO presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Tesorero en este distrito)

日本語翻訳：本區無人登記提名，競選財政司
PROCURADOR GENERAL  檢察長
Attorney General

PAUL N. GAUTREAU
Attorney at Law
Abogado 律師

COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS  保險委員
Insurance Commissioner

TED BROWN
Insurance Adjuster / Investigator
Ajustador de Seguros / Investigador  保險調査人／調查人

PARTIDO LIBERAL
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
ESTADO

LIBERTARIAN PARTY
PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990
STATE

Vote por Uno
Vote for One

54 →

61 →
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>LYN SAPOWSKY-SMITH</td>
<td>Accountant / Contador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td>(There is no contest for State Senator in this district)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Member</td>
<td></td>
<td>(No candidates filed nomination papers to appear on the ballot for State Assembly in this district)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)

本區無人候選為聯邦衆議員

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人競選州參議員

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人候選為州衆議員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
<th>COUNTY COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>MIEMBRO, COMITÉ CENTRAL DEL CONDADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro del Comité Central del Condado en este distrito)

本區無人登記，候選為縣中央委員會委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td>SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman/Maestro Jubilado</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator/Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction/</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Education Dean/Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court/Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge/Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td>Incumbent/Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge/Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote or UNO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal Dept #1</td>
<td>William J. O'Connor</td>
<td>158 ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>Ellen Chaitin</td>
<td>160 ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Tang</td>
<td>161 ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Harrigan</td>
<td>163 ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal Dept #3</td>
<td>Jerome A. De Filippo</td>
<td>167 ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>Lillian K. Sing</td>
<td>168 ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asesor</td>
<td>Ronald G. Kershaw</td>
<td>172 ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
<td>174 ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td>175 ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Schwenger</td>
<td>177 ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensor Publico</td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>181 ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

PASSenger RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

GOVERNOR'S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor's time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluya: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda. (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos que tienen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes comren casa por primera vez.

186 NO 反对

187 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desembolsos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rodantes para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril de viajeros de distancias cortas, y programas de tránsito en rieles. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resumen del Cálculo por el Analista de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatal y locales: si todos los bonos autorizados fueron vendidos al 7% por ciento y pagados durante un periodo de 20 años típicamente, el Fondo General incurriría en un costo $1,8 mil millones por pagar con el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($730 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos sería por $92 millones.

189 SI 贊成
190 NO 反对

192 SI 贊成
REVISIóN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACION. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigor la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningun efecto fiscal directo.

193 NO 反对

195 SI 贊成
EXENCIóN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto base a viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningun impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatal o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesto en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 mil millones a $2 millones por año.

197 NO 反对

200 SI 贊成
ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOSSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la ley en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para reflejar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Disminuiría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, carreteras locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecería un aumento del 56% en los cobros por paso a los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1990, y un centavo adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito. Impacto fiscal: Ningun impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatal o locales. Esta medida continuaría disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciban al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y disponiendo que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

203 NO 反对

1990年9月26日於蘇州公有選民發起。此法案提出發行公債$150,000,000資助的房屋計畫包括以下：(1)無家可歸者及家屬的緊急避難所及變動期房屋歸新出租給個人及家庭的房屋來符合老年人、殘障者及農民的特別需要；(2)舊房及出租屋的維護及維護給予第一次買屋人買屋援助。

1990年來支持交通與空氣清潔公債。此法案提出發行公債$12億，暫時獲取基礎金，資本支出及發展市內外交通工具及計劃。由加州「一般經費」來支付公債。以下為立法局分析專家對法案在財政及財政支出影響的估算：

如果所有通過法案的公債以7.5%出售，支付期為通常的20年，計算，「一般經費」每年支付約$18億，即$12億的財政支出，九億九千萬元利息，佔每年財政支出的約九十分之九。

州長對法案的評論。立法的截止日期、立法修正案。此法案將延長州長對法案在議會中的立法時期及改變法案的有效日期。對財政影響：無直接財政影響。

積極反對者免徵物業稅的立法修憲案。它允許將物業稅額轉換為物業稅的已納的房屋。對財政影響：無直接或間的財政影響，因為此修憣案只批准立法局實施其規定。如果通過實施的話，每年稅收損失約一百萬至二百萬之間。

1990年減輕交通壓塞及限制支出法案。此法案將實施一項減輕交通壓塞計劃及修改州內政府支出的限制額，便能更方便地反映日益增多加州人口的需求。它將提供 económicos用於建築州內公路、市內街道及大規模的公共交通設施以減輕辖貫。此法案將增加財政收入百分之二十五及由1990年8月1日開始，會增加汽油稅一每加侖一仙，之後四年期間內，由每年1月1日開始，會增加汽誇稅一每加侖一仙。此法案會改變州內撥款項以獲取新資金來減輕交通壓塞，發展大規模交通計劃、健康計划、老年人服務及州內其他重要計劃，同時亦能限制州及市政府支出。此法案將繼續為公共教育及社區大學提供至少州內「一般經費」預算的百分之四十，亦將規定超過州撥款額的歲收會平分給教育部及納稅人。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS, ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands &quot;peace officer&quot; definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (average annual total of $180 million).</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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211 SI 贊成

FUNCTIONARIOS ESTATALES, ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crear una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependerán de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

213 NO 反对

215 SI 贊成


217 NO 反对

218 SI 贊成

ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO, PENAS, ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Rodea y expande la definición de “oficial del orden público” que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expanda la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

220 NO 反对

222 SI 贊成

DERECHO PENAL, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida afecta significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal y se desconoce como se pondría en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

224 NO 反对

226 SI 贊成

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL, ACTO DE BONOS, ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

228 NO 反对

230 SI 贊成

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

232 NO 反对
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Legislator. Reapportionment. Ethics. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Reapportionment by Commission. Initiative Constitutional Amendment, Statute. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 School Facilities Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Votación 1</td>
<td>Votación 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 SI</td>
<td><strong>236 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>236 SI</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 NO</td>
<td><strong>238 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>238 NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 SI</td>
<td><strong>240 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>240 SI</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 NO</td>
<td><strong>242 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>242 NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243 SI</td>
<td><strong>243 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>243 SI</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 NO</td>
<td><strong>245 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>245 NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 SI</td>
<td><strong>248 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>248 SI</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 NO</td>
<td><strong>250 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>250 NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254 SI</td>
<td><strong>254 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>254 SI</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 NO</td>
<td><strong>256 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>256 NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258 SI</td>
<td><strong>258 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>258 SI</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259 NO</td>
<td><strong>259 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>259 NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legislatura, Redistribución, Ética, Enmienda y Estatuto Constitucional de Iniciativa**

Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de al voto pública y la posible redistribución por la corte. Los costos por las disposiciones para ésta son probablemente menores.

**Redistribución für Comisión, Enmienda y Estatuto Constitucional de Iniciativa**

Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hecho, el Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.

**Acta de Bonos para la Construcción de Nuevas Prisiones de 1990**

Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

**Acta de Bonos para Instalaciones de Educación Superior de Junio de 1990**

Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superio de Leyes “Hastings,” la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobados por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salubridad y seguridad.

**Acta de Bonos para Seguridad contra Sismos y Rehabilitación de Edificios Públicos de 1990**

Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aditamentos a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

**Acta de Bonos para Instalaciones Escolares de 1990**

Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejoras de escuelas públicas.

**NOTA:** N 51, N 52 & N 53
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

A
Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain public-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

B

C
Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

D
Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

E
WITHDRAWN

F
Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?
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263 SI ☑
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contraer una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del asbesto, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se contralleva más de $55,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $332,400,000 sea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

265 NO ☓

269 SI ☑
¿Tendrá la Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (o los daños subsiguientes), (ii) la mejora sísmica de los centros educativos y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iii) la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos varios relacionados a anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recolectado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual: (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $40.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $22.20 por parcela durante el catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varios familias, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, cierres terrenos y edificios de propiedad público y otros usos, tal como se dispone con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 92-13-B1 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990; y deberá establecerse un límite de aportaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

272 NO ☓

277 SI ☑
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin fin de lucro, si el Contralor certificó que el costo neto en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

278 NO ☓

280 SI ☑
¿Crearía la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vehicular y Limpieza de las Escuelas en las Paredes para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escrituras de las paredes, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un uno por ciento de sus impuestos municipales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tonar $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

281 NO ☓

ELIMINADA

284 SI ☑
¿Se realizaría una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48.7 horas (después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre Incondicional sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 8 a.m.?

285 NO ☓

19-1N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE</td>
<td>市縣提案提交選民投票 超立派投票</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Respuesta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 SI</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Transporte, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>¿Será un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen electores a los miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos enumerados, o en los cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o aptitudes especiales y no pueda encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>¿Se anmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ninguno consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que eliminen todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 51, N 52 & N 53 21-1N
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
☆ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.
☆ Write your residence address where indicated.
☆ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONS APPEAR ON THE FRONT PAGE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfore los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentren debajo de los números que coincidan con aquéllos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentaron una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíe a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRuinADA O DÀÑADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuélvala la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el “Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación” para que la balota pueda ser contada.
ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.
1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.
2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

Sample Ballot

President

CANDIDATE A

CANDIDATE B

CANDIDATE C

1

4

6

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文說明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990. Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT

I authorized ________________________________, my ________________________________

(name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall

☐ a polling place.

Name ________________________________ Signature ________________________________

Date ________________________________
GOVERNADOR  省長
Governor

DENNIS THOMPSON
President, Computer Company
Presidente, Empresa de Computación

VICEGOBERNADOR  副省長
Lieutenant Governor

ANTHONY G. BAJADA
University Professor
Profesor de la Universidad

Vote por Uno
Vote for One

PARTIDO LIBERAL

ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

L 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 & 27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partido Liberal</th>
<th>Estado</th>
<th>Secretary of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennita Watson</td>
<td>Software Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partido Liberal</th>
<th>Estado</th>
<th>Controller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tryon</td>
<td>County Supervisor / Rancher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partido Liberal</th>
<th>Estado</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR TREASURER IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Tesorero en este distrito)

本區無人登記提名，競選財政司
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ESTADO</th>
<th>省州</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TED BROWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Adjuster / Investigator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>保険調査委員/調査員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCURADOR GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAUL N. GAUTREAUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote for One
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>ELECTIONS</th>
<th>Nomination Papers to Appear on the Ballot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTIDO LIBERAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS</strong></td>
<td><strong>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</strong></td>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBERTARIAN PARTY</strong></td>
<td><strong>PRIMARY ELECTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>JUNE 5, 1990</strong></td>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Senador Estatal en este distrito)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE SENATOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</strong></td>
<td><strong>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L 22 & 27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
<th>COMITÉ DEL CONDADO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>COUNTY COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No candidates filed nomination papers to appear on the ballot for County Central Committee in this district)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro del Comité Central del Condado en este distrito)

本区无人登记，候選為縣中央委員會委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KAY TSENNIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>William J. O'Connor</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Chaitin</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Tang</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Harrigan</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>Jerome A. De Filippo</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lillian K. Sing</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Ronald G. Kershaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Schwenger</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>J. Patrick Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Housing and Homeless Bond Act of 1990</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Passenger Rail and Clean Air Bond Act of 1990</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Governor’s Review of Legislation, Legislative Deadlines, Legislative Constitutional Amendment</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Property Tax Exemption for Severely Disabled Persons, Legislative Constitutional Amendment</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Traffic Congestion Relief and Spending Limitation Act of 1990</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDA Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta ley dispone la emisión de bonos por ciento cien millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenan las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta ley dispone una emisión de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de tránsito de la ciudad para transporte en ferrocarril y para servicios de transporte de viajeros de próximo, largo y medio alcance. Impulsará el crecimiento económico del estado y aumentará las empleadas en los desempleados y locales de los bonos contratados.

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN EMENDADA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. EMENDADA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto base a viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatales o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habrá una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 millón a $2 millones por año.

1990年房屋與無家可歸者公積法案。此法案規定發行公積$150,000,000資助的房屋計 策包括以下：(1)無家可歸者及家屬的緊急避難 所及設備的房屋，(2)新的家庭單位，(3)重新裝修家庭的房屋，(4)廢棄房产的修補及維護，給予第一次買房人 購房援助。

1990年重鐵路交通與空氣清潔法案。此法 案規定發行公積$10億，資助鐵路投資， 資金支出及發展內外鐵路交通工具計劃。由 加州「一般經費」來支付公積，以下為立法局 分析專家對州及市政府財政支出影響的估計： 如果所有通過實施的公積以百分之7.5出售， 付款期為30年，以「一般經費」將 支付約18億元；預期每年公積成本約2億九千 萬元息，估計每年公積成本及息的總額約為 萬元。

州長對立法的檢討。立法的出發日期。立 法的意義。此提案將延長州長檢討的規定中 的立法時期及改善立法的有效日期。 對財政影響：無直接財政影響。

1990年減輕交通擠塞及限制支出法案。此 法案將實施一項州內交通擠塞計劃及修改州 與市政府支出的限制額，以便更確定地反映日 益增加加州人民的需求。將在州內、城市及 公共交通設施減少交通擠塞。此法案將增加貨車重量收費百分之五及由1990年8月1日開始，增加交通費每公吨一元。此 案將對州內、市內交通機構的財政影響。此 法案州內州輛款額限額以預期資金來減輕交 通擠塞、發展大型交通設施、康健計劃、老 年人服務及州其他重要的計劃，同時亦能限制 州及市政府支出。此法案將繼續為公共教育及 社區大學提供至少州「一般經費」預算的百 分之四十，亦將規定州內州款額限額的歲數會平 分給教育部及納稅人。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES 211</td>
<td>NO 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands &quot;peace officer&quot; definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226</td>
<td>NO 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230</td>
<td>NO 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Propuesta</td>
<td>Detalles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>SI - Funcionarios Estatales. Ética. Establish laws of public state</td>
<td>Crear una comisión que regule el comportamiento de los funcionarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>estatales electos. Delega las sesiones legislativas sean públicas.</td>
<td>Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce los costos al estado que dependen del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la</td>
<td>número de salarios y beneficios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de</td>
<td>Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce los costos al estado que dependen del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.</td>
<td>número de salarios y beneficios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>NO - PRÁCTICA DE LA QUIROPRÁCTICA. EMENDIA LEGISLATIVA DE</td>
<td>Mejorar la renovación de la licencia durante el mes de nacimiento.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INICIATIVA. Enmienda al Acta de la Quiropráctica. Requiere la</td>
<td>Aumentar las multas por quebrantamiento del Acta. Impacto fiscal: Menores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>renovación de la licencia durante el mes de nacimiento. Aumenta</td>
<td>costos al Fondo de Examinadores de Quiroprácticos en 1990-91 al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>las multas por quebrantamiento del Acta. Impacto fiscal: Menores</td>
<td>modificar el sistema de renovación y locales debido al aumento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>costos al Fondo de Examinadores de Quiroprácticos en 1990-91 al</td>
<td>en las multas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>SI - ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. EMENDIA</td>
<td>Publicar el acta de la Quiropráctica. Requiere la renovación de la</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la definición de</td>
<td>licencia durante el mes de nacimiento. Aumenta las multas por</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;oficial del orden público&quot; que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto</td>
<td>quebrantamiento del Acta. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos al Fondo de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fiscal: Menores costos al Fondo de Examinadores de Quiroprácticos en</td>
<td>Examinadores de Quiroprácticos en 1990-91 al modificar el sistema de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1990-91 al modificar el sistema de renovación y locales debido al</td>
<td>renovación y locales debido al aumento en las multas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>NO - DERECHO PENAL. EMENDIA ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE</td>
<td>Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los</td>
<td>derechos obligados por la Constitución federal; afecta cambios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>derechos obligados por la Constitución federal; afecta cambios</td>
<td>estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la</td>
<td>La medida afecta significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medida. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.</td>
<td>penal. Se desconoce como se pondría en ejecución y se interpretaría la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.</td>
<td>medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.</td>
<td>estatales y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>SI - TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE</td>
<td>Autoriza la emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INICIATIVA. Autoriza la emisión de bonos de obligación general</td>
<td>principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de</td>
<td>para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario.</td>
<td>durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años</td>
<td>$2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el</td>
<td>(costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>NO - PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.</td>
<td>Autoriza la emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transferir $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos</td>
<td>principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohibe agarrar al puma. Impacto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohibe agarrar al</td>
<td>fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas</td>
<td>provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarillo y productos de tabaco; $12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarillo y</td>
<td>millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la</td>
<td>transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de</td>
<td>propiedades.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efectivo por un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE 1990年6月5日
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

236 SI 贊成
LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN. ÉTICA. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de almacenar la votación pública y la posible redistribución por el costo. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores.

238 NO 反對

240 SI 贊成
REDISTRIBUCIÓN FOR COMISIÓN. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.

242 NO 反對

243 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

245 NO 反對

248 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, los cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes "Hastings," la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejorías para la salubridad y seguridad.

250 NO 反對

254 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGUROS CONTRA SISMSOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiastamiento a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y reubicación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

256 NO 反對

258 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.

259 NO 反對

118 119 120 121 122 123

1990年新监狱建筑的债券法案。此法案将发行公债$450,000,000 以提供资金来建立新监狱，改变目前州监盘，青少年管教所过度拥挤的情况。

1990年6月的高等教育建筑物债券法案。此法案将发行公债$450,000,000 以提供资金来建立或改善州公共高等教育机构的建筑物，包括以下：加州的9个大学，州立大学的20个校间，州立大学的71个社区，海斯丁（Hastings）法律学院，州海洋研究学院和州立大学董事会于1990年7/1日或之前通过批准的其建筑建筑物。此法案所批准资金的使用，将包括而不必限于实验室，实验室，图书馆的兴建或改善及实际改善防灾，其他的健康或安全的设备。

1990年防震安全设备及公共楼宇重建公债法案。此法案将发行公债$300,000,000 以提供资金来重建、改善防震安全设备，修缮，替换及搬移那些因受地震损害而成为危险的州及市政府楼宇。

1990年学校建筑物公债法案。此法案将发行公债$800,000,000 以提供资金来建立或改善公校的建筑物。
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

A  YES 263
 NO 265

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

B  YES 269
 NO 272

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

C  YES 277
 NO 278

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

D  YES 280
 NO 281

WITHDRAWN

E

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

F  YES 284
 NO 285
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contratar una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del sismo, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para los servicios inaccesibles, siempre y cuando no se contrate más de $95,000,000 de dicho bono en bonos de $332,400,000 en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de $332,400,000 sea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en condiciones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

263 SI 贊成
265 NO 反对

¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización para financiar (i) la reparación, la restauración y el reclasamiento de las Instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989, y (ii) la mejora simétrica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, como la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco y la conservación del valor de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos relacionados con ellos, por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recolocado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.20 por parcela durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $32.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, cierres terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se dispone con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 82-13-31 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1989 y que deberá establecerse un límite de apropiación de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

269 SI 贊成
272 NO 反对

¿Tendrá el Consejo de Superintendentes, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda especificados, la autorización para aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin límites de crédito, si el Contralor certifica que el costo neto en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

277 SI 贊成
278 NO 反对

¿Creará la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escrituras en las Rutas para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escrituras de las rutas, permitiendo que las empresas despachen hasta un porcentaje de sus ingresos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

280 SI 贊成
281 NO 反对

ELIMINADA

E 撤消

¿Se realizará una comisión a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 40 horas a 37 horas (después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto aun máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de inicio de los turnos de los bomberos. en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 8 a.m.?

284 SI 贊成
285 NO 反对

F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propuesta</td>
<td>Aprobación</td>
<td>Disaprobación</td>
<td>Texto Integral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autoridad de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apliaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Serán un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen anualmente a los miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y consejos superiores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a siete congresos o menos, o en las cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o aptitudes especiales y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles mientas a la fabricación; el uso; o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

Write your residence address where indicated.

You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTORAUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfora los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquéllos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentan una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRUIINADA O DAÑADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuelva la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (deber ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el “Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación” para que la balota pueda ser contada.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 5, 1990

ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:

This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on
which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and
marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for
which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the
ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the
numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked
in this booklet.

Sample Ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>CANDIDATE A</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE B</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文说明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), **check the back of the ballot card** to make sure those holes are completely punched out. **Pull off any hanging chads.**

4. To vote for a **write-in candidate**, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the **secrecy envelope**. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your **ballot** inside the **secrecy envelope**, and then put them into the **Absentee Ballot Return Envelope**.

6. Fill in the **declaration** on the Return Envelope with your **signature**, **printed name**, **residence**, and **date**. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and **mail it early**, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. **Postmarks do not count.**

**SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT**

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

**BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY**

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by **8 p.m. June 5, 1990**.

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will **not be counted**, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may **mail** your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may **bring your ballot** in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the "Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places" in order for the ballot to be counted.

**PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING**

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

---

**AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT**

I authorized ________________________________________, my ___________________________________,

(name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name ___________________________________________ Signature _______________________________________

Date ___________________________________________
GOVERNADOR  
Governor

DENNIS THOMPSON
President, Computer Company
Presidente, Empresa de Computación

VICEGOBERNADOR  
Lieutenant Governor

ANTHONY G. BAJADA
University Professor
Profesor de la Universidad
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
<th>ESTADO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECRETARIO DE ESTADO</th>
<th>Secretary of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KENNITA WATSON</td>
<td>Software Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingeniero de Software</td>
<td>軟件工程師</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRALOR</th>
<th>Controller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS TRYON</td>
<td>County Supervisor / Rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor del Condado / Ranchero</td>
<td>縣參事／農場主</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TESORERO</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR TREASURER IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Tesorero en este distrito)

本區無人登記提名，競選財政司
PROCURADOR GENERAL  檢察長
Attorney General

PAUL N. GAUTREAU
Attorney at Law
Abogado  沙律師

COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS  保險委員
Insurance Commissioner

TED BROWN
Insurance Adjuster / Investigator
Ajustador de Seguros / Investigador  保陰調整人／調查人

Vote por Uno
Vote for One

54 ➔

61 ➔
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
<th>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</th>
<th>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)</th>
<th>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</th>
<th>(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>MEMBRO, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)</td>
<td>LYN SAPOWSKY-SMITH</td>
<td>(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountant / Contador</td>
<td>本區無人候選為聯邦衆議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN WHISMAN</td>
<td>本區無人競選州參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Contractor / Contratista Electricista</td>
<td>本區無人競選州參議員</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L 23 & 24

8-3L
JOHN WHISMAN
Electrical Contractor
Contratista Electricista 電氣承造商
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Law Teacher / Abogada / Maestra de Derecho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney / Fiscal Asistente del Distrito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
<td>Sheriff’s Department’s Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>ASESOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Supervisor / Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td>Deputy Assessor / Asesor Asistente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td>Real Estate Portfolio Manager / Administrador de Bienes Raíces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogada; Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>DEFENSOR PUBLICO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990
This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

**Measure 107**
- **YES 185**
- **NO 187**

### PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990
This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

**Measure 108**
- **YES 189**
- **NO 190**

### GOVERNOR'S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT
Extends Governor's time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

**Measure 109**
- **YES 192**
- **NO 193**

### PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS
Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

**Measure 110**
- **YES 195**
- **NO 197**

### THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990
This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

**Measure 111**
- **YES 200**
- **NO 203**
Proposiciones a ser sometidas al voto de los electores — Estatal

185 SI 賛成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone el emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas para arrendas para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que tienen las necesidades esenciales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez. 107

187 NO 反對

189 SI 賛成
190 NO 反對
ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone del emisión de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desembolsos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rápidos para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte de pasajeros para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en rieles. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resumen del cálculo por el Asistente de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatal y locales: Si todos los bonos autorizados fueran vendidos el 75 por ciento y pagados durante un periodo de 2 años típicamente, el Fondo General incurriría en unos $1.8 mil millones para pagar por el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($750 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos sería de $50 millones. 108

192 SI 賛成
193 NO 反對
REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR (FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA). Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede reforzar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo. 109

195 SI 賛成
197 NO 反對
EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto a viviendas de personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatal o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 millón a $2 millones por año. 110

200 SI 賛成
ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establece un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondrá el día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para reforzar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida estaría en un aumento del 50% en los cobros por peso a los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de gasolina combustible el 1 de agosto de 1990, y un centavo adicional el 1 de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía sigue una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuaria disminuyendo la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciben al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos. 111

203 NO 反對

1990年房屋與無家可歸者公債法案。此法案提供發行公債￥150,000,000 資助的房屋計畫包括以下：(1)無家可歸者及家屬的緊急避難所及變更期房房屋新出租給個人及家庭的房屋來符合老年人、殘障者及貧困特別需要之舊房及出租屋的修補及維護均給予第一次買屋人資助援助。 107

1990年客鐵專線交通與空氣清潔公債。此法案提供發行公債十億元，資助國民之投資，資本支出及發展市內鐵路工具計劃。由加州「一級機構」來支付公債。以下為立法局分析專家對州及市政府財政支出影響的估計：如果所有通過實施的公債以百分之2.5出售，付款期限為通常的20年來計算，「一級機構」將支付約十八億；十年信用債本息，七億九千萬付息，估計每年公債本息及付息的總額為九千萬元。 108

州長對立法的檢討。立法的截止日期。立法修憲案。此提案將延長州長檢討被建議中立法時期及改變立法的有效日期。如果通過實施的話，每年稅收損失約一百萬元至二百萬元之間。 109

1990年減輕交通壓塞及限制支出法案。此法案將實施一項州減輕交通壓塞及限制州與市政府支出的限制額，使更確定地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它將提供新徵收來策州內公路、市內街道及大規模的公共交通設備以減輕交通壓塞。此法案將增加財政負擔，因州及市政府支出的限制額。此修憲案批准法案已實施其規定。110

1990年減輕交通壓塞及限制支出法案。此法案將實施一項州減輕交通壓塞及限制州與市政府支出的限制額，使更確定地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它將提供新徵收來策州內公路、市內街道及大規模的公共交通設備以減輕交通壓塞。此法案將增加財政負擔，因州及市政府支出的限制額。此修憲案批准法案已實施其規定。如果通過實施的話，每年稅收損失約一百萬元至二百萬元之間。 111

1990年減輕交通壓塞及限制支出法案。此法案將實施一項州減輕交通壓塞及限制州與市政府支出的限制額，使更確定地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它將提供新徵收來策州內公路、市內街道及大規模的公共交通設備以減輕交通壓塞。此法案將增加財政負擔，因州及市政府支出的限制額。此修憲案批准法案已實施其規定。如果通過實施的話，每年稅收損失約一百萬元至二百萬元之間。 111

N 51, N 52 & N 53 13-1N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS, ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NÚMERO</td>
<td>ELECCIÓN</td>
<td>PROPUESTA</td>
<td>VOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNCIONARIOS ESTATUALES, ÉTICA.** Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: No desconoce los costos al estado que dependerían de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.


**ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO, PENAS.** ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la deficiencia de "asesinato del oficial del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia en asesinatos en primer grado.

**DERECHO PENAL.** ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida afecta significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce como se pondría en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

**TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS, ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.** Autoriza la emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajes de día. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría 22 $2 mil millones para el capital y $1,6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

**PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE.** ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohibe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serian de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

**RECURSO DE VIUDA Y OBRERO.** Aumenta la pensión de viudedad y obraje en caso de morte del cónyuge de obligaciones y obligaciones legales. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.

**NIÑOS HERNIADA.** ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Normaliza la condición de "niño" para el principio de defensa contra el producto para el fondo de los niños heridos. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.

**RECURSO DE VIUDA Y OBRERO.** Aumenta la pensión de viudedad y obraje en caso de morte del cónyuge de obligaciones y obligaciones legales. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.

**NIÑOS HERNIADA.** ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Normaliza la condición de "niño" para el principio de defensa contra el producto para el fondo de los niños heridos. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.

**RECURSO DE VIUDA Y OBRERO.** Aumenta la pensión de viudedad y obraje en caso de morte del cónyuge de obligaciones y obligaciones legales. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.

**NIÑOS HERNIADA.** ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Normaliza la condición de "niño" para el principio de defensa contra el producto para el fondo de los niños heridos. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.

**RECURSO DE VIUDA Y OBRERO.** Aumenta la pensión de viudedad y obraje en caso de morte del cónyuge de obligaciones y obligaciones legales. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.

**NIÑOS HERNIADA.** ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Normaliza la condición de "niño" para el principio de defensa contra el producto para el fondo de los niños heridos. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.

**RECURSO DE VIUDA Y OBRERO.** Aumenta la pensión de viudedad y obraje en caso de morte del cónyuge de obligaciones y obligaciones legales. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STATUTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

236 SI 贊成

LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujetaría la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impact Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de al votación pública y la posible redistribución por la corta. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores.

238 NO 反對

118

240 SI 贊成

REDISTRIBUCIÓN FOR COMISIÓN. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impact Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.

242 NO 反對

119

243 SI 贊成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

245 NO 反對

120

1990年新监狱建筑的公债法案。此法案将发行公债$450,000,000以提供资金来建设新监狱，改善目前州监狱，青少年管教所过度拥挤的情况。

248 SI 贊成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nueve recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Los Angeles "Hastings," la Academia Maritima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salubridad y seguridad.

250 NO 反對

121

1990年6月的高等教育建筑法案。此法案将发行公债$450,000,000以提供资金来改善州公共高等教育机构的建筑，包括以下：加州的9个大学，州立大学的20个校区，州立大学的71个，希斯丁(HASTINGS)法律学院，州海洋学院和州立大学理事会于1990年7月1日之前通过批准的国立校建筑。此法案所批准的资金的使用，将包括而不必限于教室，实验室，图书馆的兴建或改善及实施消防安全，其他健康或安全的设施。

254 SI 贊成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aditamentos a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y reubicación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

256 NO 反對

122

1990年防震安全设备及公共楼宇重建公债法案。此法案将发行公债$300,000,000以提供资金来重建，改善防震安全设备，修缮，替换及废除那些因受地震损害而变为危险的州及市政府楼宇。

258 SI 贊成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.

259 NO 反對

123

1990年学校建筑物公债法案。此法案将发行公债$800,000,000以提供资本支持来兴建或改善校舍的建筑。
**PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990.** To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>YES 263</th>
<th>NO 265</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>YES 269</th>
<th>NO 272</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>YES 277</th>
<th>NO 278</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>YES 280</th>
<th>NO 281</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**WITHDRAWN**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>YES 284</th>
<th>NO 285</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

263 SI 贊成

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contrarrestar una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la eliminación del asbesto, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $332,400,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

265 NO 反對

269 SI 贊成

¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización para financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (o los choques sucesivos), (ii) la mejora sísmica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iii) la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las Instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos variables relacionados a los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recoclecido durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual: (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años; $32.20 por parcela durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, ciertos terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se dispone en mayores detalles en la resolución No. 92-1351-81 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1989; y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

272 NO 反對

277 SI 贊成

¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin líneas de lucro, si el Contralor certifica que el costo neto en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

278 NO 反對

280 SI 贊成

¿Crearán la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escrituras en las Paredes para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escrituras de las paredes, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un uno por ciento de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

281 NO 反對

ELIMINADA

284 SI 贊成

¿Será realizada una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 40.7 horas (después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra); (2) permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una enmienda, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en voz de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 8 a.m.?

285 NO 反對

E 撤消

286 SI 贊成

¿Exigirá que los bomberos sean caracterizados de bomberos en un tiempo de labor de 40.7 horas por semana, después de lo cual se otorgue tiempo extra, o, en cambio, permitirá que esta autoridad, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una enmienda, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en voz de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 8 a.m.?

287 NO 反對

F 撤消

三藩市聯合校區的社區建築之第90-1號提案

235 SI 贊成

A 1980年公共安全改善公債。發行公債$332,400,000，用於修繕、興建或改建三藩市及縣所擁有的、包括用於地震後的修繕、減少震害的學校、教堂、學校、災難管理所或其周圍的建築物。只要每年於年度內所發行公債的數目不超過$65,000,000，並經FEMA（聯邦緊急事務管理署）所規定的資金，則所余資金可再用於加州地震後的修繕及減少地震災害。設置所得的補助金將會降低至$332,400,000公債的數目。

236 NO 反對

B 三藩市聯合校區的社區建築之第90-1號建案

237 SI 贊成

C 市議會應否通過選民投票之前及在某些指定責任的限制範圍內，有權批准由非牟利公司經營租賃設備，只要主計官能確保市政府所付的淨利息比其他各種租賃設備計劃為低？

238 NO 反對

D 市政府應否設立美化山坡及清潔廁所的基金來付美化三藩市街坊及清潔廁所的費用，讓商業行業家付他們的營業稅的百份之－－此基金，每年此百份之率會被調整以控制一百萬元基金？

239 SI 贊成

E 未撤消

N 51, 52 & N 53 19-1N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Número</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autoridad de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291 NO</td>
<td>291 NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 SI</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro el sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 NO</td>
<td>293 NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294 SI</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 NO</td>
<td>295 NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 SI</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Será un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se encarguen de la toma de decisiones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 NO</td>
<td>299 NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombradas por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, en excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 NO</td>
<td>303 NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 SI</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que eliminen todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 NO</td>
<td>305 NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 SI</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 NO</td>
<td>307 NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 SI</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 NO</td>
<td>309 NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 SI</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 NO</td>
<td>311 NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
★ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

★ Write your residence address where indicated.

★ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfora los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquéllos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), vencirá el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentaron una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRuinADA O DañADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuelva la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 5, 1990

ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on
which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and
marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for
which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the
ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the
numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked
in this booklet.

Sample Ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>CANDIDATE A</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE B</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文說明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

**SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT**

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

**BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY**

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

**PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING**

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

**AUTHORIZED TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT**

I authorized ________________________________, my ____________________________ (name) (relationship) to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name ____________________________ Signature ____________________________

Date ____________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
<th>GOBERNADOR</th>
<th>DENNIS THOMPSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President, Computer Company</td>
<td>Presidente, Empresa de Computación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>總裁，電腦公司</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBERTARIAN PARTY</th>
<th>VICEGOBERNADOR</th>
<th>ANTHONY G. BAJADA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>副州長</td>
<td>University Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Profesor de la Universidad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote por Uno
Vote for One

選一人
21 →
SECRETARIO DE ESTADO
Secretary of State

KENNITA WATSON
Software Engineer
Ingeniero de Software

29

CONTRALOR
Controller

THOMAS TRYON
County Supervisor / Rancher
Supervisor del Condado / Ranchero

36

TESORERO
Treasurer

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR TREASURER IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Tesorero en este distrito)

本區無人登記提名，競選財政司
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO LIBERAL</td>
<td>PAUL N. GAUTREAU</td>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LÍBERTARIAN PARTY</td>
<td>TED BROWN</td>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO LIBERAL</td>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</td>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN**

**Member, State Board of Equalization**

**LYN SAPOWSKY-SMITH**

Accountant / Contador

**80**

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)

本區無人候選為聯邦眾議員

**LIBERTARIAN PARTY**

**PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990**

**MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL**

**Member of the State Assembly**

**JOHN WHISMAN**

Electrical Contractor / Contratista Electricista

**102**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
<th>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</th>
<th>MIEMBRO DEL COMITÉ CENTRAL DEL PARTIDO LIBERAL 17TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libertarian Party</td>
<td>Primary Election June 5, 1990</td>
<td>Member of Libertarian Party Central Committees 17th Assembly District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JOHN WHISMAN**  
Electrical Contractor  
Contratista Electricista 電氣承造商
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</th>
<th>JUDICIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>州教育司</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAROL S. KOPPEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL HONIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARK ISLER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALEX SALDAMANDO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARLOS BEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KAY TSENIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JEROME T. BENSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONNA HITCHENS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

107
YES 185
NO 187

PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

108
YES 189
NO 190

GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

109
YES 192
NO 193

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

110
YES 195
NO 197

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

111
YES 200
NO 203
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluya: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de viviendas y viviendas de arriendo ya viciadas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compren casa por primera vez.

1990年房屋與無家可歸者公債法案。此法案提供發行公債 $150,000,000 資助的房屋計劃包括以下：(1)無家可歸者及家屬的緊急避難所及變更期房屋租賃給個人及家庭的房屋來符合老年人、殘疾者及屋頂的特別需求；(2)舊有及出租的修補及維護資助首次購屋人買屋補助。

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA VIAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LÍMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desembolsos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rodantes para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en ciudades. Asigna dinero de los Fondos Generales del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resumen del cálculo por el Banco de la Federación sobre el impacto fiscal del 15% en los gobiernos estatal y locales: Si todos los bonos autorizados fueron vendidos al 75% se pagarían en anualidades de $1,000,000,000 en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo total de los fondos en los bonos sería de $1,000,000,000.

BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES 商業及商業地點的轉換。此法案提供發行公債 $1,000,000,000 資助的鐵路項目計劃及公共交通計劃，由各主來「一般經費」支付公債。以下為立法院分析報告中對此法案的影響預估：如果所有通過實施的公債以百分之三十八售出，付款期為通貨緊縮的20年來計算，「一般經費」將支付公債十億，售價十億公債本息合計為九千三百九十七萬元。計算每年公債本息的總額為九百三十九萬，計算每年本息約九千一百六十七千元。

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

1990年立法工作及立法建議報告會的廢止。此議案將會制定立法建議的廢止日期及廢止影響。對財政影響：無直接財政影響。

EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. EMNIEDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto sobre la propiedad a las personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatal o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 millón a $2 millones por año.

EJEMPT PROPIEDAD PERSONAS INCAPACITADAS. 無家庭者免徵物業稅的立法修憲案。它允許將稅務財務轉移至無家庭者替代的房屋。對財政影響：無直接財政影響。因此修憲案只批准立法局實施其規定。如果通過實施的話，每年稅收將約減少七百万元至二百萬元之間。

ACTA PARA EL DESCONECTAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establecerá un programa de desconectamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondrá al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para reflejar mejor las necesidades crecientes de la creciente población de California. Distribuirá nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida estimularía un aumento del 55% en los salarios por hora y un aumento de cinco centavos de gasolímetro de 1 de agosto de 1990, y un aumento adicional el 1 de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida provee al día la limitación en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el desconectamiento del tránsito, el tránsito, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuará disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciban al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y distribuirá los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean reajustados por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

1990年降低交通排放及限制支出法案。此法案將實施一項州降低交通排放計劃及修改州與市政府支出的限制額，使能更確定地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它將提供政府徵收額加建築州內公路、市內道路及大規模的公共交通設施以降低交通排放。此法案將增加公車重量收費百分之五十及由1990年8月1日開始，向每加汽油稅每加侖五仙。之後四年期間內，由每年8月1日起，增加汽油稅每加侖五仙。此法案將非車輛撥款限額將獲取消自動車燃料及車輛稅的徵收。此法案會調整州撥款額與獲取新資金來降低交通排放及發展大規模交通設施，交通計劃、老年人服務及其它重要的計劃，同時亦能限制州及市政府支出。此法案將繼續為省教育及社區大學提供至少州「一般經費」的四十分之四十，亦將規定超過州撥款額的徵收會平分給教育部及納稅人。
STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.


MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER, CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.

CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.

RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).

WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependerían de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.


ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefinie y expande la definición de “oficial del orden público” que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectúa significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondrá en ejecución y se interpretará la medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $800 millones).

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calcularían serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Legislature, Reapportionment, Ethics, Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>YES 236</td>
<td>NO 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Reapportionment by Commission. Initiative Constitutional Amendment, Statute. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>YES 240</td>
<td>NO 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>YES 243</td>
<td>NO 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's nine Campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>YES 248</td>
<td>NO 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>YES 254</td>
<td>NO 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 School Facilities Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>YES 258</td>
<td>NO 259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| N°  | Proposición | Acuerdo | No | Nota
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Legislatura, Redistribución, Ética, Enmienda y Estatuto Constitucional de Iniciativa. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la votación pública y la posible redistribución por la corriente. Los costos por las disposiciones de ética son probablemente menores.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Redistribución for Comisión, Enmienda y Estatuto Constitucional de Iniciativa. establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hecho más que la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para la Construcción de Nuevas Prisiones de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para Instalaciones de Educación Superior de Junio de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Los Angeles “Hastings,” la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita, el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salubridad y seguridad.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para Seguridad Contra Sismos y Rehabilitación de Edificios Públicos de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aditamentos a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos para Instalaciones Escolares de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolsos de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263
NO 265

B

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269
NO 272

C

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277
NO 278

D

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

E

WITHDRAWN

F

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 284
NO 285
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contraer una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condo de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la eliminación del astillaje, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se contrate más de $65,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $332,400,000 se vea vendida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

1990年公共安全改善 bonding — 发行公债 
$332,400,000，用于收购、重建旧金山市政府拥有的房产，包括地震后修复、减少地震危险的措施、消除障碍。债券的发行量不得超过$65,000,000，并且必须在联邦紧急事务管理署（FEMA）或加州州政府提供的款项中出售。出售的金额将降低至$332,400,000的数目。

¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización para financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989, y/o los choques subsecuentes, (ii) la mejora estática de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iii) la rectificación de los daños de seguridad contínuos en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos varios relacionados a los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recolocado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual: (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.20 por parcela durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de una o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $32.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $10.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las denominaciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, ciertos terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se dispone con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 02-13-91 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990, y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de edificios por alquiler de una empresa sin fines de lucro, si el Contralor certifica que el costo neto en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

¿Crearía la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escrituras en las Parques para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escrituras de los parques, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un porcentaje de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de esta porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

¿Se realizaría una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48.7 horas (después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comiencen a las 8 a.m.?

