

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet

General Election
November 2, 1982
Sample Ballot
Page 3

SUTRO

SP

R45

A1

11/2/82

5 CD
16 AD
8 BD

MENTS DEPT.
OCT 19 1982
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

0000

Jay Patterson
Registrar of Voters

Voter Information Pamphlet

GENERAL INFORMATION

	Page
Your Rights As a Voter	18
Words You Need to Know	20
Legislative Map	18
BART District Map	102
Absentee Ballot Application ...	103
Location of Your Polling Place ..	104
Voter Selection Coupon	104
Handicapped Information ...	20, 104
SAMPLE BALLOT	3

CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

Alfred G. Chiantelli	21
Patricia (Pat) Lucey	21

CANDIDATES FOR BART DIRECTOR

Robert Barnes	22
Bob Geary	22
Eugene Garfinkle	23
Robert Silvestri	23

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

Sister Boom Boom	24
Richard Bradley	24
Diana Coleman	25
Greg Day	25
Jerry DeYoung	26
Lee S. Dolson	26
Martin Lee Eng	27
Kenneth L. Farmer	27
Richard Hongisto	28
Daddy Andy Jones	28
Ellis L.A. Keyes	29
Julian Lagos	29
Bill Maher	30
Betty Ann McMahon	30
Eric Moncur	31
"Belle Starr" Moseley	31
Wendy Nelder	32
Robert Squeri	32
Olga Talamante	33
William Tocco	33
Ben Tom	34
Nancy G. Walker	34
Doris Ward	35
Dave Wharton	35

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rosario Anaya	36
Margaret Crichton DeOsuna ...	36
William Felzer	37
Myra Kopf	37
George L. O'Brien	38
Sodonia M. Wilson	38

CANDIDATES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD

Robert R. Bacci	39
Mike S. Bernick	39
Robert E. Burton	40
Robert A. DaPrato	40
Carole Migden	41
Leland Moglen	41
John Riordan	42
Sal Rosselli	42
Alan S. Wong	43

PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION A

Establishes a Citizen Complaint Office within the SFPD, staffed by civilians.

Analysis	44
Arguments	45-47
Text of Proposed Law	86, 87

PROPOSITION B

Removes some of the fiscal restrictions on financing muni vehicles and related items.

Analysis	48
Argument	49
Text of Proposed Law	87, 88

PROPOSITION C

Authorizes Supervisors to issue industrial development bonds or notes.

Analysis	50
Arguments	51
Text of Proposed Law	88

PROPOSITION D

Extends employee health benefits to surviving spouses.

Analysis	52
Argument	53
Text of Proposed Law	89

PROPOSITION E

Continues retirement benefits to surviving spouses who remarry after age 60.

Analysis	54
Argument	55
Text of Proposed Law	89

PROPOSITION F

Proposition F was removed by the Board of Supervisors just before press time.

PROPOSITION G

Sets Board of Supervisors' salaries at \$23,924 per year.

Analysis	56
Arguments	57-60
Text of Proposed Law	56

PROPOSITION H

Sets City Employee retirement contribution rate at 7½% for all "miscellaneous" employees instead of the present variable rate.

Analysis	61
Argument	62
Text of Proposed Law	62, 90-94

PROPOSITION I

Establishes a new retirement plan for police officers.

Analysis	63
Arguments	64, 65
Text of Proposed Law	94-99

PROPOSITION J

Provides payment of time-and-a-half for police officers who work overtime.

Analysis	66
Arguments	67, 68
Text of Proposed Law	99

PROPOSITION K

Provides for a feasibility study and an election to decide on the acquisition of the electric utility.

Analysis	69
Arguments	70-74
Text of Proposed Law	99, 100

PROPOSITION L

Would declare opposition to construction of ramps to City Hall's main entrance.

Analysis	75
Arguments	76-78

PROPOSITION M

Would declare support for hotel complex to be built in the vicinity of U.C. Medical Center.

Analysis	79
Arguments	80-85
Text of Proposed Declaration	100-101

CREDITS

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this pamphlet were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the committee are Judith Anderson, Nancy Yoshihara Mayeda, Cecile Michael (chair), Jane Morrison and Dick Robertson. Chief Deputy City Attorney Thomas Toomey serves on the committee as legal advisor.

The cover was designed by Opus Group, 1736 Stockton Street, San Francisco.

The printer was Gazette Press, Inc.

1

大選
一九八二年十一月二日

ELECCION GENERAL
2 de noviembre de 1982

GENERAL ELECTION
November 2, 1982

州

ESTADO

STATE

Governor

Gobernador 州長

Vote for One
Vote por Uno
請選一名

DAN P. DOUGHERTY, Libertarian Businessman/Comerciante	商人	3 →
GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican Attorney General of California/Fiscal General de California	加州司法廳長	4 →
ELIZABETH MARTINEZ, Peace and Freedom Author, Editor, Organizer/Autor, Redactor, Organizador	作家、編輯、組織人	5 →
TOM BRADLEY, Democratic Mayor-Los Angeles/Alcalde-Los Angeles	洛杉磯市市長	6 →
JAMES C. GRIFFIN, American Independent Professional Trucker/Caminero	專業貨運人員	7 →

Lieutenant Governor

Vicegobernador 副州長

Vote for One
Vote por Uno
請選一名

HOUSTON A. MYERS, American Independent Auto Businessman/Comerciante de Automóviles	汽車商人	13 →
LEO T. MC CARTHY, Democratic Assemblyman, California Legislature/Asambleista, de la Legislatura de California	州眾議員	14 →
JOHN R. VERNON, Libertarian Restaurant Consultant/Caterer//Consultor de Restaurante/Proveedor	餐館顧問/包辦伙食者	15 →
CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom State Party Secretary/Secretario Estatal de Partido Político	州黨書記	16 →
CAROL HALLETT, Republican State Legislator/Farmer//Legislador Estatal/Granjero	州議員/農民	17 →

Secretary of State

Secretario de Estado 州務卿

Vote for One
Vote por Uno
請選一名

ALFRED W. SMITH, American Independent Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Propiedades Inmobiliarias	實業經紀	22 →
GORDON DUFFY, Republican California State Legislator/Legislador del Estado de California	加州議員	23 →
MILTON SHIRO TAKEI, Peace and Freedom Warehouse Worker/Trabajador de Almacén	貨倉工人	24 →
MARTIN E. BUERGER, Libertarian Business Consultant/Consultor de Comercio	商業顧問	25 →
MARCH FONG EU, Democratic Secretary of State, State of California/Secretaria de Estado, Estado de California	州務卿	26 →

ControllerContralor
審計官Vote for One
請選一名
Vote por Uno

FLORENCE MC DONALD, Peace and Freedom City Council Member, Berkeley/Miembro del Consejo de la Ciudad, Berkeley	柏克萊市市參議員	27 →
JAMES L. FLOURNOY, Republican Attorney at Law/Abogado	律師	28 →
KENNETH CORY, Democratic California State Controller/Contralor del Estado de California	加州審計官	29 →
MARY GINGELL, Libertarian Transportation Service Manager/Gerente de Servicios de Transporte	運輸服務經理	30 →
"PAT" GRAHAM, American Independent Businesswoman/Mujer Comerciante	女商人	31 →

Treasurer

Tesorero 司庫

Vote for One
Vote por Uno
請選一名

LESS ANTMAN, Libertarian Certified Public Accountant/Contador Público Letrado	審定公共會計師	35 →
KEVIN AKIN, Peace and Freedom Steelworker/Herrero de Obra	鋼鐵工人	36 →
DONALD J. FRENCH, Republican Corporate Treasurer/Tesorero Corporativo	企業財務人員	37 →
JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic State Treasurer/Tesorero Estatal	州司庫	38 →
ROBERT G. CHARLTON, American Independent Analyst/Analista	分析員	39 →

Attorney GeneralProcurador General
司法廳長Vote for One
請選一名
Vote por Uno

JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic District Attorney, Los Angeles County/Procurador del Distrito de Condado de Los Angeles	洛杉磯縣地方檢察官	42 →
BARTHOLOMEW (BART) LEE, Libertarian Civil Liberties Attorney/Abogado de Libertad Civil	民事自由律師	43 →
DAN SIEGEL, Peace and Freedom Labor Lawyer/Abogado Laboral	勞工律師	44 →
GEORGE NICHOLSON, Republican Senior Assistant Attorney General/Primer Auxiliar Fiscal General	資深副司法廳長	45 →

Member, State Board of Equalization — 1st District

Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento — Distrito #1 加州平準局委員 第一議區

Vote for One
Vote por Uno
請選一名

ANDY PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom Tax Reform Advocate/Proponente de la Reforma de Impuestos	稅收改革倡議人	49 →
CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic State Board of Equalization, Appointed Member, First District/Departamento de Hacienda, Miembro nombrado, 1er distrito	州平準局第一區委任委員	50 →
WAYNE R. NYGREN, Libertarian Businessman/Anti-Tax Advocate/Comerciante/Proponente Contra los Impuestos	商人/反稅收倡議人	51 →
WILLIAM H. "BILL" IVERS, Republican California State Legislator/Legislador del Estado de California	加州立法人員	52 →

大選
一九八二年十一月二日ELECCION GENERAL
2 de noviembre de 1982GENERAL ELECTION
November 2, 1982

州

ESTADO

STATE

3

United States Senator

Senador de Estados Unidos

美國參議員

Vote for One
Vote por Uno
請選一名

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent
Printer/Impresor 印刷者

54 →

DAVID WALD, Peace and Freedom
Solar Engineer, Teacher/Ingeniero Solar, Maestro 太陽能工程師, 教師

55 →

PETE WILSON, Republican
Mayor of San Diego/Alcalde de San Diego 聖地亞哥市市長

56 →

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian
Professor of Economics/Profesor de Economía 經濟學教授

57 →

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Democratic
Governor of California/Gobernador de California 加州州長

58 →

Representative in Congress—5th District

Diputado al Congress — Distrito #5

國會眾議員

第五議區

Vote for One
Vote por Uno
請選一名

MILTON MARKS, Republican
State Senator 5th District/Senador Estatal, Distrito No. 5 第五議區州參議員

62 →

PHILIP BURTON, Democratic
Member of the United States Congress/Miembro del Congreso Estado Unidense 美國國會議員

63 →

JUSTIN RAIMONDO, Libertarian
Newspaper Editor/Editor (Redactor) de Periódico 報紙編輯

64 →

Member of the Assembly—16th Assembly District

Miembro de la Asamblea — Distrito #16

加州眾議員

第十六眾議區

Vote for One
Vote por Uno
請選一名

ART AGNOS, Democratic
State Assemblyman/Asambleista Estatal 州眾議員

75 →

GORDON A. BLOYER, Republican
Management Consultant/Consultor de Gerente 管理顧問

76 →

大選
一九八二年十一月二日

ELECCION GENERAL
2 de noviembre de 1982

GENERAL ELECTION
November 2, 1982

UNITED STATES SENATOR
SENADOR DE E.U.
美國參議員

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE
REPRESENTANTE DE E.U.
美國眾議員

MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY
MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEISTA ESTATAL
州眾議員

For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court
Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal Supremo

最高法院聯席法官

Shall **FRANK K. RICHARDSON**

be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 應否在法律指定之任

贊成

YES/SI 79 →

¿Deberá **FRANK K. RICHARDSON**

ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職?

反對

NO 80 →

For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court
Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal Supremo

最高法院聯席法官

Shall **OTTO M. KAUS**

be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 應否在法律指定之任

贊成

YES/SI 82 →

¿Deberá **OTTO M. KAUS**

ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職?

反對

NO 83 →

For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court
Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal Supremo

最高法院聯席法官

Shall **ALLEN E. BROUSSARD**

be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 應否在法律指定之任

贊成

YES/SI 85 →

¿Deberá **ALLEN E. BROUSSARD**

ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職?

反對

NO 86 →

For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court
Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal Supremo

最高法院聯席法官

Shall **CRUZ REYNOSO**

be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 應否在法律指定之任

贊成

YES/SI 88 →

¿Deberá **CRUZ REYNOSO**

ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職?

反對

NO 89 →

For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal,
First Appellate District, Division One

Para Juez Presidente del Tribunal de Apelación
Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Una

上訴法院主席法官
第一上訴區，第一分區

Shall **JOHN T. RACANELLI**

be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 應否在法律指定之任

贊成

YES/SI 91 →

¿Deberá **JOHN T. RACANELLI**

ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職?

反對

NO 92 →

For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal,
First Appellate District, Division Two

Para Juez Presidente del Tribunal de Apelación
Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Dos

上訴法院主席法官
第一上訴區，第二分區

Shall **JOSEPH R. GRODIN**

be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 應否在法律指定之任

贊成

YES/SI 94 →

¿Deberá **JOSEPH R. GRODIN**

ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職?

反對

NO 95 →

For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal,
First Appellate District, Division Two

Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación
Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Dos

上訴法院主席法官
第一上訴區，第二分區

Shall **JOHN J. MILLER**

be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 應否在法律指定之任

贊成

YES/SI 97 →

¿Deberá **JOHN J. MILLER**

ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職?

反對

NO 98 →

For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal,
First Appellate District, Division Two

Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación
Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Dos

上訴法院主席法官
第一上訴區，第二分區

Shall **JEROME A. SMITH**

be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 應否在法律指定之任

贊成

YES/SI 100 →

¿Deberá **JEROME A. SMITH**

ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職?

反對

NO 101 →

For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal,
First Appellate District, Division Three

Para Juez Presidente del Tribunal de Apelación
Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Tres

上訴法院主席法官
第一上訴區，第三分區

Shall **CLINTON WAYNE WHITE**

be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 應否在法律指定之任

贊成

103 → YES/SI

¿Deberá **CLINTON WAYNE WHITE**

ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職?

反對

104 → NO

ELECCION GENERAL

2 de noviembre de 1982

GENERAL ELECTION

November 2, 1982

JUDICIAL
司法

大選
一九八二年十一月二日

For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Three

Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación
Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Tres

上訴法院聯席法官
第一上訴區，第三分區

Shall **BETTY BARRY-DEAL**
be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
¿Deberá **BETTY BARRY-DEAL**
ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?

應否在法律指定之任 贊成
期內選任本公職？ 反對

YES/SI 105 →
NO 106 →

For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Four

Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación
Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Cuatro

上訴法院聯席法官
第一上訴區，第四分區

Shall **WINSLOW CHRISTIAN**
be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
¿Deberá **WINSLOW CHRISTIAN**
ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?

應否在法律指定之任 贊成
期內選任本公職？ 反對

YES/SI 108 →
NO 109 →

For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Four

Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación
Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Cuatro

上訴法院聯席法官
第一上訴區，第四分區

Shall **MARC POCHE**
be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
¿Deberá **MARC POCHE**
ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?

應否在法律指定之任 贊成
期內選任本公職？ 反對

YES/SI 111 →
NO 112 →

Judge of the Municipal Court, Office No. 1

Vote for One

Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1

地方法院法官，第一庭

Vote por Uno
請選一名

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY
Attorney/Abogada

律師

116 →

ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal

助理地方檢察官

117 →

Member, Board of Directors, BART District 8

Vote for One

Miembro, Junta Directiva, Distrito BART 8 灣區快車系統第八區董事

Vote por Uno
請選一名

ROBERT SILVESTRI

Transportation Engineering Consultant/Consultor de Ingeniería de Transporte 運輸工程顧問

121 →

ROBERT BARNES

Law Librarian/Bibliotecario de Leyes 法律圖書管理員

122 →

EUGENE GARFINKLE

BART Board President/Presidente de la Junta BART

快車系統董事主席

123 →

BOB GEARY

Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman/Jefe Contra Impuestos de Alcantarillado

反污水稅組織主席

124 →

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

大選
一九八二年十一月二日

JUDICIAL 司法

ELECCION GENERAL
2 de noviembre de 1982

GENERAL ELECTION
November 2, 1982

DISTRITO 區域
DISTRICT

Superintendent of Public Instruction

Superintendente de Instrucción Pública 加州教育局長

Vote for One

Vote por Uno

請選一名

WILSON RILES

State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública

加州教育局長 134 →

BILL HONIG

District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar

校區學監 135 →

Member, Board of Education

Miembro, Junta de Educacion de San Francisco

教育局委員會

Vote for no more than Three

Vote por no más de Tres

請選不超過三名

SODONIA M. WILSON

Incumbent/En el Cargo

現任教育局委員

139 →

ROSARIO ANAYA

President San Francisco Board of Education/Presidente, Junta de Educación de San Francisco

舊金山教育局主席 140 →

WILLIAM FELZER

Engineering Educator/Educador de Ingeniería

工程教育家

141 →

GEORGE L. O'BRIEN

Free Schooler - Economics Instructor/Escolar Libre - Instructor de Economía

自由教育者—經濟學教員

142 →

MARGARET CRICHTON DeOSUNA

Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes Raíces

實業經紀

143 →

MYRA KOPF

Incumbent/En el Cargo

現任教育局委員

144 →

Member, Community College Board

Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad de San Francisco

社區大學校董

Vote for no more than Three

Vote por no más de Tres

最多限選三名

ALAN S. WONG

Incumbent/En el Cargo

現任社區大學校董

148 →

SAL ROSSELLI

Business Manager/Gerente de Negocios

商業經理

149 →

JOHN RIORDAN

Incumbent/En el Cargo

現任社區大學校董

150 →

ROBERT E. BURTON

Incumbent/En el Cargo

現任社區大學校董

151 →

ROBERT R. BACCI

Lawyer/Abogado

律師

152 →

MICHAEL S. BERNICK

Professor/Agency Director//Profesor/Director de Agencia

教授/機構主任

153 →

ROBERT A. Da PRATO

Physician, Educator/Médico, Educador

醫生,教育家

154 →

LELAND MOGLEN

Hospital Administration, MS, J.D./Administración de Hospital, MS, J.D.

醫院行政人員

155 →

CAROLE MIGDEN

Administrator/Fiscal Planner//Administradora/Planificadora Fiscal

管理人員/經濟策劃員

156 →

Member, Board of Supervisors

Vote for no more than Five

Vote por no más de Cinco

最多限選五名

Miembro, Junta de Supervisores 市參議員

DIANA COLEMAN Social Union Militant/Militante de Sindicato Socialista	社會主義聯盟鬥士	159 →
RICHARD D. HONGISTO Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores	市參議員	160 →
DAVE WHARTON Public Service Attorney/Abogado de Servicio Público	公共服務律師	161 →
DORIS M. WARD Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores	市參議員	162 →
NANCY G. WALKER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores	市參議員	163 →
ROBERT SQUERI Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios	獨立商人	164 →
KEN FARMER Hotel Bellman/Botones de Hotel	旅館待者	165 →
OLGA TALAMANTE Administrator, Mission YMCA/Administradora, YMCA de la Misión	米慎街基督教男青年會主任	166 →
WILLIAM TOCCO Tax Consultant/Consultor de Impuestos	稅務顧問	167 →
BEN TOM Member, San Francisco Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco	舊金山教育委員	168 →
WENDY NELDER Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores	市參議員	169 →
JULIAN LAGOS Housing Activist/Activista de Viviendas	房屋問題活動份子	170 →
MARTIN LEE ENG Merchant/Bible Preacher//Comerciante/Predicador de la Biblia	商人/聖經傳道者	171 →
ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología	犯罪學學生	172 →
RICHARD BRADLEY Social Union Militant/Militante de Unión Socialista	社會主義聯盟鬥士	173 →
SISTER BOOM BOOM Nun of the Above/Monja del Cielo	上天女修士	174 →
GREG DAY Community Activist, Journalist/Activista de la Comunidad, Periodista	社區活躍人士, 新聞從業員	175 →
J.R. DeYOUNG Word Processor/Writer//Procesador de Palabras/Escritor	文字處理員/作家	176 →
LEE DOLSON Board of Supervisors/Junta de Supervisores	市參議員	177 →
ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES Musician, Composer/Músico, Compositor	音樂家, 作曲家	178 →
BETTY ANN McMAHON School District Consultant/Consultora de Distrito Escolar	校區顧問	179 →
BILL MAHER Member, Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación	教育委員	180 →
K.F. "BELLE STARR" MOSELEY Artist-Attorney-Activist/Artista-Abogado-Activista	藝術家, 律師, 活動分子	181 →
ERIC MONCUR Real Estate Appraiser, Consultant/Evaluador de Bienes Raíces, Consultor	實業評值員, 顧問	182 →

CITY AND COUNTY/CIUDAD Y CONDADO/市及縣

ELECCION GENERAL
2 de noviembre de 1982

GENERAL ELECTION
November 2, 1982

大選
一九八二年十一月二日

8**CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GENERAL ELECTION — NOVEMBER 2, 1982****MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS
STATE PROPOSITIONS****1**

STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of \$500,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

FOR 186 →
AGAINST 187 →

2

COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1981. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of \$280,000,000.

FOR 190 →
AGAINST 191 →

3

VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of \$450,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.

FOR 194 →
AGAINST 195 →

4

LAKE TAHOE ACQUISITIONS BOND ACT. This act provides funding for the purchase of property in the Lake Tahoe Basin, which is necessary to prevent the environmental decline of this unique natural resource, to protect the waters of Lake Tahoe from further degradation, and to preserve the scenic and recreational values of Lake Tahoe. The amount provided by this act is \$85,000,000.

FOR 198 →
AGAINST 199 →

5

FIRST-TIME HOME BUYERS BOND ACT OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of \$200,000,000 to provide funds for financing housing.

FOR 202 →
AGAINST 203 →

6

PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENT. Permits Legislature authorizing larger percentage investments in specified types of common stock. Prescribes fiduciary investment standards. Fiscal impact: If implemented, could result in opportunities for increased earnings, accompanied by greater risk to the participating funds, which could entail capital losses to the funds.

YES 206 →
NO 207 →

**CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION GENERAL — 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1982**

8

MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS VOTANTES

提交選民表決之提案

PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

市縣提案

<p>← 186 贊成 A FAVOR</p> <p>← 187 EN CONTRA 反對</p>	<p>1 ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE ESCUELAS DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de \$500,000,000 para la provisión de desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoría de escuelas públicas.</p>	<p>1982 年州校舍租—購公債法案。 這個法案規定發行公債 5 億元 (\$500,000,000)，作為興建或改善公共學校的資金。</p>
<p>← 190 贊成 A FAVOR</p> <p>← 191 EN CONTRA 反對</p>	<p>2 ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CARCELES DE CONDADO DE 1981. Esta acta permite la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y repuesto de cárceles de condado y ejecución de mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos de \$280,000,000.</p>	<p>1981 年縣監獄基建費公債法案。 這個法案規定發行公債 2 億 8 千萬元 (\$280,000,000)，用作興建、重建、改建和更換縣監獄，以及推遲維修等費用。</p>
<p>← 194 贊成 A FAVOR</p> <p>← 195 EN CONTRA 反對</p>	<p>3 ACTA DE BONOS DE VETERANOS DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de \$450,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</p>	<p>1982 年退役人員公債法案。 這個法案規定發行公債 4 億 5 千萬元 (\$450,000,000)，用作資助加州退役人員購置農場與房屋。</p>
<p>← 198 贊成 A FAVOR</p> <p>← 199 EN CONTRA 反對</p>	<p>4 ACTA DE BONOS DE ADQUISICIONES DE LAKE TAHOE. Esta acta provee financiación para la compra de propiedad en la Cuenca de Lake Tahoe, necesaria para evitar el deterioro ambiental de este recurso natural único, para proteger las aguas de Lake Tahoe de degradación adicional y preservar los valores pintorescos y recreacionales de Lake Tahoe. La cantidad provista por esta acta es \$85,000,000.</p>	<p>購置太浩湖公債法案。 這個法案規定發行公債 8 千 5 百萬元 (\$85,000,000)，用作徵購太浩湖盆地實業，以防止這個獨特的自然資源環境的衰落，保護太浩湖的水土不致退化，保護太浩湖的風景和娛樂的價值。</p>
<p>← 202 贊成 A FAVOR</p> <p>← 203 EN CONTRA 反對</p>	<p>5 ACTA DE BONOS DE COMPRADORES DE CASAS POR PRIMERA VEZ DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de \$200,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la financiación de residencias.</p>	<p>1982 年第一次買屋者公債法案。 這個法案規定發行公債 2 億元 (\$200,000,000)，用作資助買屋。</p>
<p>← 206 SI 贊成</p> <p>← 207 NO 反對</p>	<p>6 INVERSION DE FONDOS DE PENSION PUBLICOS. Permite a la Legislatura autorizar inversiones de porcentaje mayor en tipos prescritos de acciones comunes. Prescribe normas de inversión fiduciaria. Impacto fiscal: De ponerse en vigor, podría resultar en oportunidades para un aumento de utilidades, acompañadas por riesgo mayor para los fondos participantes, lo cual podría acarrear pérdidas capitales para los fondos.</p>	<p>公共養老金投資。准予州議會授權在特定普通股股票投資更大的比例。制定受托投資的標準。財政影響：一旦付諸實施，可能會因利息和資本的增值而增加收益的機會，但風險亦大，以致用作投資的公共養老金和退休金可能要承擔資金的虧損。</p>

**CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GENERAL ELECTION — NOVEMBER 2, 1982**

7

TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Allows Legislature to exclude construction of specified fire sprinkler or alarm systems from "newly constructed" definition. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenues and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and, possibly, other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 211 →

NO 212 →

8

TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF FUNDS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR MAINTENANCE. Changes limit and repayment bases from accruing "taxes" to anticipated "revenues". Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal impact. As described by Analyst, it could reduce interest costs of borrowing agency and, conversely, reduce interest normally otherwise earned by nonborrowing agency.

YES 215 →

NO 216 →

9

SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS. NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS. Authorizes provision of textbooks on a library-type loan basis to nonpublic school pupils under specified conditions. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state annual costs could exceed \$4 million for similar program to 1980-81 in grades K-8, and \$1 million in grades 9-12. Unknown administrative costs.

YES 220 →

NO 221 →

10

UNIFYING SUPERIOR, MUNICIPAL, JUSTICE COURTS. Legislature may provide for unification of courts within a county after county electors' majority vote. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state and/or county increased salary and retirement costs for judges elevated, and unknown administrative costs or savings, which could vary substantially between counties.