市議會應否批准通過選民投票之前及在某些指定條件的限制範圍內，有權批准由非牟利公司營運租賃設備，只要主計官認為市政府所付的淨利息比其他租賃設備計劃為低？

市院暨議會是否指定消防總局至少應有多少消防局及各等級的職工人數？並且應否通過消防委員會、市議員及三藩市選民的贊同，消防局，其他消防公司或單位始能開門作業？
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Resolución</td>
<td>Texto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permiso de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Será un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen electores a los miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos enumerados, o en los cuales se requiere una persona con experiencia, capacidad o habilidades especiales y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con esas condiciones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, en excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que algún preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles relacionadas a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don't forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don't count.
Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

Write your residence address where indicated.

You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUÑSTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perforé los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquellos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentado una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquela dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores Ausentes antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRuinADA O DAÑADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuélvala la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contará, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 5, 1990

ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:

This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)

Sample Ballot

President

CANDIDATE A

CANDIDATE B

CANDIDATE C

PUNCH OUT THE DOT ON THE NUMBERED BOX ON THE BALLOT CARD THAT IS THE SAME AS THE NUMBER OF YOUR CHOICE OF CANDIDATE, OR "YES" OR "NO" ON MEASURES.

Use pin provided to punch out chip on ballot.

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文說明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), **check the back of the ballot card** to make sure those holes are completely punched out. **Pull off any hanging chads.**

4. To vote for a **write-in candidate**, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the **secrecy envelope**. **Note:** Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your **ballot** inside the **secrecy envelope**, and then put them into the **Absentee Ballot Return Envelope**.

6. Fill in the **declaration** on the Return Envelope with your **signature**, **printed name**, **residence**, and **date**. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and **mail it early**, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. **Postmarks do not count.**

**SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT**

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

**BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY**

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by **8 p.m. June 5, 1990.** Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will **not be counted**, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may **mail** your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. **OR, you may bring your ballot** in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. **OR, an authorized person** (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the "Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places" in order for the ballot to be counted.

**PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING**

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

---

**AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT**

I authorized ______________________________________________________, my ____________________________ (name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name __________________________________________ Signature __________________________________

Date __________________________________________
GOBERNADOR  
Governor

DENNIS THOMPSON
President, Computer Company
Presidente, Empresa de Computación

VICEGOBERNADOR  
Lieutenant Governor

ANTHONY G. BAJADA
University Professor
Profesor de la Universidad

PARTIDO LIBERAL  
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS  
STATE  
JUNE 5, 1990  
ESTADO  
5 DE JUNIO DE 1990  
LIBERTARIAN PARTY  
PRIMARY ELECTION  
JUNE 5, 1990  
L 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 & 27
SECRETARIO DE ESTADO
Secretary of State

KENNITA WATSON
Software Engineer
Ingeniero de Software

29

CONTRALOR
Controller

THOMAS TRYON
County Supervisor / Rancher
Supervisor del Condado / Ranchero

36

TESORERO
Treasurer

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR TREASURER IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Tesorero en este distrito)

本區無人登記提名，競選財政司

L 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 & 27
PROCURADOR GENERAL  檢察長
Attorney General

PAUL N. GAUTREAUX
Attorney at Law
Abogado

COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS  保險委員
Insurance Commissioner

TED BROWN
Insurance Adjuster / Investigator
Ajustador de Seguros / Investigador  保險調查人／調查人
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
<th>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</th>
<th>LYN SAPOWSKY-SMITH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREE TRADE</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>Accountant / Contador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDLIBERAL</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR</td>
<td>80 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)

本區無人候選為聯邦衆議員

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
<th>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</th>
<th>JOHN WHISMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>Electrical Contractor / Contractista Electricista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>102 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Senador Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人競選州參議員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
<th>MIEMBRO, COMITÉ CENTRAL DEL CONDADO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>MIEMBRO DEL COMITÉ CENTRAL DEL PARTIDO LIBERAL, DISTrito 17 DE LA ASAMBLEA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JOHN WHISMAN**
Electrical Contractor
Contratista Electricista
電氣承造商

**Vote for no more than 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>自由蒙</th>
<th>縣中央委員會委員</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>烏德 1990年6月5日</td>
<td>委員會委員第17區委員</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L 23, 24 & 25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Position and Education</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corre, Municipal</td>
<td>William J. O'Connor</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Chaitin</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Tang</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Harrigan</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corre, Municipal</td>
<td>Jerome A. De Filippo</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lillian K. Sing</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asesor</td>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Schwenger</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ronald G. Kershaw</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensor Publico</td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990.
Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por el monto de 150,000,000 dólares para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda. El programa incluye: (1) reformas de emergencia, (2) viviendas intermedias para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (3) viviendas para arrendamiento a familias e individuos, (4) organismos de arriendo que llenen las necesidades de la comunidad, (5) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (6) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990.
Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por el monto de 100,000,000 dólares para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de derecho de vía, instalaciones, maquinaria, capital y para la adquisición de trenes rodantes para ferrocarriles de ciudades, para transporte interurbano en área de diario, y programas de transporte en rutas. Acompaña el financiamiento del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos emisores del público. Se resume el cálculo de los ingresos de los gobiernos estatales y locales: (1) todos los bonos autorizados fueron vendidos al 5% por año y pagados durante un periodo de 20 años, (2) el Fondo General incluye una emisión de bonos del 10% por año para pagar el capital (10% mil millones) y el interés (100 millones) en los bonos, (3) se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos sería de 800 millones.

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL Gobernador. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto basta a viviendas de reemplazo para personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatales y locales que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de recaudación de los impuestos probablemente de $1 millón a $2 millones por año.

ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida estabulina un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatales y locales para reflejar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos ruidos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, y instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecería un aumento del 50% en los cobres por paso a los caminos y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1990, y un centavo adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otras programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuaría disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciban al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y disponiendo que los ruidos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

1990年房屋與無家可歸者公債法案。此法案規定發行公債$150,000,000，用於房屋計劃。(1)撤銷緊急及保隕難離所及其它緊急變局所，(2)設置低租金及出租核貸個人及家庭的房屋，(3)為老年人、殘障者及需要特別服務的無家可歸者及出租戶的修繕及維護給予第一次買屋及買屋援助。

1990年通過鐵軌交通及空氣清潔公債法案。此法案規定發行公債$100,000,000，用於鐵軌交通及空氣清潔計劃。(1)設置鐵軌及鐵軌交通工具計劃，(2)設置空氣清潔計劃，(3)設置低銀行貸款及租金的房屋援助，(4)設置老年人、殘障者及需要特別服務的無家可歸者及出租戶的修繕及維護給予第一次買屋及買屋援助。
### Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters — State Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>Yes 211 → No 213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>Yes 218 → No 220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>Yes 222 → No 224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>Yes 226 → No 228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>Yes 230 → No 232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

FUNCIONARIOS ESTATUALES. ÉTICA. Establece reglas de ética estatal adicionales. Crear una Comisión para que fije la remuneración de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependan de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigor la medida.


ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la definición de “asesinato del orden público” que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expanda la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal: efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida es significativa en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce como se pondrá en ejecución y se interpretará la medida. Podría haber simplemente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y local o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza la emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los años siguientes a 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $160 millones).

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.

118 YES 236 → NO 238 →

119 REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STATUTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.

YES 240 → NO 242 →

120 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.

YES 243 → NO 245 →

121 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.

YES 248 → NO 250 →

122 EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.

YES 254 → NO 256 →

123 1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 258 → NO 259 →
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Legislatura, redistribución, ética, enmienda y estatuto constitucional de iniciativa. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la votación pública y la posible redistribución por el corte. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN POR COMISIÓN. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones de 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1990年新監獄建築の公債法令。此法令將發行公債$450,000,000 以提供資金來建築新監獄，改善目前日監獄，青少年管教所過度擠壓的情況。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nueve recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobados por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o renovación de los salones de clases, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejorías para la salud y seguridad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1990年6月的高等教育建築物公債法令。此法令將發行公債$450,000,000 以提供資金來建築或改善州公共高等教育機構的建築物，包括以下：加州的9個大學，州立大學的20個校園，州社區大學的71個，斯坦丁(Hastings)法律學院，州海洋研究院及州州立大學董事會於1990年7月1日或之前批准的所有新校建築物。此公債法令中資金的使用，將包括而不限於教室、實驗室、圖書館的興建或改善及/或實施改善防震、其他健康或安全的設備。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aditamentos a prueba de sísmos, reparación, remodelación y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1990年防震安全設備及公共樓宇重建公債法令。此法令將發行公債$300,000,000 以提供資金來重建，改善防震安全設備，修補、替換及改善那些因地震嚴重受損而變得危險的州及市政府樓宇。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1990年學校建築物公債法令。此法令將發行公債$800,000,000 以提供資本支出來興建或改善學校建築物。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>17-1N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17-1N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Public Safety Improvement Bonds, 1990.</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors lease financing</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Minimum number of fire stations and staffing</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contratar una deuda en bonos de $322,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que sean propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del asbesto, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se contrate más de $65,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $322,400,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

263 SI  

¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 00-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Uniificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Uniificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (o los choques subsecuentes), (ii) la mejora sísmica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Uniificado de San Francisco, (iii) la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Uniificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Uniificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos variados relacionados a los anteriores por medio de la recolección de un impuesto especial a ser recolectado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.20 por parcela durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de un o más comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, ciertos terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se disponga con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 02-13-81 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Uniificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990; y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiación de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

269 SI  

¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48.7 horas (después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comiencen a las 6 a.m.?

272 NO  

¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda específicos, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin límites de lucro, si el Contralor certifica que el costo neto en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

277 SI  

¿Crearán la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escrituras en las Paredes para pagar por embellecer las vecindades de la Ciudad y limpiar las escrituras de las paredes, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un uno por ciento de sus impuestos municipales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

280 SI  

¿Están de acuerdo en aportar $500,000 para la progresiva limpieza de las calles de la ciudad, con un porcentaje de las matrículas de vehículo y un porcentaje de la propina del presidente de la Cámara de Comercio, del 1 de enero al 31 de diciembre del año en curso?

281 NO  

¿Están de acuerdo en mantener una inversión en el fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escrituras en las Paredes, es decir, aportar $1 millón para el año 1991 para pagar por embellecer las vecindades de la ciudad y limpiar las escrituras de las paredes, para mantener el valor del mismo con un porcentaje de los impuestos de vehículos, propina del presidente de la Cámara de Comercio y otras fuentes de ingresos?

ELIMINADA

284 SI  

¿Están de acuerdo en mantener un fondo para la limpieza del vecindario y la limpieza de las escrituras de las paredes, con un porcentaje de los impuestos de vehículos y propina del presidente de la Cámara de Comercio, para mantenerlo con $1 millón anual?

285 NO  

¿Están de acuerdo en mantener un fondo para la limpieza del vecindario y la limpieza de las escrituras de las paredes, con un porcentaje de los impuestos de vehículos y propina del presidente de la Cámara de Comercio, para mantenerlo con $1 millón anual?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

288 SI  贊成  ¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?

289 NO  反对

290 SI  贊成  ¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?

292 NO  反对

293 SI  贊成  ¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?

295 NO  反对

296 SI  贊成  ¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?

297 NO  反对

298 SI  贊成  ¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Aplaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?

299 NO  反对

300 SI  贊成  ¿Será un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen electores a los miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos numerados, o en los cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o aptitudes especiales y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?

301 NO  反对

302 SI  贊成  ¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?

304 NO  反对

305 SI  贊成  ¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?

307 NO  反对

309 SI  贊成  ¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?

310 NO  反对

N 51, N 52 & N 53  21-1N
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
☆ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.
☆ Write your residence address where indicated.
☆ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONS APPEAR ON THE FRONT PAGE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfore los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquellos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentaron una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRUIVADA O DAÑADA

Si usted roba, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuélvala la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.
ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 - 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on
which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.
1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and
marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for
which you wish to vote.
2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the
ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the
numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked
in this booklet.
(Continued next page)

Sample Ballot

President
CANDIDATE A 4
CANDIDATE B 5
CANDIDATE C 6

PUNCH OUT THE DOT ON THE NUMBERED BOX ON THE BALLOT
CARD THAT IS THE SAME AS THE NUMBER OF YOUR CHOICE OF
CANDIDATE, OR "YES" OR "NO" ON MEASURES.

Use pin provided
to punch out
chip on ballot.
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), **check the back of the ballot card** to make sure those holes are completely punched out. **Pull off any hanging chads.**

4. To vote for a **write-in candidate**, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank spaces provided on the **secrecy envelope**. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your **ballot** inside the **secrecy envelope**, and then put them into the **Absentee Ballot Return Envelope**.

6. Fill in the **declaration** on the Return Envelope with your **signature, printed name, residence, and date**. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and **mail it early**, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. **Postmarks do not count.**

**SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT**

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

**BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY**

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place **by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.**

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will **not be counted, regardless of postmark date.**

1. You may **mail** your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. **OR, you may bring your ballot in** the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. **OR, an authorized person** (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

**PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING**

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

---

**AUTHORIZED TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT**

I authorized __________________________________________, my ______________________________ (name) (relationship)

________ to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall

☐ a polling place.

Name __________________________________________ Signature ______________________________

Date __________________________________________
GOBERNADOR  
Governor

DENNIS THOMPSON
President, Computer Company

Presidente, Empresa de Computación

VICEGOBERNADOR  副州長
Lieutenant Governor

ANTHONY G. BAJADA
University Professor

Profesor de la Universidad

PARTIDO LIBERAL

LIBERTARIAN PARTY

ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990

Estado

STATE

選一人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

選一人
Vote por Uno
Vote for One

2  →

21  →
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KENNITA WATSON</td>
<td>Software Engineer</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRALOR</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THOMAS TRYON</td>
<td>County Supervisor / Rancher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TESORERO</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR TREASURER IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Tesorero en este distrito)

本區無人登記提名，競選財政司
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
<th>ESTADO</th>
<th>PRIMARY ELECTION</th>
<th>JUNE 5, 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROCURADOR GENERAL 檢察長</td>
<td>柏偉士</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>选一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCURADOR GENERAL 檢察長</td>
<td>柏偉士</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>选一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL N. GAUTREAU</td>
<td>阿格納</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td>阿格納</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td>阿格納</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS 保険委員</td>
<td>柏偉士</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>选一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS 保険委員</td>
<td>柏偉士</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>选一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED BROWN</td>
<td>阿格納</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Adjuster / Investigator</td>
<td>阿格納</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajustador de Seguros / Investigador</td>
<td>阿格納</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN  州稅務均衡局會員
Member, State Board of Equalization  選一人
Vote por Uno  Vote for One

LYN SAPOWSKY-SMITH  
Accountant / Contador  會計師

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

本區無人候選為聯邦衆議員

本區無人競選州參議員

本區無人候選為州衆議員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
<th>Libararian Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elecciones Primarias 5 de Junio de 1990</td>
<td>Primary Election June 5, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comité del Condado</td>
<td>County Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro del Comité Central del Condado en este distrito)

本區無人登記，候選爲縣中央委員會委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator, Educador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>College Education Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td>Incumbent/Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Vote #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>ASESOR (Assessor)</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGGER</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>DEFENSOR PUBLICO</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters — State Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td><strong>Housing and Homeless Bond Act of 1990.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.</td>
<td>Yes 185 No 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td><strong>Passenger Rail and Clean Air Bond Act of 1990.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.</td>
<td>Yes 189 No 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td><strong>Governor's Review of Legislation. Legislative Deadlines. Legislative Constitutional Amendment.</strong> Extends Governor's time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.</td>
<td>Yes 192 No 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td><strong>Property Tax Exemption for Severely Disabled Persons. Legislative Constitutional Amendment.</strong> Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.</td>
<td>Yes 195 No 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td><strong>The Traffic Congestion Relief and Spending Limitation Act of 1990.</strong> This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.</td>
<td>Yes 200 No 203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
185 SI 贊成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDA Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone la emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos, incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapaces y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

187 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone la emisión de bonos por cien millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desembolsos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes y coches para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril de pasajeros de ciudad, y programas de transporte en rieles. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resumen del cálculo por el Gerente de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatal y locales: si todos los bonos autorizados (20) son vendidos al 1.8 por ciento y pagados durante un periodo de 20 años (suponiendo el Fondo General incurriendo en once -$1.8 mil millones por pagar por el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($750 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos sería de $90 millones.

189 SI 贊成

190 NO 反对

192 SI 贊成

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

193 NO 反对

195 SI 贊成

EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Afecta el trasferencia del impuesto base a viviendas de remplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatal o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 milión a $2 milión por año.

197 NO 反对

200 SI 贊成

ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLOSES DE 1990. Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y prohibiría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales, para reducir mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión de tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecería un aumento del 55% en los cobros por peso en los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1990, y un centavo adicional al 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidado de edad, servicios para los ancianos, etc., y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuaría disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciben al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

203 NO 反对

200 SI 贊成

1990年减数交通拥堵及限制支出法案。此法案将实施一项减数交通拥堵 reimburse机制及政府支出限制，以更准确地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它将提供新税收政策来改革州内公路、城市街道及大规模公共交通设施以减轻交通拥堵。此法案将增加货车重载收费的五分之五及从1990年8月1日开始，将增加汽油税每加仑五美分，之后四年期间内，由每年1/10日开始，再增加汽油税每加仑一美分。此法案会赋予州政府拨款限制，以获得新资金来减轻交通拥挤、发展大规模交通设施、健康计划、老年人服务及州其他重要的计划，同时，亦能限制州及政府支出。此法案将延续为公共教育及社区大学提供至少州“一般经费”的预算中的40%给予高等教育及纳税。
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

112  STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.
   YES 211  NO 213

   YES 215  NO 217

114  MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.
   YES 218  NO 220

115  CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.
   YES 222  NO 224

116  RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).
   YES 226  NO 228

117  WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.
   YES 230  NO 232
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Opción</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>(Funcionarios Estatales, Ética) Establishes laws to regulate and penalize the behavior of public officials. Fiscal impact: It does not affect the salaries or benefits of the authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>(Práctica de la Quiropráctica, Enmienda Legislativa de Iniciativa) Adjusts the rules for the practice of Quiropráctica. Fiscal impact: It reduces costs due to the increase in the number of permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>(Asesinato de Un Oficial del Orden Público, Enmienda Legislativa de Iniciativa) Defines and expands the definition of “public official” and imposes penalties for assassination. Fiscal impact: It increases the costs of public officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>(Derecho Penal, Enmienda y Estatuto Constitucional de Iniciativa) Limits the constitutional rights of those accused of federal crimes. Fiscal impact: It increases the costs of the judicial system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>(Transporte en Ferrocarril, Acto de Bonos, Estatuto de Iniciativa) Authorizes the emission of bonds to finance the construction of a new rail system. Fiscal impact: It increases the cost of transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>(Protección de la Vida Silvestre, Estatuto de Iniciativa) Transfers $30 million from the Fondo de Conservación a áreas naturales. Fiscal impact: It decreases the cost of conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 51, N 52 & N 53

15-1N
LEGISLATURE, REAPPORTIONMENT, ETHICS, INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.

REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STATUTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.

NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.

EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.

1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Tema</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de al votación pública y la posible redistribución por la corte. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores.</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN FOR COMISIÓN. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hecho, el cargo de la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALLACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nueve recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes &quot;Hastings,&quot; la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salubridad y seguridad.</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aditamentos a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean destruidos principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALLACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

A

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

B

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

C

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

D

WITHDRAWN

E

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

F

YES 263  
NO 265  
YES 269  
NO 272  
YES 277  
NO 278  
YES 280  
NO 281  
YES 284  
NO 285
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por incendio, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se contrajera más de $50,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $332,400,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

1989年公共安全改善公債。發行公債
$332,400,000，用於攜開重建三藩市
及所屬的變更，包括建築物的修復，
減少地震的威脅，消除火災，改善殘障
者。只要在每财政年度內發行公債的數目不
超過$50,000,000，並且從FEMA（聯邦緊急
事務管理署）所得的補助金是從加州地震
後重建及減少地震危險地區有關的補助金衝
減$332,400,000公債的數目。

El Distrito No. 00-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (o los cheques subsiguientes), (ii) la mejora técnica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iii) la reciclación de las cantidades de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la adquisición de propiedades o la contratación de servicios de arrendamiento de propiedades para el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y otros gastos variados relacionados con los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recolectado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $22.50 por parcela durante los años (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con uso o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $13.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los años (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, clientes prestadores, lofttrin y edificios de propiedad pública y otras, tal como se dispone con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 02-13-51 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 15 de febrero de 1990; y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiación de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias.

El Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda específicos, la autorización de aprobar al financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin líneas de hecho, le dictara que el costo neto en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler.

Creará la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vœncador y Limpieza de las Escrituras en las Paredes para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escrituras de las paredes, permitiendo a las empresas disponer hasta un 50% porciento de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, en un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año.