YES 225 →

NO 226 →

11

BEVERAGE CONTAINERS. Requires each have refund value of five cents or more that must be paid on return of empty container. Fiscal impact: Net fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could be reduced litter cleanup and solidwaste disposal costs and an unknown increase or decrease in tax revenue collections. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 229 →

NO 230 →

12

NUCLEAR WEAPONS. Requires Governor write President urging proposal to Soviets to jointly halt nuclear weapons testing, production, and development. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 233 →

NO 234 →

TASACION. VALUACION DE LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Permite a la Legislatura excluir la construcción de sistemas de extinción de incendios por rociadura automática o sistemas de alarma de la definición de "recién construida". Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta su instrumentación. Cuando se instrumente: Pérdida desconocida para gobiernos locales de réditos de impuestos a la propiedad y un aumento en los costos de evaluación. Un aumento desconocido en costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos para escuelas, universidades bienales de comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales. Un aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos estatales a la renta debido a reducciones en los descuentos de impuestos a la propiedad.

課稅。實業評估。容許州議會規定“新建”的定義不包括裝置特定的消防或火警系統。財政影響：要在付諸實施後才會發生影響。一旦付諸實施，地方政府將損失實業稅收，實業估價的費用會增加，數目不詳。由於公校區與社區大學校區收入減少，其他地方政府亦有可能減少實業稅收，將增加州政府的補助費。由於降低實業稅的扣稅額，州政府的所得稅收入會稍增。

← 211 SI 贊成

← 212 NO 反對

7

← 215 SI 贊成

← 216 NO 反對

8

TRANSFERENCIA TEMPORAL DE FONDOS POR GOBIERNOS LOCALES PARA MANTENIMIENTO. Cambia las bases de límite y pago provenientes de "impuestos" acumulantes a "réditos" esperados. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Según detalla el Analista, podría reducir los costos de interés de la agencia que reciba el préstamo y, conversamente, reducir el interés que normalmente hubiera sido ganado de otra manera por agencias que no reciban préstamos.

地方政府暫時轉移資金用作維修。修正限制，債權基點由應計“稅捐”改為“預期稅收”。財政影響：無直接財政影響。照分析員的評述，它可能減輕借款的機構所負擔的利息，反過來說，非借款機構原可賺取的利息則受到削減。

← 220 SI 贊成

← 221 NO 反對

9

TEXTOS ESCOLARES. ESCUELAS NO PÚBLICAS. Autoriza la provisión de textos en una base de préstamo tipo biblioteca a estudiantes de escuelas no públicas bajo condiciones prescritas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta que sea instrumentada. Al instrumentarse, los costos anuales estatales podrían exceder \$4 millones para un programa similar al de 1980-81 en los grados K-8, y \$1 millón en grados 9-12. Costos administrativos desconocidos.

學校教科書。非公立學校。授權制訂條文，採取圖書館的方式，在特定條件下，借教科書給在非公立學校就讀的學生。財政影響：要在付諸實施後才會發生影響。一旦付諸實施，這項類似1980-81年幼兒園至第八年級的計劃，將使州政府每年增加經費逾四百萬元，另第九年級至第十二年級每年增加經費一百萬元。行政費的增幅不詳。

← 225 SI 贊成

← 226 NO 反對

10

UNIFICACION DE TRIBUNALES SUPERIORES, MUNICIPALES Y DE MAGISTRADO. La Legislatura puede permitir la unificación de tribunales dentro de un condado previo un voto mayoritario por los electores del condado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta instrumentarse. Al instrumentarse, costos aumentados de salario y jubilación para el estado y/o los condados para los jueces elevados, y costos administrativos desconocidos a ahorros, que podrían variar sustancialmente entre los condados.

統一高等法院，地方法院與審判法院。若經縣選舉人大多數票通過，州議會可以在縣內統一各法院。財政影響：要在付諸實施後才會發生影響。一旦付諸實施，州與／或縣會因晉升法官要付更高薪酬而增加薪酬和退休金的開支。行政費或可能節省的經費，數目不詳，各縣可能差異很大。

← 229 SI 贊成

← 230 NO 反對

11

RECIPIENTES DE BEBIDAS. Requiere que cada uno tenga un valor de reembolso de cinco centavos o más que debe ser pagado al devolver el recipiente vacío. Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto neto fiscal. Podrían resultar reducciones de costos por limpieza de basura y desecho de desperdicios sólidos y un aumento o una disminución de cantidad desconocida en colecciones de réditos de impuestos. Vea el cálculo del Analista para explicación de las variables.

飲料容器。規定退回來的空罐，可獲得五分或五分以上的回扣價值。財政影響：總的財政影響不能斷定。可能會減少垃圾的清理費和固體廢料處理費，稅收的增減，數目不詳。請參閱立法分析員對有關差別的分析。

← 233 SI 贊成

← 234 NO 反對

12

ARMAS NUCLEARES. Requiere que el Gobernador le escriba al Presidente para urgirle que le proponga a la Unión Soviética un alto en conjunto de pruebas, producción y desarrollo de armas nucleares. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo.

核武器。要求州長寫信給總統，呼籲他向蘇聯建議聯合停止核武器的試驗、生產和部署。財政影響：無直接財政影響。

10

**CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GENERAL ELECTION — NOVEMBER 2, 1982**

13

WATER RESOURCES. Adds statutes regarding interbasin conservation programs, allowed instream appropriations, Stanislaus River water uses, and critical groundwater overdraft regulation. Fiscal impact: Overall fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could result in \$1.48 million annual costs for 6 years to State Water Resources Control Board; unknown planning, administrative and implementation costs; unknown litigation costs; unknown loss of power revenues; and unknown long-term savings in reduced costs to add new water. Analyst's estimate discusses factors involved.

YES 237 →

NO 238 →

14

REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION. Repeals Legislature's power over reapportionment and establishes commission to reapportion legislative and equalization districts starting with 1984 elections. Fiscal impact: On assumptions of Analyst, increased state costs of \$126,000 in 1983 and a comparable amount once every 10 years beginning in 1991.

YES 241 →

NO 242 →

15

GUNS. Requires registration of handguns. Limits number of handguns allowed in State. Prohibits absolute legislative ban on possession of firearms. Fiscal impact: Indeterminable impact. Would increase administrative costs reimbursed in whole or part by fees. Unknown impact on cost of maintaining criminal justice system. Could impact sales and income tax revenues. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 245 →

NO 246 →

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A

Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

YES 249 →

NO 250 →

B

Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 cent of each \$100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

YES 252 →

NO 253 →

C

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

YES 256 →

NO 257 →

D

Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

YES 259 →

NO 260 →

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION GENERAL — 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1982

10

← 237 SI 贊成 13
← 238 NO 反對

RECURSOS HIDRAULICOS. Agrega estatutos con respecto a programas de conservación entre cuencas, permite asignaciones para aguas fluyentes, usos del Río Stanislaus y reglamentación del consumo excesivo crítico de aguas freáticas. Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto fiscal general. Podría resultar en costos anuales de \$1.48 millones durante 6 años para el Consejo Estatal de Control de Recursos Hidráulicos; costos desconocidos de planificación, administrativos y de instrumentación; costos desconocidos de litigación; pérdida desconocida de réditos de corriente eléctrica y ahorros desconocidos de largo plazo en costos reducidos para la adición de nueva agua. El cálculo del Analista detalla factores que intervienen.

水利資源。增訂有關中央流域水利保持計法例，容許內河供水，利用斯丹尼索斯河水，以及制訂超量取用地下水的條例。財政影響：總的財政影響不能斷定。可能使加州水源局在六年內每年增加開支達一百四十八萬元；所需的計劃費、行政費和實施費不詳；電力歲入的損失不詳；減少經費增加新的供水，長期節約多少不詳。立法分析員分析了各有關因素。

← 241 SI 贊成 14
← 242 NO 反對

COMISION DE NUEVO PRORRATEO. Abroga el poder de la Legislatura sobre el nuevo prorrateo y establece una comisión para realizar un nuevo prorrateo de distritos legislativos y de igualización empezando con las elecciones de 1984. Impacto fiscal: Basado en presunciones del Analista, habrá un aumento de costos estatales de \$126,000 en 1983 y una cantidad comparable una vez cada 10 años empezando en 1991.

議區劃分委員會。撤消州議會劃分議區的權力，設立議區劃分委員會，專責劃分議區和平準局的界綫，從1984年選舉開始。財政影響：根據分析員所作的假設，州政府將在1983年增加開支\$126,000元，並從1991年開始每十年一次增加同一數額的開支。

← 245 SI 贊成 15
← 246 NO 反對

ARMAS DE FUEGO. Requiere la registración de revólveres y pistolas. Limita el número de revólveres y pistolas permitidos en el Estado. Prohíbe la proscripción legislativa absoluta de la posesión de armas de fuego. Impacto fiscal: Impacto imposible de determinar. Aumentaría los costos administrativos reembolsado completa o parcialmente por cuotas. Impacto desconocido sobre el costo de mantenimiento del sistema de justicia criminal. Podría afectar los réditos de impuestos a la venta y la renta. Vea el cálculo del Analista para detalles de los variables.

槍械。規定要登記手槍。限制在加州的手槍數量。防止立法嚴禁所有槍械。財政影響：影響程度不能斷定。行政費會增加，但所得收費會獲得全部或部分補償。對維護刑法制度所需經費的影響不詳。請參閱分析員對各不同事項的估計。

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO 市縣提案

← 249 SI 贊成
← 250 NO 反對

A

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre mala conducta de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

應否在警察局設立公民投訴處，對公民提出關於警察演職的投訴有權進行調查？

← 252 SI 贊成
← 253 NO 反對

B

¿Deberá la adquisición de vehículos que representen ingresos para el Municipal Railwav, y estructuras y equipos relacionados, excluirse de la limitación de que los detalles de costos capitales no deberán exceder ¾ de 1 centavo de cada \$100 de avalúo de propiedad tasada y del requerimiento de que las adquisiciones que excedan esta cantidad sean adquiridas mediante la emisión de bonos?

購置有收入的公共車及有關建築物和器材，不能超過應納稅實業估值每\$100元的3/4之一的限額，以及超過此限額者須發行公債籌資購置的規定，應否予以免除？

← 256 SI 贊成
← 257 NO 反對

C

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a emitir bonos y pagarés para asistir a partes particulares a adquirir, construir, y mejorar instalaciones apropiadas para usos industriales, de manufactura, investigación y otros, con reembolso por las partes particulares y sin crear ninguna deuda u obligación sobre la Ciudad?

應否授權市參議會發行公債或票據以資助私營公司獲取，修建、或改良設備，以適用於工業、製造業、研究和其他用途，由私營公司償還而不使市政府負債或承擔義務？

← 259 SI 贊成
← 260 NO 反對

D

¿Deberá la ciudad subvencionar a los cónyuges sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

市政府應否在同一基礎上津貼在職和退休市員工未亡配偶，一如市政府津貼在保健服務制度內的在職和退休員工？

11

**CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GENERAL ELECTION — NOVEMBER 2, 1982**

E

Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

YES 261 →

NO 262 →

PROPOSITION F HAS BEEN REMOVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

G

Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of \$23,924 per year?

YES 267 →

NO 268 →

H

Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?

YES 270 →

NO 271 →

I

Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?

YES 273 →

NO 274 →

J

Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?

YES 276 →

NO 277 →

K

Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?

YES 279 →

NO 280 →

L

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?

YES 282 →

NO 283 →

M

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?

YES 285 →

NO 286 →

**CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION GENERAL — 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1982**

11

← 261 SI 贊成

← 262 NO 反對

E ¿Se deberá permitir al cónyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al casarse de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?

退休制度內的成員的未亡配偶，目前可享受補助金，如果他們在60歲後再婚，應否繼續享受這種補助金？

**LA JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES A ELIMINADO LA PROPOSICION F
(市參議會撤消了F提案)**

← 267 SI 贊成

← 268 NO 反對

G ¿Deberá pagársele a cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores un salario de \$23,924 por año?

每一市參議員應否發給年薪 \$23,924 元？

← 270 SI 贊成

← 271 NO 反對

H ¿Deberá el tipo de contribución para los empleados misceláneos de la ciudad al Sistema de Jubilaciones fijarse al 7½% de la compensación de estos empleados?

市雜務員工對退休制度的捐費額，應否定為其薪酬的7½%？

← 273 SI 贊成

← 274 NO 反對

I ¿Deberá crearse un nuevo Plan de Jubilación e Incapacidad para miembros uniformados del Departamento de Policía contratados después del 1° de noviembre de 1982, teniendo los miembros de los planes actuales derecho a transferirse al nuevo plan?

警察局在1982年11月1日之後僱用的穿制服警員，應否設立新的退休計劃和殘障保險計劃？現任警員亦有權從現有的計劃轉移到新的計劃？

← 276 SI 贊成

← 277 NO 反對

J ¿Deberá pagárseles a los Oficiales de Policía por tiempo y medio o deberá dárseles tiempo libre del trabajo a razón de tiempo y medio, por trabajar horas extras o por trabajo en días feriados, según lo solicite el oficial?

警員加班或在假日執行職務，應否每小時發給一小時半的薪酬或向其要求每日補回一日半的休假時間？

← 279 SI 贊成

← 280 NO 反對

K ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tomar medidas enumeradas y hacer que se efectúe un estudio de factibilidad para lograr la propiedad pública de la empresa de servicios eléctricos en San Francisco, y presentar la adquisición de dicho servicio a los electores en la elección general celebrada luego de completarse el estudio?

市參議會應否訂出各種步驟和目標，調查研究關於把舊金山電力收歸公有的可能性，並在調查研究完成之後，為取得該公用事業提交選民在普選中付諸表決？

← 282 SI 贊成

← 283 NO 反對

L ¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco no construir rampas de acceso en la entrada a City Hall, bien sea la ubicada en la Calle Polk o la ubicada en Avenida Van Ness?


市政府大廈在樸街及閣街的入口處不修建通路是否應為舊金山市、縣政府的政策？

← 285 SI 贊成

← 286 NO 反對

M ¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco efectuar cambios de zonificación para permitir la construcción de un hotel privado en el Área del Complejo Médico Parnassus Heights y el Centro Médico U.C., especificándose la propiedad para su ubicación?

為了批准在巴納薩斯崗醫藥綜合大樓和加州大學醫藥中心地區興建一座私營酒店，分區條例應作修改，並註明該產業的所在地，這是否應為舊金山市、縣政府的政策？



LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:

- #16—Area East of (solid lines)
- #17—Area BETWEEN (solid lines)
- #19—Area WEST of (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:

- #3—Area NORTH of (virgule lines)
- #8—Area SOUTH of (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:

- #5—All the UNSHADED area
- #6—All the SHADED area

BART DISTRICTS: See page 102

YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER

By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

A—The offices are listed on the Voter Selection Coupon printed on the back cover of this pamphlet. All the candidates are listed in the Sample Ballot (Page 3)

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?

A—San Francisco has:

- three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
- two State Senate Districts (SD 3, 8)
- two United States Congressional Districts (CD 5,6)

See map elsewhere in this pamphlet

Q—Do these districts belong just to San Francisco?

A—No. State Assembly District 19 is shared with San Mateo County.

State Senate District 3 is shared with San Mateo County.

State Senate District 8 is shared with Marin County.

United States Congressional District 6 is shared with Marin County and the cities of Daly City and Vallejo.

Q—What about the United States Senator. Is there a district for this position?

A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?

A—See your sample ballot or you can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the Voters Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this election?

A—Because this handbook deals only with local candidates and propositions.

Q—When do I vote?

A—The election will be Tuesday, November 2, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?

A—Yes. You can vote early by:

- going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime beginning October 4, 1982 this year or
- mailing in the application requesting an absentee ballot sent with this voters' handbook.

Q—What shall I write when I ask for an absentee ballot?

A—You must write:

- that you need to vote early
- your address when you signed up to vote
- the address where you want the ballot mailed
- then sign your name, and also print your name underneath.

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

A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 2, 1982.

Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?

A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

Q—Where do I go to vote?

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

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

A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

A—No.

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

A—Yes. The election workers at the voting place will help you. If they can't help you, call 558-3061.

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?

A—Yes, if you are a handicapped person, or if you have language difficulties.

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

A—Ask one of the election workers and they will help you.

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

A—Yes.

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

A—Yes. This is called a "write-in." If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the election workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least 14 days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?

A—Call 558-3061 for information.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING
CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See Page 103.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions that you vote on.

BONDS OR NOTES — Contracts to borrow and repay money.

BUDGET — Planned expenditures for each City Department for the fiscal year.

CAPITAL COSTS — Expenditures for equipment and facilities.

CHALLENGE — Any citizen can ask an officer at the polls to challenge any voter if the citizen thinks the voter does not live at the address given on the registration form.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

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

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

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition.

MUNI REVENUE PRODUCING VEHICLES — Buses, streetcars and cable cars.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 1. If it deals with city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

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

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER

(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.

When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote

the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE **ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI**

My age is 42

My occupation is Attorney

My education and qualifications are: Native San Franciscan from North Beach. Saint Ignatius (1957), USF (1961), Lincoln Law School (1967). Married, one son, Monterey Heights resident. Fifteen years trial experience, over 125 jury trials, 1,000 preliminary hearings, in every SF Municipal and Superior Court. Former Assistant Chief District Attorney, law instructor.

June 1982 endorsements: SF Progress, SF Examiner, SF Chronicle, Chinese Times, Sun Reporter, Bay Area Reporter, The Voice, Mexican-American Political Association, Chinese American Citizens Alliance, Frederick Douglas Symposium, Italian Civic Federation, La Raza Bar Association, Italian American Bar Association, CRIR, SF Police Officers Association, SF Fire Fighters, Operating Engineers #3, ILWU, SF Labor Council (COPE), Union Labor Party (Teamsters).

Judges: present; Dorothy Von Beroldingen, Dominique Olcomendy, Albert Wollenberg, Frank Hart, Roy Wonder, Lucy Kelly McCabe, Maxine Chesney, Alex Saldamando, Lawrence Kay, Philip Moscone, Lillian Sing: Retired; John B. Molinari, Charles Renfrew, Robert Kane, Francis McCarty, S. Lee Vavuris, Byron Arnold, Raymond Reynolds, Samuel Yee, Mary Moran Pajalich, Albert Axelrod.

Court Commissioners: Richard Best, Ronald Quidachay.

Sponsors: William Moskovitz, Vincent Hallinan, Thomas Mellon, Thelma Shelly, Jeff Brown, Thomas Cahill, Ephraim Margolin, Quentin Kopp, Emanuel George, Dorothy Casper, Gordon Lau, Ernest Ayala, John A. Sutro, John L. Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Terry Francois, Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, John Jay Ferdon, Tina Burgess Coan, Vernon Alley, Lim P. Lee, Burl Toler, John Henning Jr., Gloria Maciel, Tom Hayes, Robert Buckley, Mike Salerno, Margaret Cruz, Lorenzo Petroni, Russell J. Dailey, Walter Farrell, Grandvel A. Jackson, Louise M. Davies, Alessandro Baccari, Mark Bautista, Fr. John Heaney, Charles W. Meyers, Angelina Genaro Alioto, Alex A. Esclamado, Duke Armstrong, Joseph Allen, Mary Sagan, Tommy Harris, Guido A. Alasia, Dorothy Stern, Guy Cherney, Bob Ross, Lee Bart, John J. Moylan, James A. Scatena, Henry E. Berman, Robert Nicco, Irene Gianaras, Harold Hoogasian Jr., Richard Siggins, Gordon H. Armstrong, Steven L. Swig, Bob Mulcrevy, Sue Weinstein, Eduardo Sandoval, Bill Paul, Joseph Aliano, Lester O'Shea, William Armanino, Peter J. Fatooh, Anne W. Halsted, Thomas Horn, Roger Lalanne, Rea Bernstein, Les Payne, Rena Nicolai, G. Joseph Bertain, Dr. Louis Batmal, Dorothy Skobelev, Ed McGovern, Francis Louie, Bernard Orsi, Frank LoFrano, Col. Martin A. Felhauer.

Alfred G. Chiantelli

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE **PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY**

My age is 57

My occupation is Lawyer

My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.

Wife of Paul Lucey, Assistant Principal Lowell High School, mother of Gloria, violinist, and Paul, planetary geologist, grandmother of Julia. Volunteer: Board of Directors, San Francisco League of Women Voters.

My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karch, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinos, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tanzey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz, Yori Wada, Juvenile Justice, U.C. Regent.

E. Patricia Lacey

CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR ROBERT BARNES

My occupation is Law Librarian

My education and qualifications are: I have specific ideas for BART's improvement and the energy and skills to make them happen. I'm concerned about BART safety and San Francisco's need for adequate parking. The incumbent has been totally nonproductive and ineffective in protecting San Francisco taxpayers. Like the Reagan administration the incumbent has no clear ideas for the future of mass transportation. I am determined to actively pursue issues such as a combination BART/Muni Fastpass. I can bring together neighborhoods, business and labor to develop reasonable growth and expansion of the system.

As a board member of San Francisco Tomorrow, I have researched and addressed important urban issues facing the city. Having worked in both banking and law, I have a firm grasp of economics. My involvement in a broad range of community-based activities and organizations has uniquely prepared me for a seat on the BART Board.

I'm a native San Franciscan, educated at Lowell High and City College and a lifelong user of public transportation. I am confronted daily with the problems all transit riders experience.

My supporters include Supervisors Hongisto, Ward, Nelder, Silver, Walker, and Kennedy, Sheriff Hennessey, Lia Belli and Party Chairman Agar Jaicks.

Robert Barnes

FOR BART DIRECTOR BOB GEARY

My age is 42

My occupation is Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman, County Central Committeeman, Police Officer, Educator

My education and qualifications are: Recipient of four Medals of Valor — two for disarming suspects, one for saving a drowning victim and one for saving a burning victim — BART commuter Bob Geary is a much decorated veteran of the San Francisco Police Department, dedicated to protecting BART riders from violent crime in/around stations. Earning a B.A. from St. Mary's College; Master's Degree and Teaching Credential from USF; distinguished himself as an Army Transportation Officer. As Chairman of Citizens to Stop the Sewer Tax and twice handily elected County Central Committeeman he has long experience in fighting government waste and now he wants to clean up BART.

Incumbent Garfinkle has persistently ignored the interests and concerns of San Franciscans. During his tenure in office:

- He has not made himself available to commuters.
- No BART Board Meetings have ever been held in San Francisco.
- Nothing has been done to cure the terrible crime and parking problems that plague BART riders.
- Transfers have been arranged for East Bay commuters but not for Muni riders.
- Garfinkle has serious conflict of interest problems from service on Southern Pacific's payroll as Railroad Attorney. Southern Pacific wants to eliminate its commuter service by extending BART — dumping its multimillion dollar headache on us.

Bob Geary

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.

CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 53

My occupation is President, Board of Directors BART and Business Lawyer

My education and qualifications are: As a director since 1977 I have worked hard to provide strong leadership as an officer and now President to help BART achieve: (1) fiscal stability; (2) respectable labor contracts and salaries; (3) consistent and reliable operations; (4) 50% passenger increase to 190,000 per day without increasing personnel; (5) recognition as one of the safest and best operating systems in the nation.

BART must provide patrons first rate service by reasonable and cost effective expenditures to protect taxpayer-owners. I seek re-election to continue my constructive efforts to thus manage and improve this \$5 billion system. BART must continue to improve service, expand capacity and extend its lines. BART's current major capital program will accomplish this but only with qualified and dedicated directors.

I am a graduate of the University of California and its law school, have a Business Administration Masters Degree and 25 years experience as a San Francisco transportation and business lawyer. I am a member of the Transportation Task Force — San Francisco Strategic Plan, the Transportation Committee — San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SPUR, a Bay Area native, a homeowner, a BART-MUNI commuter. My community supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, President-Board of Supervisors Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisors John L. Molinari and Lee S. Dolson, Senator John F. Foran and Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Eugene Garfinkle

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

FOR BART DIRECTOR ROBERT SILVESTRI

My age is 40

My occupation is Transportation Engineering Consultant

My education and qualifications are: Central Committeeman Robert Silvestri co-authored a major mass transit book.

Issues:

- San Francisco Board of Supervisors majority opposes Eugene Garfinkle re-election.
- Trying to avoid the public, Garfinkle holds BART Board meetings at 9 a.m. on weekdays — in Oakland.
- Raising BART fares, Garfinkle said: "The people don't care."
- "Do-Nothing" Garfinkle failed to deal with growing violent crime and terrible parking problems around San Francisco BART stations.
- Garfinkle strongly supported the 1979 re-election of ex-District Attorney Joseph Freitas, whom Arlo Smith overwhelmingly defeated. Freitas was politically allied to leftist San Francisco mass killer Jim Jones (Peoples Temple 1978 murder-suicide of nearly 1,000 people, Jonestown, Guyana).
- Silvestri endorses Senator Milton Marks for Congress. Garfinkle supports controversial Phillip Burton.
- Silvestri favors police "decoy" operations to trap violent criminals around San Francisco BART stations.
- Consulting French-Alexandrian engineer Charles Salloum (listed: Who's Who In Technology), Silvestri has developed proven, revenue-producing plans for elevator-aided highrise parking near San Francisco BART stations.
- East Bay commuters have bus transfers to BART, but strangely Garfinkle blocked such transfers for San Francisco Muni users.
- For years "Do-Nothing" Garfinkle sat, while BART trains had inflammable seats — emitting poison gas when they exploded in flames.

Robert Silvestri

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

SISTER BOOM BOOM

My address is 2101 California St.

My occupation is Nun of the Above

My qualifications for office are: Divine inspiration; I'm a fifth-generation San Franciscan, and notoriously tight-fisted.

Although it's unfashionable to admit it, I've spent my life in politics. I've worked for C.O.R.E., S.N.C.C., N.A.A.C.P., S.M.C., A.Q.A.G., A.F.S.C., U.F.W., S.E.I.U., G.L.F., G.A.A., B.A.G.L., F.S.L.N., C.I.S.P.E.S., P.S.H.A.W., and F.F.A., but I'm not running for alphabet supe!

Poverty taught me more about economy that most incumbents will learn. Goddess knows money helps, but problems are solved through creative innovation.

Insane? That's what people said about Columbus. A queen took a chance on him — take a chance on this queen. It's the American way!

Am I supe yet?

Sister Boom Boom

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1726 Grove Street

My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic

My age is 32

My qualifications for office are: Supporter Spartacist, labor/socialists who mobilized to stop Nazi provocation against gays — Chicago, 1982. Ten years UAW militant. Black activist, South Carolina desegregation struggles, 1966-67. Oppose anti-Soviet war preparations/austerity drive! Not a man or penny to imperialist armed forces! Military victory to Salvadoran leftists! Israeli/imperialist troops out of Lebanon! Enemies of labor/minorities! Build a workers' party! Strike action to bring down Reagan! Jobs for all, decent housing, free medical, childcare, education, transit! Stop INS raids — citizenship rights for undocumented workers! No gun control! Smash Nazi/Klan terror! Throw out bosses — establish workers' government!