ELIMINADA

¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48,7 horas (después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de cambio de los bomberos, en vez de la cuarenta horas comienzan a las 8 a.m.? 

¿Realizará una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48,7 horas (después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de cambio de los bomberos, en vez de la cuarenta horas comienzan a las 8 a.m.?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nro.</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
<td>Detalles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td>Participarán en el programa de supervisores y se les cobrará el coste de sus beneficios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>El PERS proporciona mejores beneficios que el programa de supervisores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td>Miembros del sistema de jubilación podrán trabajar como consultores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td>Incrementar la cantidad de miembros de la comisión de derechos humanos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td>Incrementar el tamaño de las comisiones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen solicitudes a los miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td>Requerir que los miembros de los consejos y comisiones residan en la Ciudad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td>Cambiar la Carta Constitucional para que ningún consejo o comisión tenga mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un periodo completo de cuatro años cuando termine su periodo actual?</td>
<td>Prohibir la reelección para el Consejo de Supervisores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles mientas a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td>Implementar una política que elimine las penas criminales y civiles para la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
☆ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

☆ Write your residence address where indicated.

☆ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONS APPEAR ON THE FRONT PAGE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE
Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perforé los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentren debajo de los números que coinciden con aquéllos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre de la persona y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentada una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si falta alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRUINADA O DAÑADA
Si usted roba, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuélvala la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCION Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS
Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (deber ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el “Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación” para que la balota pueda ser contada.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
CONSORTED PRIMARY ELECTION  
JUNE 5, 1990

ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT  
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
   This sample ballot booklet.
   A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
   An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
   A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
   A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on
   which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and
   marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for
   which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the
   ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the
   numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked
   in this booklet.

   (Continued next page)

Sample Ballot

| CANDIDATE A | 4 |
| CANDIDATE B | 5 |
| CANDIDATE C | 6 |

PUNCH OUT THE DOT ON THE NUMBERED BOX ON THE BALLOT CARD THAT IS THE SAME AS THE NUMBER OF YOUR CHOICE OF CANDIDATE, OR "YES" OR "NO" ON MEASURES.

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文说明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT

I authorized ________________________________________________________, my ___________________________________________________________, to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name __________________________________________________________ Signature ______________________________________________________

Date __________________________
GOBERNADOR  州長
Governor

DENNIS THOMPSON
President, Computer Company
Presidente, Empresa de Computación

VICEGOBERNADOR  副州長
Lieutenant Governor

ANTHONY G. BAJADA
University Professor
Profesor de la Universidad

Vote for One
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partido Liberal</th>
<th>Estado</th>
<th>Libertarian Party</th>
<th>Primary Election</th>
<th>June 5, 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretario de Estado</td>
<td>KENNITA WATSON (Software Engineer)</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>THOMAS TRYON (County Supervisor / Rancher)</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR TREASURER IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Tesorero en este distrito)

本區無人登記提名，競選財政司
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO LIBERAL</td>
<td>PROCURADOR GENERAL</td>
<td>PAUL N. GAUTREAU</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td>ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td>PAUL N. GAUTREAU</td>
<td>Abogado (律師)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS</td>
<td>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS</td>
<td>TED BROWN</td>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td>TED BROWN</td>
<td>Ajustador de Seguros / Investigador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERTARIAN PARTY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>TED BROWN</td>
<td>保険調査人／調査人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTY</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO LIBERAL</td>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERTARIAN PARTY</td>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)</td>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Senador Estatal en este distrito)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)</td>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LYN SAPOWSKY-SMITH
Accountant / Contador 会計師
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
<th>COMITÉ DEL CONDADO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>COUNTY COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANTES</td>
<td>CANDIDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21, 22, 26 &amp; 27</td>
<td>9-1L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLOMENDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

107
YES 185
NO 187

PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

108
YES 189
NO 190

GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

109
YES 192
NO 193

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

110
YES 195
NO 197

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

111
YES 200
NO 203
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 SI 贊成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluya: (1) refugio de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas para arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenan las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compren casa por primera vez.

187 NO 反對

189 SI 贊成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un emisión de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, derechos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes y locomotoras para ferrocarriles en ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en rieles. Asigne dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resumen del Cálculo por el Analista de la Legislatura sobre el Impacto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatal y locales: Si todos los bonos autorizados fuesen vendidos al 7.5 por ciento y pagados durante un periodo de 20 años típicamente, el Fondo General invertiría en unos $18.5 mil millones para pagar por el capital ($18.5 mil millones) y el interés ($750 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo actual del capital e intereses en los bonos será de $990 millones.

190 NO 反對

192 SI 贊成

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL Gobernador. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN, EMMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningun efecto fiscal directo.

193 NO 反對

195 SI 贊成

EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS, EMMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto base a viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningun impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatal y locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución las disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 millón a $2 millones por año.

197 NO 反對

200 SI 贊成

ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESCONGREGOS DE 1990. Esta medida estatuiría un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para reflejar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dimpuldiría nuevas rutas para reducir la congestión mediante la construcción de carreteras, calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida estimaría un aumento del 55% en los cubres por peso a los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible al 1 de agosto de 1990, y un centavo adicional al 1 de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, a tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuara disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciben el monto del 20% en los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

203 NO 反對

190年年儲金房地產法案。此法案提供發行公債 $150,000,000 資助的房屋計

107

108

109

110

111

N 51, N 52 & N 53

13-N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES 211 / NO 213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218 / NO 220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222 / NO 224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226 / NO 228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230 / NO 232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATUALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales ejecutivos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce los costos al estado que dependerían de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

211 SI 贊 成
213 NO 反對


215 SI 贊 成
217 NO 反對

ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. EMENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande el concepto de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

218 SI 贊 成
220 NO 反對

DERECHO PENAL. EMENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; afecta cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida afectaría significativamente en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondría en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

222 SI 贊 成
224 NO 反對

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

226 SI 贊 成
228 NO 反對

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVSTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohibe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarrollo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

230 SI 贊 成
232 NO 反對

加利福尼亚州政府官员，职业道德行为。设立州其他职业道德行为法律。设立委员会来调整州选任高级公务员的薪水。设立立法法实施委员会。

对财政影响：州政府支出增加不详。须审委员会所制定的薪酬及福利而定，而州支付委员会及实施方案的费用为较低。

脊椎神经治疗，立法修正案的初步提出。改善脊椎神经治疗的法案。须在生日的月份内换驾照。违反者将受加重的惩罚。对财政的影响：在1990至91年期间，用较低的“脊椎神经治疗的考官基金”来改善换驾照制度。提高费用将增加州及市政府的税收。

公共治安员的纪录，刑事审判。立法修正案的初步提出。重新说明，扩大“公共治安员”名词的意思及施行于犯手。对财政影响：由于扩展，一项谋杀罪名的特别情况范围，因此州政府支出不详。

刑事法律，修定案及常规的初步提出。依照联邦宪法的规定，限制被告者的宪法权利。此刑事法律是关于常规的转变。对财政影响：实施结果不详，有可能增加或减少州政府的支出，因此其影响是难以估计。

铁轨交通工具公债法案。常规的初步提出。批准发行“普通义务公债”$1,900,000,000，主要是为发展乘理及都市铁轨交通工具系统。

对财政影响：偿债期估计超过20年，估计“一般债券”须付本金约十亿美元，利息十六亿美元，平均每年偿还一亿八千万美元。

野生动物的保护，常规的初步提出。转移三千万元给保护栖息地基金。主要是为获取栖息地。限制捕杀美洲狮。对财政影响：估计每年从栖息地税及商业销售农产品转向的附加税约三千八百万元，从“一般债券”转移约一千万二百万，除非立法局再订下其他款目的转移。共计每年物管理的费用是一百万元。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>YES 236</td>
<td>NO 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>YES 240</td>
<td>NO 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>YES 243</td>
<td>NO 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>YES 248</td>
<td>NO 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>YES 254</td>
<td>NO 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>YES 258</td>
<td>NO 259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
236 SI 贊成 LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCION, ETICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribucion de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votacion legislativa y aprobatcion de los votantes. Se crea un Comite de Etica Legislativa. Impact Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitacion en los gastos por redistribucion podrian ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la votacion publica y la posible redistribucion por la corte. Los costos por las disposiciones para etica son probablemente menores.

238 NO 反对

240 SI 贊成 REDISTRIBUCION POR COMISION, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribucion de distritos mediante una comision, los criterios de poblacion en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impact Fiscal: La limitacion en el financiamiento reducira los costos de la redistribucion en varios millones de dolares cada decade. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentaran, disminuyendo los ahorros.

242 NO 反对

243 SI 贊成 ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emision de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dolares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construccion.

245 NO 反对

248 SI 贊成 ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emision de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dolares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construccion o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educacion superior publica de California, las cuales incluyen los nueve recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes "Hastings," la Academia Martimiliana de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1° de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construccion o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salubridad y seguridad.

250 NO 反对

254 SI 贊成 ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACION DE EDIFICIOS PUBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emision de bonos por trescientos millones de dolares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstruccion, aditamentos a prueba de sismos, reparacion, reemplazo y reubicacion de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

256 NO 反对

258 SI 贊成 ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emision de bonos por ochocientos millones de dolares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construccion o mejoras de escuelas publicas.

259 NO 反对
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### CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990

**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particular relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>WITHDRAWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contrar el aumento de los costos de la seguridad pública, se proponen varios proyectos para aumentar la seguridad en los barrios de San Francisco. Estos incluyen:

- **263 SI** 改善
- **265 NO** 反对

Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, la autorización para financiar:

- **269 SI** 改善
- **272 NO** 反对

- **277 SI** 改善
- **278 NO** 反对

¿Podrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores, aumentar los límites de deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin límite de duración, si el Contralor certifica que el costo neto o intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros términos de financiamiento por alquiler?

- **280 SI** 改善
- **281 NO** 反对

¿Podrá la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escuelas para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escuelas de las paredes, utilizando fondos comerciales y de otro tipo, hasta un 10% de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

- **284 SI** 改善
- **285 NO** 反对

**ELIMINADA**

- **284 SI** 改善
- **285 NO** 反对

**A** 公安局改革计划

1990年公共安全改革计划。发行公债 $332,400,000，用于购置、建设或改进城市、市政府及社区所拥有的设施，包括用于反恐的设备，减少枪支犯罪的监控，清洁街道，改善居民生活。

- **B** 三藩市综合设施的70-1号提案

- **C** 财政预算

- **D** 市政府将设立美化街区及清洁校园的基金

- **E** 撤消

- **F** 未完成
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288 NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290 NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293 NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296 NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong></td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298 NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300 NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302 NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305 NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309 NO 310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

288 SI专卖
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?

289 NO反對

290 SI专卖
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?

291 NO反對

292 SI专卖
¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?

293 NO反對

294 SI专卖
¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?

295 NO反對

296 SI专卖
¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?

297 NO反對

298 SI专卖
¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?

299 NO反對

300 SI专卖
¿Serán un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se seleccione a los miembros de estos consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos enumerados, en los cuales se requiere una persona con experiencia, capacidad o aptitudes especiales y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?

301 NO反對

302 SI专卖
¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde se disuelvan por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?

303 NO反對

304 SI专卖
¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos periodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se considerean haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?

305 NO反對

306 SI专卖
¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles mofrantes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?

307 NO反對

308 SI专卖

309 NO反對

310 SI专卖

N 51, N 52 & N 53
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Don't forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don't count.
★ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.
★ Write your residence address where indicated.
★ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
**INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE**

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfíle los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquéllos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de perforar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentaron una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si falta alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

**BALOTA ARRuinADA O DAñADA**

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuélvala la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

**FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS**

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el “Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación” para que la balota pueda ser contada.
ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
- This sample ballot booklet
- A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
- An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
- A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
- A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

Authorization to Deliver Absentee Ballot

I authorized _____________________________, my _____________________________
(name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name ________________________________ Signature __________________________

Date _________________________________
GOBERNADOR 州長
Governor

MERLE WOO
Socialist-Feminism Educator
Educadora de Feminismo Socialista

MARIA ELIZABETH MUÑOZ
Bilingual Teacher
Maestra Bilingüe

VICEGOBERNADOR 副州長
Lieutenant Governor

CLYDE KUHN
School Trustee / Teacher
Síndico Escolar / Maestro

EMMA WONG MAR
Medical Technologist / Bacteriologist
Técnico Médico / Bacteriologista

CESAR G. CADABES
AIDS / Health Educator
Educador de la Salud y del SIDA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Evelina Alarcón</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Julie Fausto</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Richard D. Rose</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Genevieve Torres</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Shirley Rachel Isaacson</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Janet D. Lewis</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Elizabeth A. Nakano</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Lewis J. Shireman</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Vote for One*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Defense Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado Defensor Penal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>B. KWAKU DUREN</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development Organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizador para el Desarrollo Comunitario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOM CONDIT</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trabajador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)

( THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(NO EXISTE CONTIENDA PARA EL PUESTO DE SENADOR ESTATAL EN ESTE DISTRITO)
ESTELLA EGAR
South-of-Market Community Worker
Trabajadora Comunitaria de South-of-Market 市場街以南社區工作者

INA Z. BRANSOME
Activist for Democracy
Activista por la Democracia 支持民主活動家

ROBERT FAMOUS
Activist for Democracy
Activista por la Democracia 支持民主活動家

JAMES J. MANGIA
Activist for Democracy
Activista por la Democracia 支持民主活動家

MORTON VICKER
Writer
Escriptor 作家

EDWARD PATUTO
Activist for Democracy
Activista por la Democracia 支持民主活動家

WILLIAM M. DEAN
Activist for Democracy
Activista por la Democracia 支持民主活動家
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</th>
<th>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTADO</strong></td>
<td><strong>JUDICIAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **MARK ISLER**  
Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios  
退休教師，商人 | **CARLOS BEA**  
Incumbent / Titular del Cargo  
現任 |
| **SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA**  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction | **JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15**  
Superior Court Judge, Office #15 |
| **SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA**  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction | **SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA**  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction |
| **CAROL S. KOPPEL**  
Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador  
退休法官，教育家 | **KAY TSENIN**  
Attorney / Abogada  
律師 |
| **SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ**  
College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria  
學院學監 | **JEROME T. BENSON**  
Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior  
高等法院法官 |
| **BILL HONIG**  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública  
州教育司 | **DONNA HITCHENS**  
Attorney / Abogada  
律師 |
| **JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3**  
Superior Court Judge, Office #3 | **JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5**  
Superior Court Judge, Office #5 |
| **ALEX SALDAMANDO**  
Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal  
地方法院法官 | **CARLOS BEA**  
Incumbent / Titular del Cargo  
現任 |
| **J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY**  
Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal  
地方法院法官 | **KAY TSENIN**  
Attorney / Abogada  
律師 |
| **系選一人**  
Vote por Uno  
選一人 | **系選一人**  
Vote por Uno  
選一人 |
| **系選一人**  
Vote por Uno  
選一人 | **系選一人**  
Vote por Uno  
選一人 |
| **系選一人**  
Vote por Uno  
選一人 | **系選一人**  
Vote por Uno  
選一人 |
| **系選一人**  
Vote por Uno  
選一人 | **系選一人**  
Vote por Uno  
選一人 |

**Vote for One**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Housing and Homeless Bond Act of 1990</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Passenger Rail and Clean Air Bond Act of 1990</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Governor's Review of Legislation, Legislative Deadlines, Legislative Constitutional Amendment</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Property Tax Exemption for Severely Disabled Persons, Legislative Constitutional Amendment</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>The Traffic Congestion Relief and Spending Limitation Act of 1990</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N 51, N 52 & N 53**
1990年房屋与无家可归者公债法案。此法案提供发行公债$150,000,000 资助的房屋计划包括以下：(1) 无家可归者及家人的紧急避难所及变动期房屋；3 新出租给个人及家庭的房屋；(2) 符合老年人、残障者及儿童的特别需要；(3) 旧屋及出租屋的修缮及维护给予第一次买屋人资助。

1990年乘客铁轨交通与空气污染公债。此法案提供发行公债$10亿，资助更换轨道路段、资本支出及发展市区列车交通工具计划。由加州「一般给付」来支付公债。以下列立法局政策专家对对州政府与市政公债影响的估计：(1) 如果没有通过公债，以5% 出售，还本付息，所节约的90000万元。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES 211</th>
<th>NO 213</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226</td>
<td>NO 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230</td>
<td>NO 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que depondrán de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por el Comité. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.


ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefina y expanda la definición de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancias de asesinatos en primer grado.

DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectúa significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce como se pondrá en ejecución y se interpretará la medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1,6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco, $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Legislature, Reapportionment, Ethics, Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Reapportionment by Commission, Initiative Constitutional Amendment, Statute. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 School Facilities Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 51, N 52 &amp; N 53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE</th>
<th>1990年6月5日</th>
<th>省提案提交選民投票</th>
<th>超党派投票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPÓSITOS A SER SOMETIDOS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTALAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 236 SI | 支成 | LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2,0 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de las votaciones. Se crea una Comisión de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de alivio total y la posible redistribución por la corte. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores. |
| 238 NO | 反對 |

| 240 SI | 支成 | REDISTRIBUCIÓN POR COMISIÓN, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo de los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros. |
| 242 NO | 反對 |

| 243 SI | 支成 | ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción. |
| 245 NO | 反對 |

| 248 SI | 支成 | ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nueve recibos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recibos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 recibos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes “Hastings,” la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recibos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salubridad y seguridad. |
| 250 NO | 反對 |

| 254 SI | 支成 | ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiciones a prueba de sismos, reparación, remodelado y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos. |
| 256 NO | 反對 |

| 258 SI | 支成 | ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas. |
| 259 NO | 反對 |

| 118 |
| 119 |
| 120 |
| 121 |
| 122 |
| 123 |
# Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters — City & County Propositions

## Public Safety Improvement Bonds, 1990

A. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Community Facilities District No. 90-1

B. Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Board of Supervisors

C. Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund

D. Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Withdrawn

E. Withdrewn

## Fire Department

F. Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del asbesto, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se contragi el máximo de $60,000,000 de deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $332,400,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

1990年公共安全改善公債 紙本公債 332,400,000 項目構成、興建及改造三藩市及所轄區的建築物，包括用於地震後的修復、減少地震危害的設施、消除石棉、確保災害通路等。只要在會計年度內所發行公債的數額不超過$60,000,000，並且從FEMA（緊急管理署）或加州政府所獲得的補助金是用於加利福尼亞州地震後的修復及減少地震災害設施的補助金將會減至$332,400,000公債的數額。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Apoyo</th>
<th>Contra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>265 SI</td>
<td>265 NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>272 NO</td>
<td>272 SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>278 NO</td>
<td>278 SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>281 NO</td>
<td>281 SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>285 NO</td>
<td>285 SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELIMINADA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Apoyo</th>
<th>Contra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>285 NO</td>
<td>285 SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

市議會會議於1990年6月5日通過選民投票之補助案。若此補助案在某些特定條件下獲通過，將被批准由非牟利公司出租租賃設備，並在租賃合約中有明確規定。”

市政府設立項目於三藩市街尾及清潔衛生費用，按商業家付給他們的業稅的百分之十一此此基金，每年此百分率會被調整以維持一百萬元基金？
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288 NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290 NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293 NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296 NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298 NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300 NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302 NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305 NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309 NO 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Concejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>🔴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Concejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>🔴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>¿Permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>🔴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño a quince a once miembros?</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>🔴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 SI</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerta, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>🔴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>¿Serán los miembros de los consejos y comisiones de la Carta Constitucional elegibles para la reelección, o no, de los miembros de estos consejos y comisiones que cumplan con los requisitos establecidos en la misma?</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>🔴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o Dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>🔴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá a la ciudad de San Francisco la autorización de permitir a los ex-supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>🔴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>🔴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
★ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

★ Write your residence address where indicated.

★ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfore los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquellos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puestu y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentada una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si falta alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíe a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRUINADA O DAÑADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuelva la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o en un lugar de votación debe firmar el “Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación” para que la balota pueda ser contada.
ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)

Sample Ballot

President

| CANDIDATE A | 1 |
| CANDIDATE B | 5 |
| CANDIDATE C | 6 |

PUNCH OUT THE DOT ON THE NUMBERED BOX ON THE BALLOT CARD THAT IS THE SAME AS THE NUMBER OF YOUR CHOICE OF CANDIDATE, OR "YES" OR "NO" ON MEASURES.

Use pin provided to punch out chip on ballot.