Richard Bradley

The Sponsors for Sister Boom Boom are:

Bill Graham, 231 Ashbury, Staffing Coordinator
Richard Stokes, 3917-22nd St., Clerk
Nina Glaser, 1500 Diamond, Photographer
Randy Schell, 566 Fell, Client Advocate Specialist
James P. "Jays" Jacobs, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Paula Hook, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Gilbert Baker, 2801 Bush St., Theatrical Designer
Mary Doyle, 4044-24th St., Nurse
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Reform Activist
Paul E. Brown, 60 Dearborn, Cosmetologist
Michael F. Davis, 1083 Lombard, Antique Dealer
Christiann H. Keith, 525-8th Ave., Punk Dilettante
Anne Diedrich, 721A Shotwell, Apathetic Proletarian
Leonard Boyer, 937 Haight, Clerk
Laura Kristal, 1996 Fell, Theatre Director
James Oakley, 1716 Fell, Fairy Priest
James K. Nash, 715A Central Ave., Blood Spinner
Paul W. Krstevich, 33 Pearl, Svc. Rep.
Randolph C. Hunt, 2126 Steiner, Unemployed
Sister Boom Boom, 2101 California St., Nun of the above
Stuart A. Gurtman, 232 Liberty, Account Clerk
Ronald Jackson, 21 Moffit St., Security Guard
Larry G. Jett, 1350 Sutter, Law Clerk
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister, Clerk

The Sponsors for Richard Bradley are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Jacquelyn E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Karen Coshak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Carloe M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Katherine G. Ikegami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian P. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl, Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth, Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.

OFFICIAL NOTICE

AN ERROR APPEARS ON PAGE 42
ALL VOTERS SHOULD READ THIS WARNING

Because of a printer's error the lists of sponsors for Community College Board candidates John Riordan and Sal Rosselli, appearing on page 42, have been placed under the wrong candidate. Sal Rosselli's sponsors have been listed under John Riordan's statements of qualifications and John Riordan's sponsors have been listed under Sal Rosselli's statement of qualifications.

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp. App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary I. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Hernan Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fot Theodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.
Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Marguerite Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamonte, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vuksich, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Mocada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street

My occupation is Letter Carrier

My age is 36

My qualifications for office are: Supporter Spartacist, labor/socialists who organized stopping Nazi celebration of Hitler's birthday, San Francisco 1980. Union militant, six years CWA. Member National Association Letter Carriers. Break with — build a workers' party! Strike action to bring down Reagan! No gun control — labor/black defense against Klan/Nazi terror! For massive public works under union control! Jobs for all, decent housing, free medical care, childcare, education, transit! Full equality — minorities, women, homosexuals! Citizenship rights for undocumented workers! From Afghanistan to Poland to El Salvador — down with Reagan's anti-Soviet war drive! Throw out the capitalists! Seize banks, industry — no compensation! Establish workers' government

Diana Coleman

GREG DAY

My address is 287 Downey Street

My occupation is Human Rights Activist, Journalist

My qualifications for office are: I worked for human rights reform and coalition between San Francisco's ethnic communities for: an end to police brutality . . . safer neighborhoods . . . stronger rent control . . . affordable housing . . . control downtown growth . . . employment for city residents.

Worked as laborer, teacher, photo-journalist, community administrator, Sergeant U.S. Army, anthropology doctoral studies, Rutgers University. Brought suit with 1981 Lesbian/Gay Freedom Day Committee, against bigoted U.S. immigration laws and won national injunction.

As a citizen supervisor I will continue work for responsible police services, better housing, comparable worth, a fair share of city jobs, social services for women, gay, black, latino, asian and other underrepresented citizens.

Greg Day

The Sponsors for Diana Coleman are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Richard Bradley, 1726 Grove St., Building Maintenance Mechanic
Jacquelyne E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Carole M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Karen Coshak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Katherine G. Ikegami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian D. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl St., Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth St., Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

The Sponsors for Greg Day are:

Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Eddie Baca, 790 Church St., Vice Pres. Latino Club
Konstantin Berlandt, 106 Eureka St., Journalist
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing
Madeline Carter, 2516-21st St., Bar Manager
Kim Corsaro, 472 Sanchez St., Newspaper Editor
Bob Cramer, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher
Eileen Gillis, 250 McAllister St., Human Rights Commission Specialist
Roma Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator
Clare M. Harris, 3478-18th St., Photographer
Cleve Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant
Leslie A. Manning, 18 Dehon St., Fund Raising Consultant
Bill Matsumoto, 470 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk
Louise A. Minnick, 656 Cole St., County Central Committee
Pat Norman, 319 Richland, Dept. of Public Health Administrator
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., S.F. Marijuana Activist
Arthur W. Simon, 3 Romain St., Foundation Manager
Tom Specht, 91 Seward St., Real Estate Sales
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Rikki Streicher, 1000 Shrader St., Corporate Executive
Vaughn Taylor, 3622-16th St., Pres. Eureka Valley Promotion Assoc.
Carmen Vazquez, 114 Steiner St., Member, S.F. Women's Center Board
Tom Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Physician
Howard L. Wallace, 763-14th St., Trade Unionist
Tim Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Community College Board
Sue Zemel, 463-14th St., Writer

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

JERRY R. De YOUNG

My address is 78 Sanchez #4

My occupation is Word Processor

My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: After serving six years in the U.S. Navy in the communications field, before being honorably discharged, and working in the private sector in the same field for an additional 19 years, my ability to analyze facts, and figures, fact and fiction, has been honed to a very fine degree.

This past experience, complimented by a natural concern for social welfare, endows me with an extraordinary capacity to serve the best interest of the public in an exemplary fashion.

Honesty, integrity and a ceaseless urge to become an effective instrument utilized for the implementation of public will qualifies me even beyond experience.

Jerry R. DeYoung

The Sponsors for Jerry R. DeYoung are:

Edward Carmick, 114 Lyon St., Clerk
Grady J. Clark, 4347A-20th St., Shipping & Receiving Clerk
Andrés Colon, 69 Webster St., Sr. Offset Operator
Patrick Conlon, 940 Lawton St., Bookkeeper
Albert P. Featherstone, 78 Sanchez St., Retired
Joe Eliseo Graham, 2607 Post St., Claims Adjuster
Lawrence M. Grant, 1828-15th St., Credit Union Mgr.
Leslie H. Gundel, 140 Duboce St., Psychiatric Technician
Timothy Wayne Hagerman, 1852 Fell St., Administrative Ass't.
J.L. Harden, 525 Fillmore St., Bartender
Rodney A. Hilacion, 88 Waterville St., Distribution Att'd Sr.
Lowell Hills, 110 Hancock St., Grocery Clerk
Ronald D. Kirk, 66 Elgin Pk., Accountant
Douglas W. Quick, 211 Dolores St., Administrative Management
Ray Reza, 115A Duboce St., Legal Ass't/Secretary
Steven Sams, 1395A Hayes St., Computer Operator
Dennis R. Singleton, 180 Duboce St., Prep. Cook
James C. Stammersky, 3227 Market St., Finance Administrator
Mary Ann Torres, 151 Gough St., Cashier
Frank Walker, 484 Eureka St., Stat Typist
Harold Weisbecker, 42 Sumner St., Manager, Retail Sales
Billy G. West, 2311-15th St., Marketing
Ferdinand C. Wheeler, 1420 Balboa, Cargo Agent
Allan G. Winkle, 69 Webster St., Offset Operator

LEE S. DOLSON

My address is 172 Portola Drive

My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

My qualifications for office are: Background: Native San Franciscan. Combat Veteran WWII-Korea. Master's Degree, San Francisco State; Second Master's and Ph.D., U.C., Berkeley. Taught Balboa High, City College, 1955-Present. Served as San Francisco Supervisor and School Board Member-President. Married, three children.

Record: Since 1972, helped cut millions from inflationary, unnecessary public spending. Demanded cost-effective, increased police and fire protection, improved Muni services, and safer, cleaner streets. Actively pushed for increased jobs, stronger economic climate, and better, affordable housing for every San Franciscan.

Priorities: Improve spending controls: Fair-share delivery of vital services to every neighborhood; Increase job opportunities; Build unity throughout San Francisco.

Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.

The Sponsors for Lee S. Dolson are:

Joseph L. Alioto, 133 Jones St., Attorney, Former Mayor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Robert F. Barry, 3105 Octavia St., President, Police Officers Assoc.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Raymond I. Brown, 726 Lake St., Real Estate Broker
Leon Bruschera, 537-10th Ave., Secretary, Firefighters Union
S. Edward Cala, 3124 Fulton St., Grocer
William H. Chester, 432 Goldmine Dr., Labor Management Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor San Francisco
R.M.W. Coonradt, 631 O'Farrell St., Presbyterian Minister
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Carlotta Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Pres., Civil Service Comm.
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
James T. Ferguson, 1850 Powell St., President, Firefighters Local 798
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., Environmental Consultant CCSF
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Photography Sales, Pres. Library Comm.
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner, Former Supervisor
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., U.S. Postmaster Retired
Francis M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner Investment Firm
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thomas A. Reed, SJ, 2130 Fulton St., Jesuit Priest Univ. San Francisco
Madeline Samarzes, 264 Dalewood Way, Union Official
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., City & County Treasurer Retired
Joseph E. Tinney, 1 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law, Retired S.F. Assessor
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton St., Labor Union Official
Jefferson Wilson, 47 Digby St., U.S. Postmaster, San Francisco
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

MARTIN LEE ENG

My address is 665 Pine Street, Penthouse Suite

My occupation is Merchant/Bible Preacher

My age is 29

My qualifications for office are: B.A., C.P.A., real estate broker, Master Divinity candidate, frequent traveler.

My lips shall not speak wickedness. A great city, or is it also a lunatic, sin capital of the world? Time is short.

I am not a politician, and will serve for one-term only. Fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget are the keys.

Most of you might be angry with my views. But I warn everyone dearly, it is for your sake to have me elected.

Break the tradition that campaigning and name-recognition are needed.

All my affiliates are not responsible for my platforms.

Martin Eng can win!

Martin Eng

The Sponsors for Martin Lee Eng are:

Ted Aksnes, 1882 Green St, Contractor
Vernon Barnes, 1332 California St., C.P.A.
Terrel L. Beckwith, 55 Vanderwater, Real Estate Executive
Melvin M. Belli, Sr., 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
Jackson Chang, 2202-17th Ave., Imports & Exports
Michael P. Christiansen, 1125 Taylor St., Real Estate Sales
Jim M. Fong, 1134 Clay St., Insurance Broker/Investor
Rebecca Ford, 515 Pierce St., Real Estate Sales
Gordon C. Gong, 665 Pine St., Nuclear Scientist
B.F. Herman III, 128 Carl St., Real Estate Investor
Flora Jayne Larkey, 41 Rudden Ave., Teacher
Michael T. McDonald, 1735 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Owner
Kevin Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Real Estate Salesman
John Tracey O'Loughlin, 1922 Broderick St., Businessman
Velma Petersilie, 665 Pine, Teacher
Edward K. Pond, 5049 Anza, Businessman
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Terrace, Property Owner;
Member, Landmark Preservation Board
Al A. Rosenthal, 159 Marina Blvd., Retired
Richard Scott, 386 Lily St., Maintenance man
D. Scherer, 1731 Vallejo, Broker/University instructor
Michael Strausz, 2860 Laguna St., Union Real Estate Brokerage
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis, Branch Manager (Savings & Loan)
Priscilla J. Trujillo, 375-19th Ave., Real Estate Salesperson
Benjamin Wong, 519-12th Ave., Clergy/Reverend
Lawrence Wong, 1001 Pine St., Restaurant Manager
Samuel Wong, 615 Broadway, Retired
Dr. John H. Wu, 2334-25th Ave., Physician/Internal Medicine
Albert Yung, 989 Filbert St., System Engineer

KENNETH L. FARMER

My address is 1273A South Van Ness Avenue

My age is 43

My qualifications for office are: My belief that I possess sufficient intelligence, common sense, enthusiasm for the job and compassion for my fellow human beings and over all a true love of San Francisco (and a horror over what is being done by current administrators) to institute needed reforms in city government so that working class, Blacks, Orientals, Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians, Elderly and Young People who now have no friends at city hall will have a voice in city politics. As a Black, gay male living in the Mission, I know many problems first hand, and believe that I have proper motivation to become a supervisor.

Kenneth L. Farmer

The Sponsors for Ken Farmer are:

Norman Armentrout, 108 Haight St., Leaflet Distributor
Eula M. Bell, 420 Baker St., Beauty Shop Operator
Paulette Belliveau, 1271 S. Van Ness Ave., Data Clerk
Jarett L. Burdine, 420 Eddy St., Cook
Elizabeth Cobbs, 652 Peralta Ave., Clothing Store Owner
Irma Crenshaw, 559 Waller St., Store Owner
Thomas T. Dalton, 108 Haight St., Bartender
Howard E. Davis, 1354 Dolores, Actor/Teacher
Harry P. Elliot, 989 Haight St., Gardener
Harold L. Gage, 1360 Hyde St., Payroll Specialist
Cathy Kornblith, 951 Alabama, Investigator
Esther Lee, 1325 Laguna, Mgr., Laundry
J.E. Malone, 421 Haight St., Store Owner
Darrell L. McClure, 768 Clementina, Systems Administrator
David Pitsch, 1561 Pine St., Artist
Alan Ross, 418 Haight St., Upholsterer
Clarence B. Shields, 1135 Laguna, Teacher
LeRoy E. Shoemaker, 1275 S. Van Ness, Paralegal
Linda Trunzo, 559 Haight, Glass Finisher
Darrell White, 324 Bartlett St., Houseman

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 65 Wood Street

My occupation is Full time Supervisor

My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: I bring the Board twenty years of government service and extraordinary administrative experience:

- Policeman for 10 years,
- Sheriff, elected twice,
- Commissioner of prison system,
- Finance Committee, Vice-Chair, SF Supervisor.