Las Instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.
中文说明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT

I authorized __________________________, my __________________________, to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name __________________________________ Signature __________________________________

Date __________________________________
GOBERNADOR 省长
Governor

MERLE WOO
Socialist-Feminism Educator
Educadora de Feminismo Socialista 社会主義／女性主義教育工作者

MARIA ELIZABETH MUÑOZ
Bilingual Teacher
Maestra Bilingüe 雙語教師

VICEGOBERNADOR 副省长
Lieutenant Governor

CLYDE KUHN
School Trustee / Teacher
Síndico Escolar / Maestro 校董／教師

EMMA WONG MAR
Medical Technologist / Bacteriologist
Técnico Médico / Bacteriologista 醫療技術專家／細菌學家

CESAR G. CADABES
AIDS / Health Educator
Educador de la Salud y del SIDA 感染病／健康教育工作者

選一人
Vote for One

Vote por Uno
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One (Num)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Evelina Alarcón</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Fausto</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Richard D. Rose</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genevieve Torres</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Shirley Rachel Isaacson</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Janet D. Lewis</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth A. Nakano</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewis J. Shireman</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROCURADOR GENERAL  檢察長
Attorney General

ROBERT J. EVANS
Criminal Defense Lawyer
Abogado Defensor Penal

Vote for One

Vote por Uno

54

COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS  保險委員
Insurance Commissioner

B. KWAKU DUREN
Community Development Organizer
Organizador para el Desarrollo Comunitario

Vote for One

Vote por Uno

61

TOM CONDIT
Worker
Trabajador

63

P 31 & 32
MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN  州稅務均衡局會員
Member, State Board of Equalization  義務政治工作者

NANCY LAWRENCE
Volunteer Political Worker / Trabajadora Política Voluntaria

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)
本區無人候選為聯邦眾議員

PARTIDO POR LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD
PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY

ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990

STATE SENATOR
MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Senador Estatal en este distrito)
本區無人競選州參議員

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)
(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)
本區無人候選為州眾議員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTELLA EGAR</td>
<td>South-of-Market Community Worker</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INA Z. BRANSOME</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT FAMOUS</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES J. MANGIA</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORTON VICKER</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD PATUTO</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM M. DEAN</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</td>
<td>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</td>
<td>UFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS</td>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDICIAL</td>
<td>JUDICIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**州教育司**
SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**高等法院法官，第三號辦事處**
JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3
Superior Court Judge, Office #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**高等法院法官，第五號辦事處**
JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5
Superior Court Judge, Office #5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**高等法院法官，第十五號辦事處**
JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15
Superior Court Judge, Office #15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>William J. O’Connor</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Chaitin</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney / Law Teacher / Abogada / Maestra de Derecho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Tang</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney / Fiscal Asistente del Distrito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Harrigan</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheriff’s Department’s Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>Jerome A. De Filippo</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>Lillian K. Sing</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asegurador</td>
<td>Ronald G. Kershaw</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Real Estate Portfolio Manager / Administrador de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogado, Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor / Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Schwenger</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Assessor / Asesor Asistente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensor Público</td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

YES 185  NO 187

PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

YES 189  NO 190

GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 192  NO 193

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

YES 195  NO 197

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

YES 200  NO 203
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990.
Esta acta dispone de la emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($500,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos que tienen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

185 SI

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990.
Esta acta dispone de la emisión de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desembolsos de capital y para la adquisición de trenes volantes para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en rieles. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resuelve que el monto de este acta se realizará en los siguientes plazos: (1) el Fondo General en un período de 20 años, y (2) los bonos se emitirán en múltiplos de $30 millones.

189 SI

190 NO

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

192 SI

193 NO

EXENCIÓN DE IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto base a viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatal o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probables de $1 millón a $2 millones por año.

195 SI

197 NO

ACTA PARA EL DESCONEGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESBORDAMIENTOS DE 1990. Esta medida establece un descubrimiento de descongestión del tránsito para todo el estado y pondrá fin a la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para reflejar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, caminos locales y estaciones de transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecería un porcentaje del 5% en los costos por peso de los camiones y un aumento de 50 centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de enero de 1990, y un centavo adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en los desbordamientos del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desbordamientos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuaría disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior en la comunidad reciban al menos el 48% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones se repartan igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

200 SI

203 NO

1990年房屋与无家可归者公投法案。此法案提供发行公债计划,通过筹集资金来支持和资助无家可归者的住房计划。法案规定，该资金将用于建设新的住房项目，为无家可归者提供临时住房和永久住房。法案还包括增加联邦和州政府在公共住房建设中的投资。”

208 SI

1990年铁道交通与空气污染公投法案。此法案提供发行公债计划，通过筹集资金来支持和资助铁道交通系统和污染控制项目。法案规定，该资金将用于建设新的铁道交通系统和改善现有的交通系统。法案还包括增加联邦和州政府在污染控制和环境保护中的投资。”

210 SI

州长对立法的建议。立法的截止日期。立法修正案。此提案要求州长在提案中包括立法截止日期和立法修正案的建议。”

1990年交通污染及限制支出法案。此法案将实施一项交通污染及限制支出计划，该计划将对各市政府支出的限制，以使能够更准确地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它将提供新的收费来支付州内公路、城市街道和进一步污染控制设施的成本。此法案将增加车辆使用税收的百分比。”

211 SI
STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure. YES 211  
NO 213

NO 217

MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder. YES 218  
NO 220

CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact. YES 222  
NO 224

RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million). YES 226  
NO 228

WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs. YES 230  
NO 232
| N 51, N 52 & N 53 | 15-1N |

**BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE**

**CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, Elecciones Primarias Consolidadas, 5 de Junio de 1990**

**Proposiciones a Ser Sometidas al Voto de los Electores — Estatal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Voto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Funcionarios Estatales. Ética. Establece leyes de Ética estatal adicionales. Crea una comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependerían de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Práctica de la QUIROPRÁCTICA. Enmienda Legislativa de Iniciativa. Enmienda el Acta de la QUIROPRÁCTICA. Requiere la renovación de la licencia durante el mes de nacimiento. Aumenta las multas por quebrantamiento del Acta. Impacto fiscal: Menores costos al Fondo de Examinadores de QUIROPRÁCTICOS en 1990-91 al modificar el sistema de renovación y locales debido al aumento en las multas.</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDE LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine el concepto de &quot;asesinato oficial del orden público&quot; que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: menores costos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expanda el definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; establece cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida afecta significativamente a los ciudadanos en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondría en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobrestasa al cigarillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**省提案提交選民投票**

**超黨派投票**

**加入越南公務員，改革行文標準。訂立州內的行文標準法律，設立委員會來調整州內高級公務員的培訓。訂立公開法律。**

對財政影響：州政府支出增加，須提升委員會所制定的薪酬及福利而定，而州支付委員會及執行措施的費用為低。

**廢除神經治療，立法修正案的初步提出。改善神經治療的法案須在生日的月份內有磁照。違反者將受加重的懲罰。對財政影響：在1990至91年期間，用較低的「神經治療的考官基金」來改修磁照制度。提高罰款將增加州及市政府的收入。**

**公共治安員的謀殺，刑事懲罰。立法修正案的初步提出。依新證明，擴大公共治安員名詞的適用及範圍。對財政影響：由於擴展第一級謀殺罪名的特別情況範疇，因此州政府支出不詳。**

**刑事法律，修憲案及法規的初步提出。依新規定，限制被告的憲法權利。此修憲法律是關於法規的轉變。對財政影響：實施結果不詳，有可能增加或減低政府支出，因此其影響數難以估計。**

**鐵路交通工具公債法案。法規的初步提出。批准發行「普通義務公債」$1,500,000,000，主要用於發展乘客及客內外鐵路交通工具系統。對財政影響：債券公債期限20年，估計「一般經濟」需本金約二十億元，利息十六億元，平均每年總額一億八千萬元。**

**野獸的保護，法規的初步提出。轉移三千萬元給保護地基，主要是為獲取地基。限制捕殺美洲豹。對財政影響：估計每年從當地及農業作物所轉移的附加稅約一千八百萬元。從「一般經濟」轉移資金約三千二百萬元，非立法局還訂下其他款項的轉移。共計每年物業管理的費用約一百萬元。**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATALES

236 SI 238 NO

240 SI 242 NO

243 SI 245 NO

248 SI 250 NO

254 SI 256 NO

258 SI 259 NO

LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la votación pública y la posible redistribución por el corto plazo. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente mayores.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN PARA COMISIÓN, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría la costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta mil dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes “Hastings,” la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y seguridad contra la salud y seguridad.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiciones a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y reubicación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.

立法。重評分配，通 suç行為標準，修憲案及法律的初步提出，改變選舉區而通過三分之二議員，選民投票贊成。成立一個立法者修憲委員會。對財政影響：從支出重評分配的損失所節省下來的，會全部或部分撥出於選民投票及重評分配地區選民。施行適當行
為標準的費用可能較低。

改委員會作重評分配，修憲案及法律的初步提出，訂立由委員會以地區人口為標準，重評分配議席地位，決定1992年選舉的議委員會數。對財政影響：十年期間內，政府的服務就會減少了重評分配的費用約數百萬元。如果
由最高法院執行，政府所省下來的將是支出的增加。

1990年新監獄建築的公債法案。此法案將
發行公債$450,000,000 以提供資金來建築新
監獄，改良目前州監獄，青少年管教所過度擠
壓的情況。

1990年6月的高等教育建築物公債法案。
此法案將發行公債$450,000,000 以提供資金
來建築或改良州公共高等教育機構的建築物，
包括以下：加州的9個大學，州立大學的20個
校園，州社區大學的71個，希斯丁（HASTINGS）
法律學院，州海洋研究院及州立大學董事會
於1990年7／1日起生效。此公債所使用的建築
物，對財政影響：將包括而不
必限於科研，實驗室，圖書館，柬埔寨及改
善及實施改善防盜，及其他健康或安全的設施。

1990年防震安全設置及共樓樓重建公債
法案。此法案將發行公債$ 800,000,000 以提
供資金來重建，改善防震安全設置，修補，替
換及廢棄那些因受地震損壞而變為危險的設置
及政府設施。
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263
NO 265

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269
NO 272

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277
NO 278

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

WITHDRAWN

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 284
NO 285
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Respuesta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (I) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (o los choques subsiguientes); (II) la mejora técnica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (III) la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (IV) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos varían relacionados con los anteriores por medio de una recaudación especial a ser recolocada durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual: (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.00 por parcela durante los siguientes doce (14) años; (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de un o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los siguientes doce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las de las parcelas no residenciales, y no residenciales, y a los detalles referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, ciertos terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se disponen con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 82-13-81 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1989; y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal, relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias? | A

| ¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y suelo de la deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin líneas de hecho, el alcalde certifica que el costo es en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler? | B

| ¿Crearía la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escrituras en las Paredes para pagar por el embellecimiento de las paredes y limpiar las escrituras de las paredes, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un uno por ciento de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año? | C

| ¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48.7 horas (después de lo cual se debe trabajar al máximo) y (2) permitir en cambio que la Comisión de Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan en las 8 a.m.? | D

| ¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48.7 horas (después de lo cual se debe trabajar al máximo) y (2) permitir en cambio que la Comisión de Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan en las 8 a.m.? | E

| ¿El condado debe legalizar la dispensación de marihuana para fines medicinales? | F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propuesta</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
<td>Opción 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td>市參議會應否有權容許曾任市參議員繼續參加本市的健康服務制度，如果他們付全部費用?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Tendrán el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>市參議會應否有權與加州公務員退休制度（PERS）簽約，以使市政府防止安全檢察官及防火工程師成為公務員退休制度的會員而不需市政府付附加的費用？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td>現屬市退休制度的退休教師能否與三藩市聯合校區或三藩市社區大學簽約作諮詢顧問而不失掉他們的退休權益?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td>人權委員會應否成立為市民委員會，並且會員人數應否由15名減至11名?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td>市警察、消防、社會服務、海港、公用事業、公務員、機場、泊車及交通、牌照上訴等各委員會或董事會應否將會員人數由5名增至7名?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Serán un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen electores a los miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos, comisiones o cuerpos asesores para los que no se requiera que sean residentes de la Ciudad?</td>
<td>除市民委員會外，市憲章應否修訂成立一個准使市長或市憲章成立的董事會或委員會應否有過多數的同性成員?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos periodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un periodo completo de cuatro años cuando termine su periodo actual?</td>
<td>市民應否禁止任何人在市參議會連任多過兩期的「一期」市參議員及應否有四名選民可再出任市參議會？而1990年7月1日在的參議員應否當作已任滿了一期「四年」的參議員?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Sor la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td>市民有此政策來要求加州立法局撤消皮下注射針的製造，使用，銷售或分發所涉及的民事懲罰?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
★ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

★ Write your residence address where indicated.

★ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfure los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquellos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentó una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRUIINADA O DAÑADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuélvala la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.

缺席選民選票樣本

投票兩次是一個刑事案

内容

你的缺席選票封套內有以下內容:

選票樣本小冊

印有號碼（1-312）的選票卡。

缺席選票的公開信封,

數紙一張，用作選票上打孔。

選票信封一封，用作確保已投選票和填寫你要投給的候選人姓名。

缺席投票須知

在選票上打孔前，請細閱所有指示，

1. 填寫選票樣本小冊後作出你的選擇。在你所選擇的候選人或選項的號碼上 圖下記號。

2. 你應在你所選擇的號碼下方記號之

後，取出選票卡，用數紙於選票卡上照原

你在選票樣本所示的數紙孔打孔。

3. 投票後（即你所選擇的候選人或選項）的

選票信封後面，確保所有數紙已打孔，如

果數紙仍留有折痕，須予除去。

4. 你的缺席選票可寄封內，然後在選

票信封外。

5. 母親及親屬姓名及地址及日期，如

果有任何一項未有填寫，你的選票將作

無效。

6. 把數紙於信封上貼上25分郵票，選擇出

你的選票必須在 1990 年 5 月 5 日寄

到選民註冊處，郵戳日期不遲，你的選票

必須在 11 月 7 日下午八時前寄到選民註冊

處。

選票寄送日期

選票必須在 1990 年 5 月 5 日下午八時前

送到選民註冊處或任何一個投票站。

在投票站開封後收到的缺席選票需

作無效，郵戳日期不算。

1. 你可以用鎮好的缺席選票信封把選票

寄出，記號貼上25分郵票。

2. 或者，你可使用鎮好的缺席選票信封

把選票親自送到選民註冊處，或選民任

何一個投票站。

3. 或者，授權你的親屬（必須是你的配偶、

兒女、父母、祖父母、孫子女，兄弟或妹

妹）把你的選票送到選民註冊處或任何

一個投票站，請將假下表，叫你的代表把此

表和你的選票送回。

親自把已投選票送到選民註冊處或投票站的人必須簽署“已投缺席選票返回投票站記錄”，

以供計算票數，
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 5, 1990

ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on
which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.
1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and
marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for
which you wish to vote.
2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the
ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the
numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked
in this booklet.

Sample Ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>CANDIDATE A</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE B</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文說明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT
If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY
Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the "Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places" in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING
Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT

I authorized _______________________________________, my __________________________, to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name __________________________________________ Signature _________________________________

Date __________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOBERNADOR</th>
<th>MARIA ELIZABETH MUÑOZ</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Bilingual Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maestra Bilingüe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MERLE WOO</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialist-Feminism Educator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educadora de Feminismo Socialista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICEGOBERNADOR</th>
<th>EMMA WONG MAR</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>Medical Technologist / Bacteriologist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Técnico Médico / Bacteriologista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CESAR G. CADABES</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS / Health Educator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educador de la Salud y del SIDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLYDE KUHN</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Trustee / Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Síndico Escolar / Maestro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECRETARIO DE ESTADO  省務卿
Secretary of State

JULIE FAUSTO
Bilingual Instructor
Instructora Bilingüe  雙語教師

EVELINA ALARCÓN
Political Organizer
Organizadora Política  政治組織家

CONTRALOR 市計官
Controller

GENEVIEVE TORRES
Cancer Researcher
Investigadora del Cáncer  癌症研究員

SHIRLEY RACHEL ISAACSON
School Psychologist
Psicóloga Escolar  學校心理專家

RICHARD D. ROSE
Community Service Consultant
Consultor de Servicios Comunitarios  社區服務顧問

TESORERO 財政部長
Treasurer

ELIZABETH A. NAKANO
Social Worker
Trabajadora Social  社會工作者

LEWIS J. SHIREMAN
Independent Computer Consultant
Consultor Independiente de Computación  獨立電腦顧問

JANET D. LEWIS
Political Party Organizer
Organizadora de Partidos Políticos  政黨組織家

Vote por Uno  選一人
Vote for One
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Defense Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado Defensor Penal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>TOM CONDIT</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trabajador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. KWAKU DUREN</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development Organizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizador para el Desarrollo Comunitario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO POR LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY LAWRENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Political Worker / Trabajadora Política Voluntaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN**  州稅務均衡局會員
**Anchor, State Board of Equalization**  選一人

**Vote for One**  

**Nancy Lawrence**

**United States Representative**

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)

本區無人候選為聯邦眾議員

---

**PARTIDO POR LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD**

**ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990**

**UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE**

**STATE SENATOR**

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人競選州參議員

---

**PARTIDO POR LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD**

**PRIMARIES PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990**

**MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY**

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人候選為州衆議員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT &quot;BOB&quot; MEOLA</td>
<td>Non-aligned Peace Activist</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN J. METTLER</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT NEWMAN</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESAR G. CADABES</td>
<td>Community Health Educator</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERLE WOO</td>
<td>Socialist Feminist Educator</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELESTE M. PERSIDSKY</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLLY HONIGSFELD</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER J. SMITH</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3</th>
<th>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5</th>
<th>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15</th>
<th>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>William J. O'Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Chaitin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Tang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Harrigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jerome A. De Filippo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lillian K. Sing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Schwenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ronald G. Kershaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensor Publico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

107
HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

YES 185 ➔
NO 187 ➔

108
PASSenger RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

YES 189 ➔
NO 190 ➔

109
GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 192 ➔
NO 193 ➔

110
PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

YES 195 ➔
NO 197 ➔

111
THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

YES 200 ➔
NO 203 ➔
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 SI 负成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta mil cuatrocientos dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) refugio de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya vivas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

190 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un emisión de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de las joyas bidé de viaje para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, transporte de ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de transporte en rieles. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Recomendado por el Conselling Board sobre la abstención fiscal en los gobiernos estatal y locales; y todos los bonos autorizados fueron vendidos al 75 por ciento y pagados durante un período de 20 años. Lamentablemente, el Fondo General incurrirá en unos $1,600,000,000 para pagar por el capital ($1,000,000,000) y el interés ($600,000,000) en los bonos. Se calcula que el coste anual del capital e intereses en los bonos será de $50,000,000.

192 SI 负成

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR, FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

193 NO 反对

EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatal o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de recaudación de los impuestos probabilmente de $1 mil a $2 millones por año.

200 SI 负成

ACTA PARA EL DESCONECTONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESECHAMIENTOS DE 1990. Esta medida establecería un programa de desconectamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para reducir mejor la eficiencia de la creciente población de California. Disponería de nuevos ríos para ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carriles estaduales, calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecería un aumento del 50% en los costos por peso en las camionetas y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1 de octubre de 1990. Y un aumento adicional al 1 de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pondrá al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el desconectamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estaduales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desechos y residuos locales e instituciones, e instalaciones para la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunitaria reciban al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

203 NO 反对

1990年房屋与无家可归者公投法案。此法案提供发行公债150,000,000美元的资金，用于援助无家可归者，以及正在建设中的房屋，包括：(1)为无家可归者和家庭的紧急避难所及临时住房；(2)小数额资金用于购买用于临时住房；(3)为低收入者及残障人士提供住房援助，以及购买房屋的贷款及维修服务。1990年房屋与无家可归者公投法案。此法案提供发行公债150,000,000美元的资金，用于援助无家可归者，以及正在建设中的房屋，包括：(1)为无家可归者和家庭的紧急避难所及临时住房；(2)小数额资金用于购买用于临时住房；(3)为低收入者及残障人士提供住房援助，以及购买房屋的贷款及维修服务。
STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.

YES 211 →
NO 213 →


YES 215 →
NO 217 →

MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.

YES 218 →
NO 220 →

CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.

YES 222 →
NO 224 →

RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).

YES 226 →
NO 228 →

WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.

YES 230 →
NO 232 →
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependerían de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigor la medida.


ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la definición de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Costos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expanda la definición cubierta por la circunstancia esencial en asesinatos en primer grado.

DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDE Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. Se desconoce los efectos significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Podría haber serios impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,990,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarro y productos de tabaco, $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.
118. LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.

119. REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STATUTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.

120. NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.

121. HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.

122. EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.

123. 1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.
LEGISLATURA. REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se creó un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la votación pública y la posible redistribución por la corriente. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN DE COMISIÓN, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión. Los criterios de población en distritos de los mismos gastos de la votación de las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría la competencia en la votación en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Presos por medio de nueva construcción.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes "Hastings," la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1º de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salubridad y seguridad.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adaptaciones a prueba de sísmos, reparación, reemplazo y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros rotacionales con terremotos.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejoras de escuelas públicas.