My experience gives me necessary tools for facilitating the most effective, pragmatic approach to problems facing government. An Examiner analysis of Board members ranks me #2. This reflects not only my experience and expertise, but also the commitment I have to my position.

I'm concerned with issues affecting our daily life: public safety, employment, affordable housing, efficient use of government money, preserving cultural activities, better transportation, and a clean city.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Pres. Community College Board
Lia Triff Belli, 2950 Broadway, Pres. California Council
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner/Businessman
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Administrator/Attorney at Law
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins, Electrical Engineer/Vice Pres.
Lily Cuneo, 3819 Jackson St., War Memorial Board Trustee
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Direct. Victim Witness
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney
Jess T. Esteve, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of S.F.
Stanley Herzstein, 1170 Sacramento St., Consultant
Donna J. Hitchens, 4176-20th St., Commission on the Status of Women
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Delinquency Prevention Commissioner
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Pres. of S.F. Public Library Commission
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
William S. Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
Harold D. Madison, 1250 Shafter Ave., Retired
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Kira Z. Nelson, 30 Homestead St., College Student
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., 44 Corbett Ave., Pres., S.F. Taxpayers Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Housing Administrator
Rev. Edward L. Peet, 350 Arballo Drive, Clergy
Claire C. Pilcher, 471 Hoffman Ave., Director, Board of Permit Appeals
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson, Facilities Management
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel Wright, 195 Terra Vista Ave., Retired
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor

ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell St.

My occupation is Handyman and Criminology Student

My age is 55

My qualifications for office are: At the present time I am attending City College of San Francisco with an AA degree in sight. I have been a concerned father of the Mission community for twenty-one years and know the value of keeping the district organization alive and full of service to the people and to help work for social change.

During the spring months I was a volunteer counselor at Project New Pride, a program of the American Red Cross. Also in the past I have worked with many other agencies that serve the youth of the city.

Andrew Jones

The Sponsors for Andrew "Daddy Andy" Jones are:

Jack Bourne, 1426 Florida, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Peggy Hall, 702 Andover St., Counselor
David L. Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Salesman
Helen Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Housewife
Pinsky Andrea, 286 Guerrero St., Health Administration
Carmencita L. Dela Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Larry L. McCrum, 3412-26th St., Bartender
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Retired
Joseph F. Martinez, 274 Lowell St., Executive Director
Jose F. Hernandez, 66 Vienna, Accountant
Virginia Sheldon, 1275 Hampshire St., Administrative Secretary
Lorenzo Richard Dill, 385 Nevada St., Educational Coordinator
R. Ashley Cohn, 1331-11th Ave., Attorney
Janet Showers, 997 Shotwell St., Housewife, Mother
Alice McDonnell, 372 Capp, Intake Interviewer
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Immigration Coordinator
Detor.
Connie Rucker, 1146 Key Ave., Wife
Barry Wm. Showers, 977 Shotwell St., Roofer
Dottie A. Dinelli, 275 Girard, Secretary
Ana D. Bonilla, 537 Prentiss, Legal Secretary
Joseph L. Rodriguez, 2779-21st St., Law Clerk
Racshelle Cottonreader, 215 St. Charles, Letter Carrier
Wilfredo A. Garcia, 1046 Capp St., Self-employed
David Gonzalez, 1522-48th Ave., Disabled
Abby Rodriguez, 1418 Florida St., Social Services Coordinator
Jay Smith, 472 Clipper St., Landlord

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 443 Broadway

My occupation is Musician, Composer

My qualifications for office are: I am a common person, raised and educated in San Francisco. I want San Francisco to have more affordable housing. I want more jobs for the young and elderly citizens of San Francisco, more jobs so that the welfare burden will be reduced. I want San Francisco government to become more honest and responsive to our needs. I want San Francisco streets safe, for all good people to walk. I want better schools with more music and fine art, to maintain our San Francisco tradition of trend setting.

Please give me the opportunity to serve you and try to solve our problems.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The Sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Enrico Banducci, 1050 Green St., Restaurant Owner
Ness A. Aquino, 220-23rd St., Restaurateur
Lenore Cauttrelle, 1556 Clay, Retired Pac-Tel
Christeen M. Bergess, 2279 Bryant St., Housewife
Claudia L. Weems, 189 Precita, Foster Parent
Ginger Coleman, 734 Bush, Editor
Jose Berntsen, 375-29th St., Marine Machinist
Roger E. Miller, 2231-15th St., Student
James Husted, 333 Geary St., Electronics
Michael D. Helland, 450 A Vallejo, Construction Worker
Emmanuel Sobieski, 1745 Broadway, Security Manager
Sandra D. Parks, 147 Kingston, Railway Worker
Theresa D. Ward, 905 Columbus, Silk Screen Printer
Paul B. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Musician
Jean Weems, 189 Precita, Musician
John Pappadakis, 3241 Taraval, Doorman
Naomi Ruth Eisenberg, 980 Bush, Phone Call Operator
Roger Wayne Paupore, 1426 Haight St., Bartender
John Hess, 554 Broadway, Barker
Tana Lynn Lemmons, 527-3rd St., Waitress
Julie R. Brown, 331 Willard North, Pre School Teacher
Suzanne Roche, 2411 Webster St., Manager Shoe Boutique
Mark Greenspun, 2721 Pacific, Electronic Technician

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo

My occupation is Urban Planner

My qualifications for office are: Ringling Bros. couldn't do a better job. Circus acts, such as the recent handgun ban, make San Francisco the laughing stock of America. Our supervisors have hula-hooped the City into a \$2 billion sewer project, an \$80 million Muni overhaul, a \$156 million budgetary surplus, and a severe case of governmental dyslexia. Any American city that deprives its' citizens of affordable housing, affordable utilities, and dignity, while getting fat at the expense of parkers and bus riders, needs a house cleaning. Eliminating bureaucratic neuroses, instituting a tenant-landlord collective agreement, and buying PG&E is what the doctor orders. Elect me.

Julian Lagos

The Sponsors for Julian A. Lagos are:

Jay Adams, 1956 Lombard, Unemployed
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 440 Geary, Psychologist
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall, Cab Driver
John Beazley, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Elizabeth Bedford, 508 Andover, Attorney
Ed Bennett, 2440 Van Ness, Cab Driver
John W. Blethen, 1460 Haight, Attorney
Kathryn Bobrowski, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Margaret Burns, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Morris J. Commer, 3042 San Bruno Ave., Retired
Mark S. Emery, 555 Taylor, Artist
James Fisher, 2240 Fillmore, Cab Driver
Stanley Allen Grumet, 1237-4th Ave., Attorney
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore, Filmmaker
Richard Jensen, 450 Jones
William H. Jones, 925 Hayes, Cab Driver
Marilyn Kalman, 1012 DeHaro, Attorney
Vincent R. Latimer, 4118A-24th St., Service Manager
Patrick McMahon, 1515 Sutter, Cab Driver
Joe Miller, 739 Elizabeth, Cab Dispatcher
Victor E. Miller, 70 Liberty, Consultant
Ruth Moses, 2317 Folsom, Postal Worker
Stephen A. Schetman, 1301-20th St., Attorney
Peter M. Spear, 1138 Green, Gift Shop Worker
R. William Vega, 1261 Guerrero, Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 560 Page, Legal Worker
Hayes Wilsey, 417 Stockton, Messenger

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

BILL MAHER

My address is 2260 - 9th Avenue

My occupation is Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education; attorney

My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: Attorney — USF Law School; Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education since 1976; President for two consecutive terms. During that time, school test scores have improved from last to first among California's major cities.

Today, despite major cutbacks, schools are academically sound, better integrated, and better managed.

The long-term financial base of the City is uncertain. We must breach the alienation between downtown and neighborhood interests, maintain basic services such as police, roads, libraries and public transportation, and end the excessive, unproductive bickering of the current Board.

I have years of experience in helping to solve these types of problems.

Bill Maher

The Sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Pres. S.F. Board of Education
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Fire Commissioner
Susan Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates, Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Dorothy M. Casper, 870 Bush St., Property Manager
William K. Coblentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Arthur Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Dorman L. Commons, 155 Jackson St., Business Executive
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Board Member, Y.W.C.A.
Jess T. Esteve, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
George Evankovich, 1644A Filbert St., Pres. Laborer's Union
George Foos, 1750 Taylor St., President, Department Store
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Neighborhood Activist
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President, ILWU
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., P.U.C. Administrator
Caryl Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Public Affairs Consultant
Stephanie Mischak, 1851-8th Ave., Board Member, Nat'l Women's Political Caucus
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., 944 Corbett Ave., Pres. S.F. Taxpayer's Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Director, Kimochi Senior Services
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter
Janet H. Weinstein, 1080 Francisco, Retired
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist, Pres. Asian Inc.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent

BETTY ANN McMAHON

My address is 880 Portola Drive

My occupation is School District Consultant

My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan who cares about San Francisco. I taught in the San Francisco School District for thirty years and now work as a consultant.

I take great pride in San Francisco and it hurts me to see how some politicians have used our city government to the detriment of our best interests.

I will work to achieve a responsible city housing policy, equitable taxes for homeowners and businesses and to free our fire and police forces from political interference.

I am dedicated to San Francisco's future and with your help, together, we can make it one to look forward to.

Betty Ann McMahon

The Sponsors for Betty Ann McMahon are:

Irene Antoni, 2643 Greenwich St., Teacher
James D. Currivan, 2550 Irving, Funeral Director
Elizabeth Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Housewife
Frank C. Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Retired Administrator - Union
Wm. A. Flading, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Attorney
Josephine Flanagan, 1798 Bush, Housewife
Peter L. Forslund, Retired - Electrical Contractor
Josephine B. Honn, 2322 Union St., Consultant S.F. Unified School District
Thomas F. McDonough, 1562-38th Ave., Retired
John McMahon, 880 Portola Dr., Accountant
Frances Fae Melaneph, 125 Juanita Way, Retired
Joseph L. Misuraca, 2333 Funston Ave., Retired Recreation Supt.
Vincent J. Mullins, 3383 Washington, Lawyer
Francis J. Murphy, 2155-9th Ave., Engineer
Carlos Palacios, 186 St. Elmo Way, Shipping
Greg Rocca, 175 Lansdale Ave., Accountant
James V. Rocca, 175 Lansdale Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Jerome Sapiro, 66 Sotelo Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired Treasurer
Virginia L. Shea, 1563-38th Ave., Retired
Paul Shinn, 2 San Marcos Ave., Stationary Engineer
Lavita G. Smith, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Accountant
Roberta Stewart, 181 Addison, Admissions Coordinator
Daniel F. Sullivan, 2724 Yorba St., Real Estate Broker
Gertrud Vorderwinkler, 255 Shrader St., Nurses Aide
James T. Ward, 220 Buckingham Way, Retired
Vincent A. Yalon, 160 Hernandez Ave., Administrator, Blood Bank

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

ERIC MONCUR

My address is 1866 Great Highway

My occupation is Businessman

My qualifications for office are: Vice President of the Henry George School of Economics, Real Estate Consultant, former San Francisco Deputy Assessor, Activist for human rights and economic justice. Background in economics, public administration and urban problems.

The ownership of over 95 percent of our land by less than 3 percent of the population is the underlying cause of unemployment, housing shortages, stagnation and crime in our cities. This can be reversed by removing taxes from buildings and have a land value tax only. Land speculators and slumlords will be forced to sell or build, homeowners freed from taxes to improve homes. This creates jobs, homes and peace.

Eric Moncur

The Sponsors for Eric Moncur are:

Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Consultant
Americ Azevedo, 269 Cheney St., Radio Producer
Ophelia R. Balderrama, 271-19th Ave., Health Educator
Janice Bernard, 18 Presidio Terrace, Artist, Paralegal
Mebane F. Croom, 1515 Gough St., Property Clerk
Lawrence E. Danos, 835 Cole St., Machine Shop Specialist
Jim Dennis, 700 Goettinger, Photographer
Shukri E. Dudum, 2497 Funston Ave., Retired
Wendell Fitzgerald, 144 Locksley, Production Manager
Florence Fried, 271-19th Ave., Retired
Morton Garfield, M.D., 85 Cleary Court
H. Alfred Hanken, 995 Harrison St., Business Man.
Alanna Hartzok, 269 Chenery, Education Director
David H. Hill, 3319 Clay St., Engineer
James A. Hirabayashi, 3377 Market St., Professor
Patricia A. Hollingsworth, 3025 Van Ness, Claims Operations Assistant
Lorrie K. Inagaki, 3319 Clay Street, Attorney
Richard W. Lowry, 2235-47th Ave., Travel Agent
Salomon E. Martinez, 5809 Mission St., Businessman
Patricia Rose, 415 Randolph St., Designer
Charles J. Sahourieh, 68 Allston Way, Grocer-Owner
Mark E. Schwier, 350 Turk St., Research Assistant
E. R. Scrofani, 4301-20th St., Teacher
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
Hiram Smith, 345 Monticello, Director-Legal Services Program
Leon E. Smith, 1395 Golden Gate, Business Representative
Mario V. Vega, 59 Paulding, Gardener
Elmer Wilhelm, 277-B Shipley St., Buyer, Endup
John J. Wilson, 901 Lake St., Artist
George K. Woo, 1729 Lake St., Educator

K. F. "BELLE STARR" MOSELEY

My address is 2120 Market St., Apt. 103

My occupation is Lawyer and Artist

My age is 32

My qualifications for office are: I am a 7th generation Californian, and 2nd generation San Franciscan. I have attended U.C. Berkeley (English and genetics), San Francisco State University (M.A. communications) and the University of San Francisco Law School. I produce free concerts in parks.

My job as supervisor will be to create and coordinate places where your opinions and solutions to our city's problems can be collected and where I can communicate what the other supervisors are considering.

I am willing to work for your Populist Democracy.

I promise to protect our bill of rights and provide for our health, education and welfare.

K. F. Moseley "Belle Starr"

The Sponsors for K.F. (Belle Starr) Moseley are:

Edward A. Barry, 415 Winston Dr., Attorney-at-Law
Clayton L. Bigbie, 230 Eddy St., Retired Auditor
Paulette Burks, 1723-7th Ave., Disabled
James M. Carter, Jr., 3751-20th St., Social Worker
Philip Curatola, 1436 Waller St., Musician
Loret L. Duncan, 480 Eddy St., Salesperson
Lynn Circe Forrest, 40 Langton St., Accountant
Paula "Ralf" Laguna, 2267-30th Ave., Artist
Andrew A. Livers, 373 Ellis St., Disabled
Ellen W. Mahoney, 415 Winston Dr., Librarian
Mark Mahone, 415 Winston Dr., Student
Ray Lee McCracken, 480 Eddy St., Painter
Linda Marie Pillay, 156 Carl St., Writer
Timothy Dwayne Rice, 480 Eddy St., Mechanic
Trina L. Smith, 2267-30th Ave., Painter
Marie Sooklaris, 412 Fair Oaks St., Tax Consultant
Joyce Stoller, 190 San Jose, Activist
Kendall R. Summers, 389 Dolores, Disabled
Carol Leigh Szego, 3740-25th St.
David A. Whitaker, 1456 Page St.

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue

My occupation is Lawyer/Member of Board of Supervisors

My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: As a supervisor, former assistant city attorney and current president of Queen's Bench (Bay Area women lawyers), I work to benefit all San Franciscans — while maintaining prudent financial administration.

My priorities include:

- Retaining jobs and attracting new employment,
- Making Muni responsive and affordable.
- Creating needed services for seniors.
- Protecting neighborhoods and providing affordable housing.
- Assuring healthful drinking water.
- Restricting careless storage or transportation of lethal chlorine gas within The City.

To make our homes and streets safe, I led a successful drive for a fingerprint computer to modernize the Police Department.

My votes have benefited both renters and property owners.

Wendy Nelder

The Sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas, Retired Police Chief
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of S.F.
Alex L. Pitcher, 61 Pomona, President of San Francisco NAACP
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett, Teacher
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
Marie K. Brooks, 100 Stonecrest Dr., Executive
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Director, Filipino Cultural Council
Rev. James Leach, 744 Urbano Dr., Pastor
John J. Moylan, 2985-24th Ave., Union Business Representative
Joe Sharpe, 1547-46th Ave., Labor Official
Ernest Mitchell, 133 Gillette, Administrator
Mark Forrester, 55 Elsie St., Director, Sr. Escort Service
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis St., Retired Teacher
Louella C. Leon, 1221 Hyde, Neighborhood Coordinator — Sr. Escort
Leonard "Lefty" Gordon, 140 Margaret, Social Worker
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Shirley Cohelan Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Former Treasurer — San Francisco
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin, Jr., 20 Cashmere St., Coordinator Snr. Escort Service
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Thomas C. Tong, 846 Clay St., Merchant
Joseph A. Gaggero, 80 Somerset, Retired
Joseph J. Allen, 2186-36th Ave., Public Relations
Christopher Martin, 347 Green St., Businessman
Ernest Lenn, 3933 Clement, Retired Newspaperman
Phil F. Kenniston, 34 Belcher, Administrator-Senior Escort
Angelo Rolando, 3276 Harrison, Real Estate Broker

ROBERT SQUERI

My address is 31 Hernandez

My occupation is Independent Businessman

My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan. Married to Denise Dempster, one daughter, residing at 31 Hernandez. Graduated Saint Ignatius High School (1965), San Francisco City College and Cal State, Hayward (1971). I am an independent businessman who is now interested in giving my services to the city. I feel the most important issues are education, jobs, safety on the streets and housing. It's time for a change!

Robert Squeri

The Sponsors for Robert Squeri are:

Alfred D. Bacci, 240 Dolores St., R.E. Appraiser
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Ave., Self-employed
Paul V. Cummins, 166 San Felipe St., Attorney
Dorothy V. Del Negro, 343 Panorama Dr., Clerk
Margaret C. DeOsuna, 3774-B Mission St., Real Estate Broker
George Dickenson, 731 Cayuga St., Retired
Monica Duffy, 2171-21st Ave., Clerk
Claire H. Farrell, 2563-39th Ave., Clerk
Kathleen A. Gulbengay, 2177-17th Ave., Administrator
Donald J. Hadley, 212 Castenada St., Advertising
Frank E. Hart, 15 Garcia Ave., Muni Judge
Daniel V. Jaime, 1708 Filbert, Title Searcher
Lucille Jones, 4646 California, Clerk
R.E. Kennedy, 55 Montecito Ave., Chief Appraiser Assessor
Margaret Keohne, 2675-45th Ave., Clerk
Thomas J. LaLanne, 161 Edgewood Ave., Attorney
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St.
Lucy Palmiano, 11 Dolores St., Auditor
Miriam L. Pearson, 1280 Laguna St., Retired
Nadyne Ricks, 138 Hyde St., Receptionist
Claire Roddy, 1827-43rd Ave., Clerk
Patricia J. Smith, 522 Judah St., EDP Operator
Thomas T. Snyder, 2 Roosevelt Way, Title Officer
Denise Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Housewife
Robert Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Sales

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

OLGA TALAMANTE

My address is 1086 Capp Street
My occupation is Administrator, Mission YMCA
My age is 32

My qualifications for office are: Graduate, U.C. Santa Cruz; Community Organizer, United Farmworkers Union; National Coordinator, Human Rights Office, American Friends Service Committee; Parent Involvement Coordinator, Head Start; Administrator, Mission YMCA.

It is the duty of government to provide community services. Since Proposition 13 all we have been provided is higher Muni fares, fewer teachers and cuts in health care and other services. Two years ago voters passed Proposition M to tax the big corporations. The Supervisors refuse to implement it; they listen to Big Business, not the people. I will fight to implement M, to make our city a decent place to live.

Olga Talamante

The Sponsors for Olga Talamante are:

Jennifer Biehn, 1086 Capp St., Community College Instructor
Peter Goselin, 1892B Market St.
Karen Hudiburgh, 272½ Missouri, Store Owner
Jean Ishibashi, 1363 Alabama, Community Organizer
Jeff Jones, 500 Franconia, Fundraising Consultant
Sam Jordan, 4004-3rd St., Caterer
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Fiscal Planner
Susan D. Latham, 1432 Page St., Artist
Leonard M. Malliett, 386 Maynard St., Longshoreman
Marie C. Malliett, 386 Maynard St., V.P. of S.F. Labor Union
Tessa Martinez, 2905 Harrison St., Bilingual Teacher
Michael Mitchell, 329A Frederick St., Artist Painter
Eileen M. Purcell, 1232 Alabama St., Social Worker
Steve Clifford Rabisa, 2 Italy, California State Auditor
Sylvia Ramirez, 190 Emmet Ct., Legal Worker
Alberto Saldamando, 1363 Alabama, Attorney
Robert W. Switz, 642 Brussels, Vicar
Diane Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Religious Worker
Ronald D. Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Educator
William Valentine, 126 Laguna St., Clerical Worker
Robert D. Williams, 1509 Shrader, Nuc. Disarm Proj. Dir., Archdiocese S.F.
Thomas Yrene, 233 Arkansas, Retired Railroad Worker

WILLIAM TOCCO

My address is 947 Geary Street
My occupation is Tax Consultant
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: Leadership: Commission on the Aging Advisory Council; Delinquency Prevention Commission, Education Task Force; Kiwanis Club, Senior Citizens Committee Chairman; Internal Revenue Service Manager; Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars and AMVETS.

Priorities: We have seen a change from individual responsibility, to a belief in government as Big Brother and responsible for our welfare. We must regain pride in ourselves, and we must regain confidence in individual initiative. We must bring back respect for family values, respect for the elderly, respect for basic education, and respect for a safe city.

William Tocco

The Sponsors for William Tocco are:

Donald W. Allen, 947 Geary, U.S. Postal Carrier, Member NALC
AFL-CIO
Gloria R. Austria, 1505 Gough, Computer Operator
Frank J. Bello, 2021 Fox Plaza, Retired Lawyer
Gordon Bunker, 2029-14th Ave., Engineer
Francis Burger, 1339-32nd Ave., Ret. Electrician, Past CMDR
Am. Legion
George R. Coan, 59 Chabot, Lawyer
John J. Doyle, 2998-22nd Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Ethel W. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Housewife
Wallace B. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Retired CPA
William Fisher, 3578 Pierce, Retired Businessman
Mark Forrester, 55 Elsie, Senior Citizen Program Director
Joseph M. Hannan, 68½ Hancock, Retired Railroad Inspector
Ernest D. Hopper, 1957 Anza, Retired S.F. Police Officer
Samuel B. Johns, 2238-38th Ave., Retired Executive Chef
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis, Retired Teacher
Leon A. Latno, 191 Los Pamos, Ret. SFPD, Past CMDR
VFW Post 4103
Albert Park Li, 148 Highland, Retired MUNI mechanic
Ernest M. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Past Pres. Chauffeur's Union
Local 265
Laura L. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Homemaker
John M. McDuffie, 444 Hyde, Member Union Local 1100, Barber
Florence M. Neil, 145 Guerrero, Retired
Georgina Ocasio, 947 Geary, Housewife
Chester Romanowicz, 935 Geary, Retired Seaman
Victor Romero, 850 Rutland, Retired Merchant Marine
Jose Del Rosario, 947 Geary, Chemical Engineer
Dorothy M. Rosenbaum, 1000 Sutter, Retired Federal Employee
Sam Rosey, 349 Cherry St., Retired
Frank T. Sharpe, 28 Admiral, Ret. Steamfitter, Member Union
Local 38
John Viberg, 555 Arguello, Retired Businessman
Julius Zamacona, 63 San Juan, Ret. Warehouseman, Teamsters
Local 860

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones St.

My occupation is Member: San Francisco Board of Education

My age is 56

My qualifications for office are: Almost six years as a member of the San Francisco Board of Education, experience with problem solving and familiarity with our city and its people. My wife Ruby and I have raised four children in San Francisco, all of whom attended public schools. I am supported by a broad cross section of our city's communities, leaders and constituencies.

I will work toward cooperation between interest groups, improved city services and a livable urban environment. San Francisco is valuable and unique: its continued health of paramount importance. I will serve our city and work to keep it healthy.

Benjamin Tom

The Sponsors for Ben Tom are:

John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Samuel Duca, 16 Wawona St., City Assessor
Agar Jaicks, 62 Wooland Ave., County Party Chair
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific, U.S. Postmaster Retired
Pius Lee, 699 Marina Blvd., Real Estate
Agrisino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
May Vail, 641-3rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President, Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Reverend Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Urban Planner
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, S.F. Board of Education
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President I.L.W.U.
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Del Mar, Airports Commissioner
Andrew Katten, 108 Turquoise Way, Business Executive
David J. Sanchez, 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Executive Director
Steven J. Doi, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
Yoritada Wada, 656-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Dr. Z. L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay Street, Attorney
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th Ave., Special Assistant to the Mayor

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 228 Anderson Street

My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: I have kept the promises I made during my campaign for Supervisor. I have represented the interests of working people. I will continue to work to: make San Francisco a safe, healthy, economically sound and affordable place for families, single people, young and old to live and work; make our parks and streets clean and safe; assure accessible, affordable health care and public transportation; create good working conditions for city employees so they are more effective and productive; develop neighborhood businesses; equitably distribute police and fire services; develop jobs for our unemployed and productive activities for our children and youth.

Nancy G. Walker

The Sponsors for Nancy Walker are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Burton, 350 Texas St., Member of Congress
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman, California Legislature
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Elizabeth H. Anello, 176 Julian Ave., Social Worker
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli, Public Relations
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Leon Bruschera, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Douglas Engmann, 408 Stanyan St., Commissioner
Joseph Frietas, Jr., 3360 Laguna St., Attorney-at-Law
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Attorney
Carlton Benjamin Goodlett, 2060 O'Farrell, Physician & Publisher
Victor Honig, 50 Lopez Ave., Business Person
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan, Author/Lecturer
William F. McCabe, 355 Green, Attorney
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero, Union Business Agent
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Kay Pachtner, 155 Vicksburg St., Consumer Advocate
Gina Pennestri, 1324 Clayton St., Admin. Aide — Congressman
John Burton
Gertrude Bland Platt, 339 Walnut, Historic Preservation Consultant
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court, Apt. 1409

My occupation is Supervisor

My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, all its neighborhoods, all its people and its development. I have worked for improved City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Through the Council for Economic Development, I have worked for increased employment, especially entry level positions for the young or unemployed. I have twice been elected to the Board of Supervisors, following two terms with the Community College Board. I am the only supervisor with evening office hours open to all constituents without appointment.