1990年8月31日的高等教育建築物公債法案。此法案將發行公債$450,000,000以提供資金來興建新建築，改善目前的建築，及青少年管教所過度擁擠的問題。
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

A

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

B

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

C

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

D

WITHDRAWN

E

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?
263 SI  
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la eliminación del asbesto, al hecho de proporcionar un acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se contragolpe más de $65,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando se autoriza de la cantidad de $332,400,000 se vaya reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA e el estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

265 NO  

269 SI  
¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 06-1 de instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (I) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989; (II) las obras de infraestructura; (III) la reutilización de las instalaciones; (IV) la restauración de las instalaciones de la educación; (V) la restauración de las instalaciones de la vida social de la ciudad y (VI) la conservación del dinero en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y sufragar los gastos variados relacionados con los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recolocado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas residenciales de familias no residenciales de $45,00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32,20 por parcela durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $33,00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16,00 por unidad de vivienda durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y las dotaciones referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, cierres de terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se disponen con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 02-13-01 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1996; y deberá establecerse un límite de aportaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado con los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

272 NO  

277 SI  
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin líneas de crédito, si el Contrato certifica que el uso no es en interés de la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otras formas de financiamiento por alquiler?

278 NO  

280 SI  
¿Creará la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escuelas en las Paredes para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escuelas de las paredes, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un uno por ciento de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

281 NO  

ELIMINADA  

284 SI  
¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (I) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 40,7 horas (después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra) y permitir la compensación de la Comisión sobre incrementos, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una escuesta, establecer la duración y los horarios de comienzo de la jornada de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 6 a.m.?

285 NO  

E  

F  

19-1N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Resumen de la Proposición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td>Si el Consejo de Supervisores permite que los ex-Supervisores permanezcan en el Sistema de Servicio de Salud, deben pagar el costo completo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>Si el Consejo de Supervisores permite que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios sean miembros del PERS, no se producirá un costo adicional para la Ciudad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td>Si los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad aceptan contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco, podrán mantener sus beneficios de jubilación.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td>Si la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos es una comisión de la Carta Constitucional, se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social Aéreo, Capitanías y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td>Si se aumenta el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social Aéreo, Capitanías y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Serán tres individuos de la propiedad, tres del vecindario y tres de la fuerza laboral de la ciudad, y uno más que se elija por lotería?</td>
<td>Si se eligen tres individuos de la propiedad, tres del vecindario y tres de la fuerza laboral de la ciudad, y uno más que se elija por lotería.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde se dispusiera por otra manera que la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td>Si se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde se dispusiera por otra manera que la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1980 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
<td>Si se prohíbe que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohíbe que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1980 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1980 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
<td>Si se prohíbe que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohíbe que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1980 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1980 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
<td>Si se prohíbe que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohíbe que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1980 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas críminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td>Si se solicita a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas críminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don't forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don't count.
★ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.
★ Write your residence address where indicated.
★ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfore los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquellos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentan una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si falta alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRUIJNADA O DAÑADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuélvala la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entrega una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.
CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)

Sample Ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidnet</th>
<th>CANDIDATE A</th>
<th>4 ▲</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE B</td>
<td>5 ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE C</td>
<td>6 ▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文說明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT

I authorized ____________________________________________, my ______________________________

(name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________ Signature ______________________________

Date ____________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOBERNADOR</th>
<th>MARIA ELIZABETH MUÑOZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Bilingual Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maestra Bilingüe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MERLE WOO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialist-Feminism Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educadora de Feminismo Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICEGOBERNADOR</th>
<th>EMMA WONG MAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>Medical Technologist / Bacteriologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Técnico Médico / Bacteriologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CESAR G. CADABES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS / Health Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educador de la Salud y del SIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLYDE KUHN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Trustee / Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Síndico Escolar / Maestro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCURADOR GENERAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attorney General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance Commissioner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. KWAku DUREN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS
5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY
PARTIDO POR LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD

JUNE 5, 1990

P 33, 34, 35, 36 & 37
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO POR LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY LAWRENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Political Worker / Trabajadora Política Voluntaria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE SENATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT &quot;BOB&quot; MEOLA</td>
<td>Non-aligned Peace Activist</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN J. METTLER</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT NEWMAN</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESAR G. CADABES</td>
<td>Community Health Educator</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERLE WOO</td>
<td>Socialist Feminist Educator</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELESTE M. PERSIDSKY</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLLY HONIGSFELD</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER J. SMITH</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| STATE | SUPERINTENDENT DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|       | CAROL S. KOPPEL  
Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador |
|       | SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ  
College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria |
|       | BILL HONIG  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública |
|       | MARK ISLER  
Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios |
| STATE | JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3  
Superior Court Judge, Office #3 |
|       | ALEX SALDAMANDO  
Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal |
|       | J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY  
Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal |
| STATE | JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5  
Superior Court Judge, Office #5 |
|       | CARLOS BEA  
Incumbent / Titular del Cargo |
|       | KAY TSENIN  
Attorney / Abogada |
| STATE | JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15  
Superior Court Judge, Office #15 |
|       | JEROME T. BENSON  
Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior |
|       | DONNA HITCHENS  
Attorney / Abogada |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party/Position</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELLEN CHAIGHTIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Law Teacher / Abogada / Maestra de Derecho</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney / Fiscal Asistente del Distrito</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
<td>Sheriff’s Department’s Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>ASESOR</td>
<td>評估司</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Supervisor / Supervisor</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td>Deputy Assessor / Aesor Asistente</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td>Real Estate Portfolio Manager / Administrador de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogada; Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>DEFENSOR PUBLICO</td>
<td>公設辯護律師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>GOVERNOR'S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor's time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELEY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

**185 SI**

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDA Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ciento cuarenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluya: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

**187 NO**

1990年房屋与无家可归者公债法案。此法案发行公债$150,000,000用于房价计划，包括以下：(1)为无家可归者及家属提供紧急避难所，(2)新的住宅出租给个人及家庭的住宅，(3)为老年人、残疾者及当地特别需要的住宅及出租房的修补及管理给予第一次买家住房援助。

**189 SI**

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por un millón de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desembolsos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rotativos para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en los corredores para el aire limpio, y programas de tránsito en rieles. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resumen del cálculo por el Analista de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatales y locales: Si todos los bonos autorizados fueran vendidos al 7.5 por ciento y pagados durante un período de 20 años típicamente, el Fondo General Incurriría en unos $1.8 mil millones para pagar por el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($760 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos sería de $50 millones.

**190 NO**

1990年公共汽车与空气清洁公债。此法案发行公债$1,000,000,000用于购买权利、支付费用及购买空气清洁公共交通车辆。由加利福尼亚州一般基金支付。以下为立法局分析专家对州及市政府财政支付影响的估计：

如果所有发行的公债以每年7.5%出售，将支付约18亿美元；十年支付公债本息，七亿九千万元，估计每年公债本息的总付数为九千万元。

**192 SI**

**REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.** Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revocar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que en efectiva la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

**193 NO**

州长对立法的修订，立法的截止日期。立法修宪案。此法案将延长州长对立法中立法的时效及改定立法的有有效期。

**195 SI**

**EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA.** Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto base a viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo a los gobiernos estatales o locales que sencillamente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 millón a $2 millones por año.

**197 NO**

1990年减轻交通拥挤及限制支出法案。此法案将通过一项减少交通拥塞计划及修州与市政府支出的限制，使能更准确地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它将提供新功能用以塞州内公路，市街道路及大规模公共交通设施，以减少交通拥挤。此法案将增加年度税收百分之五十至由1990年8月1日起，会增加汽油税每加仑一文，之后四年期间内，由1月1日开始，再增加汽油税每加仑一文。此法案会减少州政府肆意行为及免受资金影响减轻交通拥挤，发展大规模交通设施，健康计划，老年人服务及州其他重要计划，同时亦能限制州及市政府支出。此法案将用于公共教育及社区大学提供至少州一般基金的百分之四十分，亦将规定超过州限定限额的税收会平分给教育部及纳税人。

**200 SI**

**ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMPEÑOS DE 1990.** Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatales y locales para reflejar las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medición estabilizaría un aumento del 95% en los costos por peso a los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de gasolina combustible el 1º de agosto de 1990, y un centavo adicional el 1º de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuará disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciban al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los réditos exceden el límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

**203 NO**

1990年交通拥挤及限制支出法案。此法案将实施一项减少交通拥挤计划及修州与市政府支出的限制，使能更准确地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它将提供新功能用以塞州内公路，市街道路及大规模公共交通设施，以减少交通拥挤。此法案将增加年度税收百分之五十至由1990年8月1日起，会增加汽油税每加仑一文，之后四年期间内，由1月1日开始，再增加汽油税每加仑一文。此法案会减少州政府肆意行为及免受资金影响减轻交通拥挤，发展大规模交通设施，健康计划，老年人服务及州其他重要计划，同时亦能限制州及市政府支出。此法案将用于公共教育及社区大学提供至少州一般基金的百分之四十分，亦将规定超过州限定限额的税收会平分给教育部及纳税人。

N 51, N 52 & N 53

13-1N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES 211</td>
<td>NO 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226</td>
<td>NO 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230</td>
<td>NO 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES, ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependerían de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

211 SI ȘI
213 NO 反對


215 SI ȘI
217 NO 反對

ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO, PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la definición de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Cargas estatales desconocidas como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

218 SI ȘI
220 NO 反對

DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectúa significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondrá en ejecución y se interpretará la medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

222 SI ȘI
224 NO 反對

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

226 SI ȘI
228 NO 反對

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

230 SI ȘI
232 NO 反對
**CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990**
**MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td><strong>LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE.</strong> Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td><strong>REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STATUTE.</strong> Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td><strong>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td><strong>HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td><strong>EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td><strong>1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT.</strong> This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Número de Votos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 SI</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 NO</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 SI</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243 SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254 SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258 SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA.** Sujeto la redistribución de díes de los 28 portes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la votación pública y el posible reajuste de tarifas de luz. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores.

**REDISTRIBUCIÓN FOR COMISIÓN, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA.** Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, el criterio de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hecho, cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 28 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes "Hastings," la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusivo. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra incendios y mejoras para la salud y seguridad.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiciones a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.

**1990年新監獄建築的公債法案。**此法案將發行公債500,000,000以提供資金來建築新監獄，改良目前州監獄，為青少年犯人所適度收容的情況。

**1990年6月的高等教育建築物公債法案。**此法案將發行公債500,000,000以提供資金來建築或改善州公共高等教育機構的建築物，包括以下；加州的9個大學、州立大學的20個校園、州社區大學的71個學院、哈斯丁斯（HASTINGS）法律學院、州海洋研究所以及州立大學董事會於1990年7/1之前所通過的其他建築物。此法案所批准資金的使用，將包括而不限於課堂、實驗室、圖書館的興建或改善及實施改善防衛、其他健康或安全的設備。

**1990年學校建築物公債法案。**此法案將發行公債800,000,000以提供資金來興建或改善州的建築物。
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263 ➤ NO 265 ➤

A

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial use) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269 ➤ NO 272 ➤

B

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277 ➤ NO 278 ➤

C

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280 ➤ NO 281 ➤

D

WITHDRAWN

E

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 284 ➤ NO 285 ➤

F

N 51, N 52 & N 53 18-1N
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contraer una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que sean propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del astillero, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se contrate más de $65,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $332,400,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

1990年公共安全改善公债。发行公债
$332,400,000，用于购买、新建或改建三藩市
及县拥有的设施，包括用于地震后的修
复、减少地震危害的设施。除非疏散五分钟
内，只能在每次1990年内发行公债的数额不
超过$65,000,000，并且从FEMA（联邦应急
管理署）或加州地震
灾后重建基金所获得的补助金或是在加利福
尼亚州用于完成后应使用的补助金将
减至$332400,000公债的数额。

A

¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 o (ii) la mejora sismica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iii) la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos varios relacionados a los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recaudado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual: (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $40.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.00 por parcela durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, ciertos terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se dispone con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 02-13-91 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990 y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

B

¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda específicos, la autorización de aprovisionar de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin líneas de lucro, si el Contralor certifica que el costo neto en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

C

¿Crearán la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vaciado y Limpieza de las Escaleras en las Paredes para pagar por embellecer las escaleras para la Ciudad y limpiar las esculturas de las paredes, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un poco por ciento de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de no tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

D

ELIMINADA

¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48.7 horas (después de lo cual un hombre gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión Sobrededicada, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los hombres, en vez de que se tomen turnos de 24 horas que comiencen a las 8:00 a.m.?

E

Caso de emergencia:

F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPUESTAS A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

288 SI 贊成  ¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?

289 NO 反對

290 SI 贊成  ¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?

292 NO 反對

293 SI 贊成  ¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?

295 NO 反對

296 SI 贊成  ¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?

297 NO 反對

298 SI 贊成  ¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Transito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de permisos de cinco a siete miembros?

299 NO 反對

300 SI 贊成  ¿Serán los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen a los miembros de los consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos enumerados, o a los cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o aptitudes especiales y no pueda encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?

301 NO 反對

302 SI 贊成  ¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?

304 NO 反對

305 SI 贊成  ¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?

307 NO 反對

309 SI 贊成  ¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de aguas hidropérmicas?

310 NO 反對

N 51, N 52 & N 53
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
☆ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

☆ Write your residence address where indicated.

☆ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONS APPEAR ON THE FRONT PAGE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfore los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquellos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentaron una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíe a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRUIINADA O DAÑADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuélvala la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCION Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes al Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.
ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
- This sample ballot booklet.
- A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
- An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
- A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
- A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)

Sample Ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>CANDIDATE A</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE B</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CANDIDATE C</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文說明在封底

PUNCH OUT THE DOT ON THE NUMBERED BOX ON THE BALLOT CARD THAT IS THE SAME AS THE NUMBER OF YOUR CHOICE OF CANDIDATE, OR "YES" OR "NO" ON MEASURES.

Use pin provided to punch out chip on ballot.
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), **check the back of the ballot card** to make sure those holes are completely punched out. **Pull off any hanging chads.**

4. To vote for a **write-in candidate**, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the **secrecy envelope**. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your **ballot** inside the **secrecy envelope**, and then put them into the **Absentee Ballot Return Envelope**.

6. Fill in the **declaration** on the Return Envelope with your **signature**, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and **mail it early**, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. **Postmarks do not count.**

**SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT**

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

**BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY**

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place **by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.**

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will **not be counted**, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may **mail** your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. **OR, you may bring your ballot** in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. **OR, an authorized person** (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the "Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places" in order for the ballot to be counted.

**PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING**

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

---

**AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT**

I authorized __________________________________________________________, my __________________________ (name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall

☐ a polling place.

Name __________________________________________________________ Signature _________________________________________

Date __________________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate 1</th>
<th>Candidate 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOBERNADOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>MARIA ELIZABETH MUÑOZ</strong></td>
<td><strong>MERLE WOO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governor</strong></td>
<td>Bilingual Teacher</td>
<td>Socialist-Feminism Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate 1</th>
<th>Candidate 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICEGOBERNADOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>EMMA WONG MAR</strong></td>
<td><strong>CESAR G. CADABES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lieutenant Governor</strong></td>
<td>Medical Technologist / Bacteriologist</td>
<td>AIDS / Health Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate 1</th>
<th>Candidate 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLYDE KUHN</strong></td>
<td>School Trustee / Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PARTIDO POR LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD*

*PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY*

*ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990*

*5 DE JUNIO DE 1990*

*ESTADO*

**STATE**

*P 33, 34 & 35*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>JULIE FAUSTO</td>
<td>Bilingual Instructor</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EVELINA ALARCÓN</td>
<td>Political Organizer</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>GENEVIEVE TORRES</td>
<td>Cancer Researcher</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHIRLEY RACHEL ISAACSON</td>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD D. ROSE</td>
<td>Community Service Consultant</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>ELIZABETH A. NAKANO</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEWIS J. SHIREMAN</td>
<td>Independent Computer Consultant</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JANET D. LEWIS</td>
<td>Political Party Organizer</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General (Vote for One)</td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Defense Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado Defensor Penal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>员公辯護律師</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner (Vote for One)</td>
<td>TOM CONDIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trabajador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>社會發展組織家</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. KWAKU DUREN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development Organizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizador para el Desarrollo Comunitario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</td>
<td>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(State Board of Equalization)</td>
<td>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY LAWRENCE</td>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Political Worker / Trabajadora</td>
<td>la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Política Voluntaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO POR LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(State Senate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE SENATOR IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS DISTRICT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postulación para aparecer en la balota como</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador Estatal en este distrito)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS DISTRICT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postulación para aparecer en la balota como</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distrito)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

本區無人候選為聯邦眾議員

本區無人競選州參議員

本區無人候選為州衆議員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT “BOB” MEOLA</td>
<td>Non-aligned Peace Activist</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN J. METTLER</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT NEWMAN</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESAR G. CADABES</td>
<td>Community Health Educator</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERLE WOO</td>
<td>Socialist Feminist Educator</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELESTE M. PERSIDSKY</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLLY HONIGSFELD</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER J. SMITH</td>
<td>Activist for Democracy</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</td>
<td>JUDICIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>William J. O'Connor</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Chaitin</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Tang</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Harrigan</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #2</td>
<td>Jerome A. De Filippo</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lillian K. Sing</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Schwenger</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ronald G. Kershaw</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

**107**

HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

YES 185

NO 187

**108**

PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

YES 189

NO 190

**109**

GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 192

NO 193

**110**

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

YES 195

NO 197

**111**

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

YES 200

NO 203
185 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDA Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta mil millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para programas de vivienda que incluyen: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas para arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

187 NO 反对

189 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desembolsos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rodantes para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en rieles. Asigna dinero del fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resumen del cálculo por el Analista de la Legislatura sobre el Impacto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatal y locales: si todos los bonos autorizados fueran vendidos al 7.5 por ciento y pagados durante un periodo de 20 años típicamente, el Fondo General incurriera en unos $1.6 mil millones para pagar por el capital ($1.6 mil millones) y el interés ($357 mil millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos sería de 200 millones.

190 NO 反对

192 SI 贊成
REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

193 NO 反对

195 SI 贊成
EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto base a viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatal o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 mil a $2 mil por año.

197 NO 反对

200 SI 贊成
ACTA PARA EL DESCONECIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida estima un programa de desconexiónamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para reflejar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispone nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, caminos locales, o instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecería un aumento del 56% en los cobros por peso a los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible al 1° de octubre de 1990, y un centavo adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para que se financie el desconexiónamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, a tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuaria disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciban al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

203 NO 反对

1990年房屋與無家可歸者公投法案。此法案提供發行公債 $150,000,000 資助的房屋計劃包括以下：（1）無家可歸者及家屬的緊急避難所及變動時期房屋新出租給個人及家庭的房屋來符合老年人、殘障者及孤兒的特別需要；（2）舊屋及出租屋的修補及維護助給予首次買房人買屋援助。

1990年乘客鐵路交通與空氣清潔公債。此法案提供發行公債 $10,000,000.00 資助調度及投資，資本支出及發展在內鐵路交通和工具計劃。由加州“一般經費”來支付公債。以下為立法局分析專家對此和市政府財政支出影響的估計：如果通過的數目的公債為之 7.5 億元，付出期為閉關的流來計算，“一般經費”將支付約七千萬元，一千萬元公債資金，其中十億萬元。}

州長對立法的檢討：立法的截止日期。立法投棄案。此提案將會在州長捷克檢討建議中的立法時期及改變立法院的日期。對政府影響：無直接財政影響。

200 SI 贊成

1990年減輕交通塞塞及限制支出公債。此法案將實施－－項州減輕交通塞塞計劃及修改州及市政府支出的限制額，使能更確定地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它將提供 Few 收成用來修建州內公路、市內街道及人口多的公共交通設施以減輕交通塞塞。此法例將新設資本基金收債人保守之五十五及在1990年8月1日開始，會增加汽油稅每加侖五仙，之後四個期間內，由每年1/1日開始，再增加汽油稅每加侖一仙。此法案會調整州撥款額以獲取資金來減輕交通塞塞、發展大規模交通設施、健康計劃及老年人服務及州其它重要的計劃，同時亦能限制州及市政府支出。此法案將減為公共教育及社區大學提供至少州“一般經費”預算的百分之四，亦將規定超過州撥款額的收稅會平均結教育部及納稅人。
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STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.

112 YES 211 → NO 213 →


113 YES 215 → NO 217 →

MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.

114 YES 218 → NO 220 →

CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.

115 YES 222 → NO 224 →

RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).

116 YES 226 → NO 228 →

WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.

117 YES 230 → NO 232 →
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Votos</th>
<th>Voto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES, ÉTICA.** Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependerían de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.


**ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO, PENAS. ENMIENDE LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA.** Redefine y expande la definición de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos debido a que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

**DERECHO PENAL, ENMIENDE Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA.** Límite los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida afecta significativamente cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondría en práctica y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales a pesar de haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

**TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL, ACTO DE BONOS, ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.** Autoriza emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1,6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $100 millones).

**PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVÍSTRE, ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.** Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $8 millones provinientes de la sobretasa al cigarillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.
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118  LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.

YES 236  NO 238

119  REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, STATUTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.

YES 240  NO 242

120  NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.

YES 243  NO 245

121  HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.

YES 248  NO 250

122  EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.

YES 254  NO 256

123  1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 258  NO 259
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDE Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 25 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la votación pública y la posible redistribución por la corriente. Los costos por las disposiciones para Ética son probablemente menores.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN EN COMISIÓN, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y la distribución en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarán, disminuyendo los ahorros.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuarentocinco millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuarentocinco millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nueve recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, el Colegio Superior de Comunidad de California, el Colegio de Derecho de Las Vegas, la Academia Martina de California, y las instalaciones de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1989 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejorías para la salubridad y seguridad.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1980. Esta acta dispone un empréstito de $300,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiciones a prueba de sismos, reparación, remodelación y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolsos de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.

1990年6月的高等教育建築物公債法案。
此法案将發行公債$450,000,000 以提供資金來建築新
錫腊島州律師學院，愛荷華州立大學的20
校園，州社區大學的2個，希斯丁(HASTINGS)
拉伯學院，州海洋研究所以州立大學董事會
於1990年7/1日或之前所通過批准的其校建築
物，此法案所批准資金的使用，將包括而不
必限於居室，實驗室，圖書館的興建或改善及
實際改善措施，其他健康或安全的設施。

1990年9月的建築物公債法案。
此法案將發行公債$300,000,000 以提
供資金來重建，改善安全、修繕、替
換及搬遷那些因受地震影響而變為危險的州及
市建築物。

1990年學校建築物公債法案。此法案將發
行公債$800,000,000 以提供資本支出來興建
或改善公校的建築物。
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MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

B
Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

C
Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

D
Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

E
WITHDRAWN

F
Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECTORES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

263 SI 贊成
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contratar una deuda en bonos de $322,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que sean propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la eliminación del mantenimiento, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se contraguie más de $65,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $322,400,000 no se vaya reducir por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

265 NO 反對

269 SI 贊成
¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de la Unidad Escolar de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (o los daños posteriores); (ii) la mejora técnica de los centros intinerantes y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco; (iii) la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad tanto en viviendas como en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la reconstrucción documental de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos vinculados a la autorización? Si: 20 años (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, $43,000 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32,200 por parcela durante los años siguientes; y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con un o más usos residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, $33,000 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y $16,10 por unidad de vivienda durante los años siguientes hasta el año 2000. Con una influencia del 2% de los fondos de la escuela para viviendas, el edificio para viviendas y el edificio para el uso mixto.

272 NO 反對

277 SI 贊成
¿Tendrá el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiaudós de alquiler de una empresa sin límites de lucro, desde que el Contralor certifique que el costo neto a intereses a la ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

278 NO 反對

280 SI 贊成
¿Creará la ciudad un fondo de embellecimiento del vecindario y limpieza de las escrituras de las parcelas para pagar las comisiones de los vecindarios y limpiar las escrituras de las parcelas, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un porcentaje de su impuesto comercial a dicha fonda, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal que no vaya a $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

281 NO 反對

ELIMINADA

284 SI 贊成
¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Constitución, para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 40,7 horas (después de una semana de 40 horas) o (2) permitir en cambio que la Junta de Municipios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 8 a.m.?

285 NO 反對

A

B

C

D

E

F

N 51, N 52 & N 53

19-1N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Proponent</td>
<td>Opponent</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Será un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen a las comisiones para miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos enumerados, o en los cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o aptitudes especiales y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumple con estas condiciones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Se hablará de la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o designados por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
★ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

★ Write your residence address where indicated.

★ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONS APPEAR ON THE FRONT PAGE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfore los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquéllos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones están completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escribe el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentada una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sello postales.

BALOTA ARRUIÑADA O DAÑADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuelva la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregará una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el “Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugaures de Votación” para que la balota pueda ser contada.
Absent Voter Sample Ballot

Contents

Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:

- This sample ballot booklet.
- A ballot card with numbers (1 - 312) printed on it.
- An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
- A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
- A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

Absentee Voting Instructions

Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)

Sample Ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Candidate A</th>
<th>4 ▲</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate B</td>
<td>5 ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate C</td>
<td>6 ▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文说明在封底.
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), check the back of the ballot card to make sure those holes are completely punched out. Pull off any hanging chads.

4. To vote for a write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person’s name in the blank spaces provided on the secrecy envelope. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your ballot inside the secrecy envelope, and then put them into the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.

6. Fill in the declaration on the Return Envelope with your signature, printed name, residence, and date. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and mail it early, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. Postmarks do not count.

SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT
If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY
Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will not be counted, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may mail your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it.

2. OR, you may bring your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco.

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING
Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT

I authorized __________________________________________, my ____________________________ (name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name __________________________________________ Signature ________________________________

Date __________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOBERNADOR</strong> Governor</td>
<td>MARIA ELIZABETH MUÑOZ</td>
<td>Partido por la Paz y la Libertad</td>
<td>ESTADO</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilingual Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maestra Bilingüe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERLE WOO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socialist-Feminism Educator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educadora de Feminismo Socialista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VICEGOBERNADOR</strong> LG</td>
<td>CLYDE KUHN</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom Party</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Trustee / Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Síndico Escolar / Maestro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Technologist / Bacteriologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Técnico Médico / Bacteriologista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CESAR G. CADABES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIDS / Health Educator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educador de Salud y del SIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Julie Fausto</td>
<td>Bilingual Instructor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evelina Alarcón</td>
<td>Political Organizer</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Richard D. Rose</td>
<td>Community Service Consultant</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genevieve Torres</td>
<td>Cancer Researcher</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shirley Rachel Isaacson</td>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Janet D. Lewis</td>
<td>Political Party Organizer</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth A. Nakano</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewis J. Shireman</td>
<td>Independent Computer Consultant</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PROCURADOR GENERAL Attorney General | ROBERT J. EVANS
Criminal Defense Lawyer
Abogado Defensor Penal | 54    |
| COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS Insurance Commissioner | TOM CONDIT
Worker
Trabajador | 61    |
|                                  | B. KWAKU DUREN
Community Development Organizer
Organizador para el Desarrollo Comunitario | 63    |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partido por la Paz y la Libertad</th>
<th>Peace and Freedom Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN**

**Member, State Board of Equalization**

**NANCY LAWRENCE**

Volunteer Political Worker / Trabajadora Política Voluntaria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Representante de los Estados Unidos en este distrito)

本区無人候選為聯邦眾議員

(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人競選州參議員

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal en este distrito)

本區無人候選為州衆議員

80 → 8-1P
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>縣中央委員會委員</th>
<th>選一人</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, COMITÉ CENTRAL DEL CONDADO</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE IN THIS DISTRICT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para aparecer en la balota como Miembro del Comité Central del Condado en este distrito)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>本區無人登記，候選為縣中央委員會委員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>和平自由黨</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO POR LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMITÉ DEL CONDADO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAY TSENNIN</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL DEPARTAMENTO #1</td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELLEN CHAITIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Law Teacher / Abogada / Maestra de Derecho</td>
<td>律師/法學教師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULIE TANG</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant District Attorney / Fiscal Asistente del Distrito</td>
<td>副理律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAMES HARRIGAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff’s Department’s Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff</td>
<td>司法部檢察官</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL DEPARTAMENTO #3</th>
<th>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LILLIAN K. SING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASESOR 評估司</th>
<th>Assessor</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RONALD G. KERSHAW</strong></td>
<td>Real Estate Portfolio Manager / Administrador de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>房地產行銷經理</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WENDY NELDER</strong></td>
<td>Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogado; Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</strong></td>
<td>Supervisor / Supervisor</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAUL SCHWENGER</strong></td>
<td>Deputy Assessor / Asesor Asistente</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFENSOR PUBLICO 公設辯護律師</strong></td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JEFF BROWN</strong></td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990

#### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 SÍ: ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluya: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que tienen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

187 NO: ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluya: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que tienen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

189 SÍ: ACTA DE BONOS PARA TRANSEÚNTES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desplazamientos de capital, para la adquisición de trenes rápidos para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en rieles. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resumen del cálculo por el Análisis de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatales y locales: 30 mil bonos autorizados fueron vendidos al 7.5 por ciento y pagados durante un periodo de 20 años típicamente, el Fondo General iría en unos $1.8 mil millones por pagar por el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($790 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos sería de $60 millones.

190 NO: ACTA DE BONOS PARA TRANSEÚNTES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desplazamientos de capital, para la adquisición de trenes rápidos para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en rieles. Asigna dinero del Fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Resumen del cálculo por el Análisis de la Legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal neto en los gobiernos estatales y locales: 30 mil bonos autorizados fueron vendidos al 7.5 por ciento y pagados durante un periodo de 20 años típicamente, el Fondo General iría en unos $1.8 mil millones por pagar por el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($790 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos sería de $60 millones.

192 SÍ: REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR, FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

193 NO: REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR, FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

195 SÍ: EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto base a viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatales o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 millón a $2 millones por año.

197 NO: EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto base a viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatales o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 millón a $2 millones por año.

200 SÍ: ACTA PARA EL DESCONEGOSANIMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestión del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatales y locales para rellenar las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondría de nuevas rutas para reemplazar el tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, y instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecería un aumento del 50% en los cobros por peso de los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1996, y un centavo adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continua la inversión que la educación y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad recibían al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y disponería que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

203 NO: ACTA PARA EL DESCONEGOSANIMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestión del tránsito para todo el estado y pondría al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatales y locales para rellenar las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondría de nuevas rutas para reemplazar el tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, y instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecería un aumento del 50% en los cobros por peso de los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1996, y un centavo adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continúa la inversión que la educación y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad recibían al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y disponería que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES 211 → NO 213 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER, CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218 → NO 220 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222 → NO 224 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226 → NO 228 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230 → NO 232 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FUNCIONARIOS ESTATUALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que lleve la contabilidad de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: No desconoce los costos al estado que dependan de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

211 SI 贯成
213 NO 反对


215 SI 贯成
217 NO 反对

ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redacta y expande la definición de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena para asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que no se expanda la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

218 SI 贯成
220 NO 反对

DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; establece cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de esta medida. La medida afecta significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondrá en ejecución y si se interpretará de esta manera. Podría haber solamente un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

222 SI 贯成
224 NO 反对

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza la emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar los sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requerirá del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

226 SI 贯成
228 NO 反对

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $8 millones provenientes de la sobrecasa al cigarrillo y productos de tóbetos; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

230 SI 贯成
232 NO 反对

二 

112
113
114
115
116
117
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Legislature. Reapportionment. Ethics. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Reapportionment by Commission. Initiative Constitutional Amendment, Statute. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 School Facilities Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Votación</td>
<td>Comentarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 236</td>
<td>SI 118</td>
<td>Legislatura, redistribución, ética, enmienda y estatuto constitucional de iniciativa. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 25 partes de la votación legislativa y aprueba el voto de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto fiscal: los gastos por redistribución podrán ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la votación pública y la posible redistribución por el corte. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 238</td>
<td>NO 119</td>
<td>Redistribución for comisión, enmienda y estatuto constitucional de iniciativa. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto fiscal: la limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hecho, la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los gastos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 240</td>
<td>SI 120</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para ativar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de una nueva construcción.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 243</td>
<td>NO 121</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 11 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes &quot;Hastings,&quot; la Academia Maritimea de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1º de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salud y seguridad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 245</td>
<td>NO 122</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiciones a prueba de sismos, reparación, remodela y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. 248</td>
<td>SI 123</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1990年6月5日，初選，提案提交選民投票。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Public Safety Improvement Bonds, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.</td>
<td>YES 263 → NO 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?</td>
<td>YES 269 → NO 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?</td>
<td>YES 277 → NO 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?</td>
<td>YES 280 → NO 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?</td>
<td>YES 284 → NO 285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del daño, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se une más de $65,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $332,400,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad real restituida en consecuencia del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 0-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del distrito escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (o los choques subsiguientes), (ii) la mejora sísmica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (iii) la financiación de las medidas de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos varios relacionados a los anteriores por medio de la recogida de un impuesto especial a ser recogido durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual: (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.20 por parcela durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $15.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, ciertos terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se displica con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 02-13-91 aprobada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990; y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

¿Dirá la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escrituras en las Paredes por pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escrituras de las paredes, permitiendo que las empresas disparen hasta un uno por ciento de sus impuestos a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Constitución para que: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48,7 horas (después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 8 a.m.?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290</td>
<td>NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293</td>
<td>NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298</td>
<td>NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305</td>
<td>NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309</td>
<td>NO 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Propuesta</td>
<td>Resumen</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>292 NO</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>295 NO</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>299 NO</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apeaciones de permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td>¿Será un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se enlisten en los miembros de los otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando sea requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos enumerados, o en los cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o aptitudes especiales y no puede encontrar ningún residente de San Francisco que cumple con estas condiciones?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>304 NO</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para logar que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>307 NO</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>310 NO</td>
<td>¿Será la política de los gastos de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don't forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don't count.
★ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

★ Write your residence address where indicated.

★ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE
Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfora los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coinciden con aquéllos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentado una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si falta alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíe a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRuinADA O DAñADA
Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuelva la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS
Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990. Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.
ABSENT VOTER SAMPLE BALLOT
Voting twice constitutes a felony

CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:
This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)

Sample Ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>CANDIDATE A</th>
<th>4 ▲</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CANDIDATE B</td>
<td>5 ▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANDIDATE C</td>
<td>6 ▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Las instrucciones en español se encuentran en la cubierta posterior.

中文说明在封底
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), **check the back of the ballot card** to make sure those holes are completely punched out. **Pull off any hanging chads.**

4. To vote for a **write-in candidate**, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the **secrecy envelope**. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your **ballot** inside the **secrecy envelope**, and then put them into the **Absentee Ballot Return Envelope**.

6. Fill in the **declaration** on the Return Envelope with your **signature**, **printed name**, **residence**, and **date**. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and **mail** it **early**, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. **Postmarks do not count.**

**SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT**

If you tear, mar, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

**BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY**

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. June 5, 1990.

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will **not be counted, regardless of postmark date**.

1. You may **mail** your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, **you may bring your ballot** in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the "Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places" in order for the ballot to be counted.

**PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING**

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

---

**AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT**

I authorized ___________________________________________ , my ____________________________

(name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________ Signature ________________________________

Date ____________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOBERNADOR</th>
<th>选一人</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARIA ELIZABETH MUÑOZ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Teacher</td>
<td>Maestra Bilingüe</td>
<td>雙語教師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERLE WOO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist-Feminism Educator</td>
<td>Educadora de Feminismo Socialista</td>
<td>社會主義／女性主義教育工作者</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICEGOBERNADOR</th>
<th>副州長</th>
<th>选一人</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE KUHN</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Trustee / Teacher</td>
<td>Síndico Escolar / Maestro</td>
<td>校長／教師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA WONG MAR</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technologist / Bacteriologist</td>
<td>Técnico Médico / Bacteriologista</td>
<td>醫療技術專家／細菌學家</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESAR G. CADABES</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS / Health Educator</td>
<td>Educador de la Salud y del SIDA</td>
<td>感染病／健康教育工作者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Vote #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>JULIE FAUSTO</td>
<td>Bilingual Instructor</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructora Bilingüe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EVELINA ALARCÓN</td>
<td>Political Organizer</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizadora Política</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>RICHARD D. ROSE</td>
<td>Community Service Consultant</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor de Servicios Comunitarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENEVIEVE TORRES</td>
<td>Cancer Researcher</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investigadora del Cáncer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHIRLEY RACHEL ISAACSON</td>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psicóloga Escolar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>TESORERO</td>
<td>Political Party Organizer</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizadora de Partidos Políticos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JANET D. LEWIS</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trabajadora Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELIZABETH A. NAKANO</td>
<td>Independent Computer Consultant</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultor Independiente de Computación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>ROBERT J. EVANS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Defense Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado Defensor Penal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>TOM CONDIT</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trabajador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. KWAKU DUREN</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Development Organizer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizador para el Desarrollo Comunitario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</td>
<td>NANCY LAWRENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>Volunteer Political Worker/Trabajadora Política Voluntaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THIS DISTRICT)

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)

(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON THE BALLOT FOR STATE ASSEMBLY IN THIS DISTRICT)
(NO CANDIDATES FILED NOMINATION PAPERS TO APPEAR ON
THE BALLOT FOR COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
IN THIS DISTRICT)

(Ningún candidato presentó los papeles de postulación para
aparecer en la balota como Miembro del Comité Central del Condado
en este distrito)

本區無人登記，候選為縣中央委員會委員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG (State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARK ISLER (Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL (Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ (College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria)</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO (Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal)</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY (Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal)</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
<td>CARLOS BEA (Incumbent / Titular del Cargo)</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KAY TSENIN (Attorney / Abogada)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON (Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior)</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS (Attorney / Abogada)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal Departamento #1</td>
<td>William J. O'Connor</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Chaitin</td>
<td>Attorney / Law Teacher / Abogada / Maestra de Derecho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Tang</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney / Fiscal Asistente del Distrito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Harrigan</td>
<td>Sheriff's Department's Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal Departamento #3</td>
<td>Jerome A. De Filippo</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lillian K. Sing</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asesor</td>
<td>Ronald G. Kershaw</td>
<td>Real Estate Portfolio Manager / Administrador de Bienes Raíces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
<td>Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogado; Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td>Supervisor / Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Schwenger</td>
<td>Deputy Assessor / Asesor Asistente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensor Público</td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

PASSenger RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDA Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un emisor de bonos por ciento cuarenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para programas de vivienda que incluyen: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda. (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que tienen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

187 NO 反對

189 SI 贊成
ACTA DE BONOS PARA TRANSPORTES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un emisor de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el desarrollo de las nuevas vías de transporte de carga y pasajeros, y programas de transporte en tierras, y para la adquisición de vehículos de transporte de carga y pasajeros para viajeros de día, y programas de transporte en tierras. El Fondo General para el transporte de día invertirá en unos $1.8 millones para pagar el capital ($1 millón) y el interés ($750 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos sería de $50 millones.

190 NO 反對

192 SI 贊成
REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

193 NO 反對

195 SI 贊成
EXENCION DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto base a viviendas de personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatal o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probablemente de $1 mil a $2 millones por año.

197 NO 反對

200 SI 贊成
ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBOLSOS DE 1990. Esta medida establece un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y pondrá al día la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para reflejar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondría nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecería un aumento del 50% en los cobros por paso a los camiones y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1990, y un centavo adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales de prioridad. El mismo tiempo que todavía disponen una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuaría disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad recibieran al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean repartidos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

203 NO 反對
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

112 STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.


114 MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.

115 CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.

116 RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).

117 WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

211 SI 贊成

FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES, ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. Podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

213 NO 反對

215 SI 贊成


217 NO 反對

218 SI 贊成

ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO, PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la definición de "oficial del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expanda la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

220 NO 反對

222 SI 贊成

DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; rechaza cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida rechaza significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce como se pondrá en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

224 NO 反對

226 SI 贊成

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza una emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización duró los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

228 NO 反對

230 SI 贊成

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SIVELSTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

232 NO 反對

成巷、公益、民主、發展、財政影響：請政府支出增額不詳。須視委員會所制定的罰則及福利而定，而政府支出及其它支出的費用為較低。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Legislature, Reapportionment, Ethics, Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Reapportionment by Commission, Initiative Constitutional Amendment, Statute. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 School Facilities Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, Elecciones Primarias Consolidadas, 5 de Junio de 1990
Proponemos a ser sometidas al voto de los electores — estatal

236 SI 贷成
Legislatura, redistribución, ética, enmienda y estatuto constitucional de iniciativa. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de la votación pública y la posible redistribución por la corte. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores.

238 NO 反对

240 SI 贷成
Redistribución for comisión. Enmienda y estatuto constitucional de iniciativa. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hecho cargo a la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorrillos.

242 NO 反对

243 SI 贷成
Acta de bonos para la construcción de nuevas prisiones de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

245 NO 反对

248 SI 贷成
Acta de bonos para instalaciones de educación superior de junio de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyan los nueve recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes "Hastings," la Academia Marina California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de las salas de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejorías para la salubridad y seguridad.

250 NO 反对

254 SI 贷成
Acta de bonos para seguridad contra sismos y rehabilitación de edificios públicos de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aditamentos a prueba de sismos, reparación, reemplazo y reubicación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inequívocamente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

256 NO 反对

258 SI 贷成
Acta de bonos para instalaciones escolares de 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.

259 NO 反对

118
119
120
121
122
123

N 51, 52 & 53
17-1N
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

A

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

B

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

C

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

D

WITHDRAWN

E

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contratar una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del desastre, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para los vehículos, los edificios y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, que se reducirá por la cantidad de $32,400,000 se ve reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

1990年公共安全改善公債。發行公債
$332,400,000，用於購買、建設或改擴建市內
市及縣所擁有的車庫，包括由於地震後的修
減地層鴨京的損壞，清除道路、礦坑路通
道，只要在各年內實際發行的公債不超過
$32,400,000。並且要求FEMA提供緊急
援助管理1台所獲得的救助金或是其他國家
政府及減地層或其他損壞所的補助金將會
減$332,400,000公債的數額。

B: 1935年聯邦民居的重新建築法第90-1號應
以免何者？1935年10月20日後，應在後
所規定的三藩市聯合校舍的建築物損壞的修
理，修繕或重建；已改建於liner及三藩市聯
合校舍其他建築物的修繕等，是已於該司法
案時期內修繕的建築物修繕的工程及相鄰
的臨時費用將各自於一項特別收，稅收期內30年:
a.每戶一間室的住宅地皮及非住宅地皮在稅
收期內30年。每戶每年稅額以33.25，鎮滿10年
後，每年逐年增加以33.25，鎮滿10年後增加
b.用戶在於住宅，非住宅住宅地皮，混合
用途及非住宅住宅地皮的定義，分配及最高稅
率的詳細規定，由3藩市聯合校舍的司法等
.jpg

C: 市參議會是否通過選民投票之前及在某
些指定單位的限制範圍內，有權批准由非牟利
公司兼職租賃單位，只要其計劃能維持市政府
所付的凈利息比其他抵押設備計劃為低？

D: 市政府是否設立美化街坊及清潔塗壁的基
金來美化三藩市坊及清潔塗壁的費用，讓
各商業家作他們的營業稅的節省之一。此基
金，每年此百萬或會被調低以維持一百萬元基
金？

E: 撤消

F: 市議會應否指定消防局至少設有多少消
防員及各級消防員的職工人數，並應否通過消防
委員會，市參議會及三藩市選民的贊同，消防
局，其他消防公司或單位始能開門停業？
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Número</td>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
<td>Respuesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autoridad de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apalaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que no se envíen consultores a los miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos sancionadores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos enumerados, o en los cuales no se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacitación o habilidades específicas y no puede encontrar ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrado por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de la Mujer, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que eliminen todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 51, N 52 & N 53
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
☆ Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

☆ Write your residence address where indicated.

☆ You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTORAUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, tome la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfore los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentada una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y los datos. Si faltara alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíelo a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores Ausentes antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración las fechas de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRuinADA O DAñADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equivoca en su balota, devuelva la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCIÓN Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (es decir, su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el "Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación" para que la balota pueda ser contada.
CONTENTS
Your absentee ballot packet contains the following items:

This sample ballot booklet.
A ballot card with numbers (1 – 312) printed on it.
An Absentee Ballot Return Envelope.
A wire poker you use to poke holes in your ballot to vote.
A secrecy envelope in which to place your voted ballot and on which you can write in the name of write-in candidates if you wish.

ABSENTEE VOTING INSTRUCTIONS
Please read all instructions before punching your ballot.

1. Make your choices by going through this sample ballot booklet and marking the numbers assigned to each candidate or measure for which you wish to vote.

2. After you finish the booklet by marking all your choices, take the ballot card and, using the wire poker, punch the circles under the numbers on the ballot card that match the numbers that you marked in this booklet.

(Continued next page)
3. After voting (i.e., you punched all the numbers of your choice), **check the back of the ballot card** to make sure those holes are completely punched out. **Pull off any hanging chads.**

4. To vote for a **write-in candidate**, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank spaces provided on the **secrecy envelope**. Note: Write-in votes are only counted if those people have filed and qualify to be write-in candidates.

5. Place your **ballot** inside the **secrecy envelope**, and then put them into the **Absentee Ballot Return Envelope**.

6. Fill in the **declaration** on the Return Envelope with your **signature**, **printed name**, **residence**, and **date**. If any of this is left blank, your ballot will not be counted.

7. Seal the Return Envelope, put a 25¢ stamp on it, and **mail it early**, so that your ballot reaches the Registrar of Voters by June 5, 1990. **Postmarks do not count.**

**SPOILED OR DAMAGED BALLOT**

If you tear, mark, fold, or make a mistake punching holes in your ballot, return the ballot card to the Registrar anytime before 8:00 p.m. on Election Day and request another ballot.

**BALLOT DUE DATE AND DELIVERY**

Ballots must be delivered to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by **8 p.m. June 5, 1990.**

Absentee ballots received after the polls are closed will **not be counted**, regardless of postmark date.

1. You may **mail** your ballot in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope — remember to put a 25¢ stamp on it,

2. OR, **you may bring your ballot** in the completed Absentee Ballot Return Envelope to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or to any polling place in San Francisco,

3. OR, an authorized person (must be your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother or sister) may deliver your ballot to the Registrar or any polling place. Complete the form below and have your representative deliver the form with your ballot.

Each person returning a voted ballot in person to the Office of the Registrar of Voters or a polling place must sign the “Log of Voted Absentee Ballots Returned to Polling Places” in order for the ballot to be counted.

**PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTING**

Please see page 24 of your Voter Information Pamphlet.

---

**AUTHORIZATION TO DELIVER ABSENTEE BALLOT**

I authorized __________________________________, my __________________________________ (name) (relationship)

to deliver my June 5, 1990 ballot to

☐ the Registrar of Voters, 158 City Hall
☐ a polling place.

Name __________________________________________________________ Signature ______________________________________________________

Date __________________________________________
### GOBERNADOR  
**Governor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation/Specialization</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DONALD L. BULLOCK</td>
<td>Gun Show Producer - Productor de Espectáculos con Armas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID M. WILLIAMS</td>
<td>Businessman-Engineer - Hombre de Negocios-Engieniero</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE WILSON</td>
<td>U.S. Senator - Senador de los Estados Unidos</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFFREY T. GREENE</td>
<td>Industrial Hygienics Supervisor - Supervisor de Higiene Industrial</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VICEGOBERNADOR  
**Lieutenant Governor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation/Specialization</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARIAN BERGESON</td>
<td>California State Senator - Senador Estatal de California</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SEYMOUR</td>
<td>California State Senator - Senador Estatal de California</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECRETARIO DE ESTADO  (Secretary of State)

JOAN MILKE FLORES
Los Angeles Councilwoman
Concejala de Los Angeles

GORDON P. LEVY
Deputy District Attorney
Fiscal Asistente del Distrito

CONTRALOR (Controller)

MATT FONG
Business Attorney
Abogado de Negocios

TESORERO (Treasurer)

ANGELA "BAY" BUCHANAN
Chief Financial Officer
Funcionario Financiero Principal

THOMAS W. HAYES
Appointed State Treasurer
Tesorero Estatal Nombrado

Vote for One

Vote por Uno
### PROCURADOR GENERAL
**Attorney General**

**DANIEL E. LUNGREN**
Attorney
Abogado (律師)

### COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS
**Insurance Commissioner**

**JOHN S. PARISE**
Attorney-Insurance Broker
Abogado-Agente de Seguros (律師／保險經紀)

**JOSEPH D. DUNLOP**
Claims Consultant
Consultor de Reclamos (索賠顧問)

**JOHN L. “JACK” HARDEN**
Insurance Adjustor / Investigator
Ajustador de Seguros / Investigador (保険調査員)

**THOMAS A. SKORNIA**
Businessman / Lawyer
Hombre de Negocios / Abogado (商人／律師)

**WES BANNISTER**
Small Business Owner
Dueño de una Pequeña Empresa (小企業的東主)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO REPUBLICANO</th>
<th>REPUBLICAN PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS 聯邦衆議員</td>
<td>United States Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN NICHOLS</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL 州参議員</td>
<td>State Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANS HANSSON</td>
<td>County Central Committeeman / Miembro del Comité Central del Condado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>Fireman / Bombero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL 州衆議院議員</td>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER</td>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candidate</td>
<td>position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence Faulkner</td>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina H. Frank</td>
<td>Businesswoman / Mujer de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Keller</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis J. Mark</td>
<td>Accountant / Businessman / Contador / Hombre de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablo J. Wong</td>
<td>Real Estate Consultant / Consultor de Bienes Raíces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bok F. Pon</td>
<td>Community Outreach Director / Director de Extensión Comunitaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Grayson</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James E. Gilleran</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna M. Guth</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold M. Hoogasian</td>
<td>Small Businessperson / Florist / Hombre de Negocios / Florista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James L. Howard</td>
<td>Child Welfare Supervisor / Supervisor del Bienestar Infantil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun R. Hatoyama</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</td>
<td>ESTADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>超党派投票</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal Department #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal Department #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal Department #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASESOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASESOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASESOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASESOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensor Publico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
185 SI 贷成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un emisión de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluya: (1) refugios de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda, (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compren casa por primera vez.

187 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desambulos de capital, y para la adquisición de trenes rápidos para ferrocarriles entre ciudades, para transporte en ferrocarril para viajeros de diario, y programas de tránsito en rieles. Asigne dinero del fondo General del estado para amortizar los bonos. Realizar un Calcular por el analista de la legislatura sobre el impacto fiscal neto en los programas de transporte. Se autoriza la venta de los bonos a los inversores. El Fondo General invertirá en unos $1.6 mil millones para pagar por el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($790 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos será de $60 millones.

189 SI 贷成

190 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA RENOVACIÓN DE VIVIENDAS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para la renovación de viviendas en áreas urbanas e industriales, para el mantenimiento de viviendas en áreas rurales y para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desambulos de capital, y para la adquisición de programas de transporte. Se autoriza la venta de los bonos a los inversores. El Fondo General invertirá en unos $1.6 mil millones para pagar por el capital ($1 mil millones) y el interés ($790 millones) en los bonos. Se calcula que el costo anual del capital e interés en los bonos será de $60 millones.

192 SI 贷成

193 NO 反对

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extender el tiempo en que el Gobernador puede revisar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigencia la legislación. Impacto fiscal: Ningún efecto fiscal directo.

195 SI 贷成

197 NO 反对

EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. ENMIENDE CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza la transmisión del impuesto basado en viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo para los gobiernos estatal o locales ya que simplemente autoriza a la Legislatura a que ponga en ejecución sus disposiciones. De ser puesta en ejecución, habría una pérdida de réditos de los impuestos probabilidades de $1 mil a $2 mil millones por año.

200 SI 贷成

ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESEMBSLOS DE 1990. Esta medida establecerá un programa de descongestionamiento del tránsito para todo el estado y permitirá la limitación en las asignaciones de los gobiernos estatal y locales para reflejar mejor las necesidades de la creciente población de California. Dispondrá nuevos réditos a ser usados para reducir la congestión del tránsito mediante la construcción de carreteras estatales, calles y caminos locales, e instalaciones para el transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecerá un aumento del 65% en las cobras por pas a los automovilistas y un aumento de cinco centavos por galón de combustible el 1° de agosto de 1990, y un centavo adicional el 1° de enero de cada uno de los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en las asignaciones del estado para permitir que se financie el descongestionamiento del tránsito, el tránsito en gran escala, cuidados de salud, servicios para los ancianos, y otros programas estatales y locales de prioridad, al mismo tiempo que todavía dispone una limitación en los desembolsos estatales y locales. Esta medida continuará disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciban al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y dispondría que los réditos en exceso del límite en las asignaciones sean recompensos por igual entre la educación y los contribuyentes de impuestos.

203 NO 反对

1990年提出交通系统及限制支出法案。此法案将实施一项交通系统及限制支出计划，减少加州政府支出的限额，使能更准确地反映日益增加加州人口的需要。它将提供新税收来支持在城市内公路、市内街道及大规模的公共交通设备以减少交通拥挤。此法案将把增加的税收全部用于减少政府支出的额。自1990年9月1日，将增加汽油税至每加仑1美分。之后四年内，由每年1月1日开始，增加汽油税每加仑1美分。此法案将为公共教育及健康大学提供至少州的一般税收预算的百分比的四分之三，也将规定所有州的税收限額的征收者必须支付教育支出及纳税人。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>CHIROPRACTIC PRACTICE. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Amends Chiropractic Act. Requires license renewal during month of birth. Increases penalties for violating Act. Fiscal impact: Minor costs in 1990-91 to Chiropractic Examiners Fund to modify license renewal system. Additional state and local government revenues from increased fines.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
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211 SI 贊成
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al Estado que dependerían de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.

213 NO 反對

215 SI 贊成

217 NO 反對

218 SI 贊成
ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la definición de “oficial del orden público” que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expande la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

220 NO 反對

222 SI 贊成
DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida afecta significativas cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce como se pondría en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber saliendo un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

224 NO 反對

226 SI 贊成
TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza la emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros en diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

228 NO 反對

230 SI 贊成
PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobrestata al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.

野獸的保護，法規的初步提出。轉移三千萬元給保護野生動植物基金，主要是用於保護野生動物。限制捕獵美洲豹。對財政的影響：預計每年從香煙和燃燒物品中轉移的財政收人約一千八百萬元，從「一般經費」轉移來約一千二百萬元。除非立法局還訂下其他款項的轉移。共計每年物業管理的費用是一百萬元。

232 NO 反對

N 51, N 52 & N 53

15-1N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Legislative Reapportionment, Ethics, Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Reapportionment by Commission, Initiative Constitutional Amendment, Statute. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 School Facilities Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balota Independiente</td>
<td>1990年6月5日</td>
<td>省提案提交選民投票</td>
<td>超黨派投票</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, Elecciones Primarias Consolidadas, 5 de Junio de 1990</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposiciones a Ser Sometidas al Voto de los Electores — Estatal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>118 Legislativa, Redistribución, Ética, Emenda y Estatuto Constitucional de Iniciativa.</strong> Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la limitación en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente o en su totalidad por los costos de al voto pública y la posible redistribución por la corte. Los costos por las disposiciones para ética son probablemente menores.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>119 Redistribución por Comisión, Emenda y Estatuto Constitucional de Iniciativa.</strong> Se establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: Se limitarán los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990.</strong> Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIORE DE JUNIO DE 1990.</strong> Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes &quot;Hastings,&quot; la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusivo. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salud y seguridad.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990.</strong> Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiamentos a prueba de sismo, reparación, reemplazo y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990.</strong> Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 51, N 52 & N 53 17-1N
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263

NO 265

B

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269

NO 272

C

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277

NO 278

D

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280

NO 281

E

WITHDRAWN

F

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 284

NO 285
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
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263 SI 贷成
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PUBLICA, 1990. Para concurrir una deuda en bonos de $322,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del asesto, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapazadas; siempre y cuando no se contrajera más de $65,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la cantidad de $322,400,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en concesiones del FEMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y al redescuento de los peligros.

265 NO 反对

269 SI 贷成
¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reestructura, la restauración, y/o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (o los cheques sucesivos, (ii) la mejora técnica de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (i) la recolocación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos relacionados con los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recolectado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales, de $46.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y de $32.20 por parcela durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias unidades, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los catorce (14) años siguientes al sexto año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias parcelas, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para personas mayores, clósets, terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública y otros usos, tal como se dispone con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 02-13-B1 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990; y deberá establecerse un límite de aportaciones de $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

272 NO 反对

277 SI 贷成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a límites de deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin líneas de lucro, si el Contralor certifica que el costo neto en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

278 NO 反对

280 SI 贷成
¿Creará la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vocabulario y Limpieza de las Escrituras en los Paredes para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escrituras de las paredes, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta un uno por ciento de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

281 NO 反对

ELIMINADA

284 SI 贷成
¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 48.7 horas (después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra) y permitir un cambio en que la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 8 a.m.?

285 NO 反对
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes Votes</th>
<th>No Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
<td>288 SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>289 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de dejar el Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>292 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultoría con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>295 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>297 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td>298 SI</td>
<td>299 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>¿Será un requisito que los miembros de los consejos y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen electores a los miembros de esos consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesores de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos enumerados, o en los cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o aptitudes especiales y no pueda encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?</td>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>301 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrado por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>304 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que se hayan puesto en el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un periodo completo de cuatro años cuando termine su periodo actual?</td>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>307 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles relevantes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td>309 SI</td>
<td>310 NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Don’t forget to mail your Absentee Ballot so that it arrives in the office of the Registrar no later than June 5, 1990. Postmarks don’t count.
Remember to sign your name, do not print, on the back of the return envelope, and write the date when you signed.

Write your residence address where indicated.

You must sign the envelope yourself. A power of attorney is not acceptable.
ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONS APPEAR ON THE FRONT PAGE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA VOTAR COMO ELECTOR AUSENTE

Por favor lea todas las instrucciones antes de perforar su balota.

1. Realice sus selecciones leyendo este folleto con la balota de muestra y marcando los números asignados a cada candidato o medida por la cual usted desea votar.

2. Después de terminar el folleto habiendo marcado todas sus selecciones, toma la tarjeta de la balota y, usando el alambre metálico, perfíl los círculos en la tarjeta de la balota que se encuentran debajo de los números que coincidan con aquéllos que usted marcó en este folleto.

3. Después de votar (es decir, después de haber perforado los números de sus selecciones), verifique el dorso de su balota para asegurarse que dichas perforaciones estén completamente abiertas. Retire cualquier trozo de papel que pudiera haber quedado.

4. Para votar por un candidato propio, escriba el nombre del puesto y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco proporcionados en el sobre secreto. Nota: Los votos propios sólo se cuentan si dichas personas presentado una solicitud como, y tienen el derecho de ser, candidatos propios.

5. Coloque su balota dentro del sobre secreto, y luego colóquelo dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes.

6. Complete la declaración en el Sobre de Entrega con su firma, nombre, dirección y la fecha. Si falta alguna de esta información, no se contará su balota.

7. Cierre el Sobre de Entrega, coloque un timbre de 25 centavos y envíe a tiempo para que su balota llegue al Registrador de Electores antes del 5 de junio de 1990. No se tendrán en consideración la fecha de los sellos postales.

BALOTA ARRuinADA O DAñADA

Si usted rompe, marca, dobla o se equívoca en su balota, devuelva la tarjeta de la balota al Registrador en cualquier momento antes de las 8:00 p.m. el Día de las Elecciones y solicite otra balota.

FECHA DE RECEPCION Y ENTREGA DE BALOTAS

Las balotas deben entregarse en la oficina del Registrador de los Electores o en cualquier lugar de votación antes de las 8 p.m. del 5 de junio de 1990.

Las balotas para electores ausentes recibidas después de que se hayan cerrado los lugares de votación no se contarán, sin importar la fecha del sello postal.

1. Usted puede enviar por correo su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes — recuerde que debe colocar un timbre de 25 centavos.

2. O BIEN, usted puede traer su balota dentro del Sobre de Entrega de la Balota para Electores Ausentes a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a cualquier lugar de votación de San Francisco.

3. O BIEN, una persona autorizada (debe ser su cónyuge, hijo, padre, abuelo, nieto, hermano o hermana) puede entregar su balota al Registrador o en cualquier lugar de votación. Complete el formulario que se encuentra en la página 24 y haga que su representante entregue el formulario junto con su balota.

Cada persona que entregue una balota personalmente a la Oficina del Registrador de Electores o a un lugar de votación debe firmar el “Libro de Actas de las Balotas para Electores Ausentes Entregadas en los Lugares de Votación” para que la balota pueda ser contada.

内容

你的缺席計算票有以下內容：

1. 印有選民的姓名和地址的選票用紙

2. 票面上印有選民的選票登記號

3. 你用選票上打孔

4. 選票封袋上，印有你的姓名和地址，必要時可由你所住的選民登記處獲得

缺席計算票須知

1. 在選票上打孔前，請詳細閱讀所有指示。

2. 印有選民的姓名和地址的選票用紙

3. 選民的選票登記號

4. 選票封袋上，印有你的姓名和地址，必要時可由你所住的選民登記處獲得

5. 把你的選票交到選民登記處，然後裝入選票封袋

6. 如果你的選票封袋上未填寫姓名、地址和日期，無論其任何一項不正確，你的選票將作廢

7. 把選票封袋封好，貼上25分郵票，並標記日期

如果你的選票封袋後，並未在選票上打孔記號，可在選舉日 下午八點之前把選票退回選民登記處，另取一張選票。

選票寄達日期

選票必須在 1980年6月5日下午八點以前送到選民登記處或任何一個投票站。

在投票站開設之日起，收到的缺席選票將作廢，郵票日期不算。

1. 你可以用填好的缺席計算選票封袋把選票寄出，記好貼上25分郵票。

2. 也可以用填好的缺席計算選票封袋把選票寄到選民登記處，或在選票登記處的任何一個投票站，並標記日期

3. 填寫時，選民的親屬（必須是你的配偶、子女、父母、祖父母、孫子、兄姐妹）打印選票選民登記處或任何一個投票站，並標記日期，把選票封袋交到選民登記處或任何一個投票站，並標記日期

現在把已投票選民選票封袋交到選民的選民登記處

以便計算選票