Doris M. Ward

The Sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Boulevard, U.S. Congressman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Member Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
John Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates, Attorney
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Gwenn Craig, 493 Haight St., Pres. Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hgts. Blvd., Publisher
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Betty Lim Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager Mayor's Office
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel, Consultant
Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland, Chairman Party County Committee
Calvin Jones, 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Thomatra N. Scott, 1912½ Broderick St., Intake & Referral Specialist
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilitas, Minister

DAVE WHARTON

My address is 2040 Franklin St

My occupation is Public Service Attorney

My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: Yale Law School. Attorney, 17 years: U.S. Energy Department; OEO; City Attorney; Small business, community service clients. Volunteer: United Way, church and education groups. Three children. Apartment renter.

San Francisco needs a new voice.

I believe in more City service per tax dollar, less regulation and red tape. The Board needs greater neighborhood and ethnic participation and fewer meaningless resolutions. Recognizing in-law units creates more affordable housing. I want more police fighting crime and special attention to senior citizens and social services.

Replace entrenched interests at City Hall. As Supervisor, I'll hold neighborhood forums to give everyone a voice.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

John S. Abney, 828 Chenery St., Sheriff's Sergeant
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Executive
Robert F. Bole Jr., 990 Prague St., Tutoring Center Dev. Director
Raymond Cohn, 1980 Scott St., Firefighter
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Mary Lou Finegold, 45 San Jacinto, Housewife
Mortimer Fleishacker III, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Business Executive
Charles Q. Forester, 1266 Fulton St., City Planner
Roger Friedenthal, M.D., 2530 Chestnut St., Physician
Susan Garell, 1874 Green St., Law Student
Lonnie Green, 739-27th St., Writer
Herbert Holmgren, 2040 Franklin St., Retired
James Earl Jewell, 749 Rhode Island, Lighting Designer
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Newspaper Editor
Alan Lubliner, 1919 Grant Ave., Transportation Planner
Patrick W. McGrew, 2398 Pacific Ave., Architect
Lee Menconi, 532 Clayton St., Financial Manager
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Assoc. Executive
Peter J. Nardoza, 4086-26th St., Administrative Assist., City of S.F.
Ramsay B. Navarrete, 253 Castro St., Computer Software Manufacturer
Ronald Neiport, 2040 Franklin St., Financial Marketing Specialist
Patrick J. O'Hern, 3559 Jackson St., Attorney
Ronald S. Peterson, 580 Hill St., Government Attorney
Gayle Prince, 1980 Scott St., Small Business Owner
Charles B. Renfrew, 21-5th Ave., Attorney
Michael Earnest Sanchez, 579 Corbett Ave., Entertainment Management
Michael A. Schoch, 1266 Fulton St., Landscaper
Ross R. Snow, 3422-16th St., Teacher
Lawrence J. Stupski, 308 Maple, Business Executive
Carla White, 2500 Van Ness, Account Executive

CANDIDATES FOR SCHOOL BOARD

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street #331

My occupation is President, S.F. Board of Education

My qualifications for office are: I have six years of experience on the Board, the last year as President, and four years on the State Educational Innovation and Planning Commission. I am Executive Director of the Mission Language and Vocational School with responsibility for negotiation, administration and evaluation of youth and adult training programs. We need to continue setting higher academic goals, recognizing the diversity of our students, and establishing exciting educational alternatives. All children deserve a safe, stimulating environment to prepare for higher education and employment. The district has gained a momentum we must work hard to maintain.

Rosario Anaya

The Sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Lucille Abramson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
John Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie L. Brown, Jr. 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Agrisino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Janet Chambers MD, 82 Peralta Ave., Prof. Obstetrics Gynecology
Judy Dellamonica, 3323 Taraval, President SF Classroom Teachers Assoc.
Jess T. Esteve, 5285 Diamond Hgts. Blvd., Publisher
Ladde Farfan, 1322 Funston, Chair. Comm. Advis. Comt. Special Education
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania, Attorney
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Betty Lin Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Sybel Klein, 19 San Jacinto Way, Business Teacher
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner Board of Education
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman CA Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Former Police Chief
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, President Police Commission
Stanley R. Stefanic, 759-23rd Ave., Unitarian Universalist Minister
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones, Member Board of Education
Michael A. Toms, 269 States, Executive Dir.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

MARGARET CRICHTON DeOSUNA

My address is 3774 B Mission Street

My occupation is Real Estate Broker

My age is 52

My qualifications for office are: I am a former member of the Criminal Justice Committee of the Association of Bay Area Government's Regional Citizens Forum, former State Assembly Nominee, Real Estate Broker, owner of DeOsuna Realty, married for twenty-six years and the mother of five children. I received my B.A. Degree (Economics and Spanish) from Macalester College. I am an alumnus of the University of California, San Francisco State, City College (Computer Information Science) and have studied piano for twenty years. I support teaching students the ability to change their future, basic computer technology, cutting violence and drugs in schools and administrative waste.

Margaret Crichton DeOsuna

The Sponsors for Margaret Crichton DeOsuna are:

John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Business-Real Estate Broker
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Frank J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission, Retired
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Catherine T. McCathy, 95 Park St., Retired
Virginia Creighton, 350 Arballo Dr., College Business Professor
Mohamed Nour Taqi-Eddin, 1390-29th Ave., Grocer
Nidal Nazzal, 7 Locksley Ave., Chief Financial Officer
Julius Giorgi, 746 Monterey Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Thomas Hanratty, 38 Mizpah Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
James M. Jungkurth, 77 Gladstone Drive, Outdoor Advertising
Patrick C. Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., County Central Committeeman
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
James E. Curtin, 59 Newton St., Real Estate Broker
Donald Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood, County Central Committeeman
Patricia K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Bookkeeper
Peter J. Gutierrez, 630 Edinburgh St., Veterans Benefits Counselor
Joseph J. Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Warehouseman
Cecila Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Housewife
Lorenzo Flores, 3151 Alemany Blvd., Senior Citizen
Terence Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Michael J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission St., Assistant Broker
Ramon P. Navarro, 2107 Alemany Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Paul P. McGinty, 415 Collingwood St., Investor
William J. Young, 85 Richland Ave., Retired
Margie Osuna, 3774B Mission St., Student
Evelyn Pettit, 50 Park St., Operations Officer
Donald Michael Carr, 318-29th Ave., Retired
Mark B. Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student
Blair A. William Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student

CANDIDATES FOR SCHOOL BOARD

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street

My occupation is Engineering Educator

My qualifications for office are: 16 years teaching experience, City College of San Francisco; 25 years Industrial experience as a Mechanical, Industrial Engineer; Registered Professional Engineer; General Secondary Credential; President, American Association Retired Persons, Sunset Chapter.

PROPOSE:

New 4 year Professional Sport Curriculums, 3 year High School Diploma Programs, 2 year Certificate of Achievement Programs, Semiprofessional Programs.

Reducing the number of High Schools; operating them like colleges from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.; using collegiate Time Class Schedules for students' and teachers' programs; thereby increasing classroom usage, eliminating duplications, and saving millions of dollars.

Modifying Report Cards to show Grade Level Achievements for Reading, Writing, Mathematics.

William Felzer

The Sponsors for William Felzer are:

Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Supervisor
E. Patricia Lucey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney
A. John Shimon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board of Equal Member
John J. Brady, 1441-38th Ave., Administrative Dean, CCSF
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Paul S. Hungerford, 1511-35th Ave., Retired School Administrator
Julius Jelinek, 1080 Alabama St., Engineering Educator
Betty J. Johnson, 4301 Ocean Ave., Business Educator, CCSF
Charles P. Paccagnella, 345 Hanover St., Civil Engineer
Lawrence Jue, 1065 Baker St., Consulting Engineer
Whitney A. Geiger, 3209 Noriega St., Statistician
Evelyn N. Kerkhof, 2929-25th Ave., Mathematician
Ruth L. Clark, 2610-21st Ave., Senior Insurance Underwriter
Olive Homer, 2344-17th Ave., Insurance Agency Office Manager
Gloria T. Barcojo, 57 Paradise St., Administrative Assistant
John P. Comisky, 1230-26th Ave., Retired Stationary Engineer
Clement Dang, 161 Madison St., Maintenance Supt.
Curt P. Fischer, 2191-33rd Ave., Purchasing Agent
James T. Fitzgerald, 2254-40th Ave., Jet Engine Mechanic
Chris J. Pallis, 2201-39th Ave., R.E. Appraiser
Christina Solari, 1518-38th Ave., Communications
Anna Mae Stacke, 251 Vicente, Accountant
S. J. Swanson, 318 Vienna St., Sr. Accountant
Richard J. Tessman, 1834-26th Ave., Advertising
Pat E. Weidy, 680 Sutter St., Computer Operator
David R. Zisko, 2351-41st Ave., Pharmacist
Anita A. Flori, 1479-34th Ave., Computer Operator
Johnnie Ordean Espeland, 1578-27th Ave., Sta. Engineer
Lillian H. Sherman, 601 O'Farrell St., Retired Nurse

MYRA KOPF

My address is 1940 - 12th Avenue

My occupation is Incumbent

My qualifications for office are: Years of experience and first-hand knowledge of the School District, as a parent, educator, PTA activist and School Board Member.

Commitment to provide stability, to secure necessary funding, and to continued responsiveness to the needs and concerns of students, teachers and parents.

Although during my four years in office our schools have improved significantly, test scores have risen, and public confidence in our public schools has increased, there is still much to do.

I pledge continued vigil, determination and energy to ensure that all students in San Francisco have the best possible education.

Myra Kopf

The Sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
Agripino Cerbato, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz Way, Police Commissioner
Carlota Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., S.F. Board of Education Member
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Member Board of Supervisors/Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of the City and County of S.F.
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood, School/Community Leader
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortez St., Architect
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro, Artist
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona St., Bank Officer
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman, California Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 827-24th Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Howard N. Nemerovski, 40 Sea View Terrace, Attorney
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson, Attorney-at-Law and Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Schneider, 4209-22nd St., Deputy Chief CAL/OSHA
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Burl Toler, 581 Orizaba, Police Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Educator/Member Board of Supervisors

CANDIDATES FOR SCHOOL BOARD

GEORGE LANDIS O'BRIEN

My address is 1506 - 8th Avenue

My occupation is Deschooler/Economics Instructor

My qualifications for office are: I am an opponent of government control and an advocate of individual liberty.

If elected I will work to:

- Promote alternatives to government education
- Support home education.
- Oppose compulsory attendance laws.
- Return control of education to parents and students.
- End taxes for schools people don't want.
- Dispose of empty schools.
- Get rid of the huge statist bureaucracy.
- Let parents and students decide what courses are taught, how students dress, if prayers recited.
- Let parents and students decide where to go to school.

People will control education when government doesn't!

Vote for George O'Brien for Board of Education.

George L. O'Brien

The Sponsors for George L. O'Brien are:

Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert, Civil Liberties Attorney
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Robert A. DaPrato, 374 Laidley, Physician
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes St., Abortion Rights Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Kathleen O'Shea, 3346-21st. St., Registered Nurse
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Dena M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Cathie Ellen Heinrich, 1506-8th Ave., Pension Administrator
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak St., Process Server
Laura M. Kroutil, 1952 Divisadero, Purchasing Agent
Beverly Locke, 117 Pierce, Controller
Ronald W. Dorsey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Hannah M. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Data Processing Consultant
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist
Stanley F. Kern, 2515 Sacramento, Insurance Auditor
Raymond Borkowski, 1300 Lawton St., Railroad Clerk
Milton Mueller, 1952 Divisadero, Proofreader
Francis S. Goeltz, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm'l Mail Receiving Agent
Judith Goeltz, 130 Clifford Ter., Publisher
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker St., Ballot Access Consultant
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student and Photographer
Pennie L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student

SODONIA M. WILSON, Ph.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way

My occupation is incumbent

My age is 48

My qualifications for office are: I have resided in San Francisco for 31½ years and my son attended grades kindergarten through twelfth in San Francisco's Public Schools. Consequently, I know that our youngsters must be proficient in basic skills and should explore the areas of high technology for future employment. Parental involvement in education is also essential for more effective student learning and school-community relations. I have been an instructor, counselor, coordinator and am presently a college administrator. The programs I supervise are extended Opportunity Programs and Services, College Readiness, Tutoring, Disabled Students and Women's Re-entry. I possess a B.A.-Nursing, M.A.-Counseling, Ph.D.-Clinical Psychology.

Sodonia M. Wilson

The Sponsors for Sodonia Wilson are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon, Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific, Lawyer/Legislator
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Workers' Compensation
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones, School Board Member
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Josephine E. Cole, 1598-36th Ave., Educator
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th St., Special Assistant to the Mayor
Zuretti Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Leonard M. Grimes, Jr., 876 Guerrero St., State Gov't. Employee
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Union Official, I.L.W.U.
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Retired
Sandy A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Alex L. Pitcher, Jr., 61 Pomona, Pres. N.A.A.C.P.
Pauline Rosenbaum, 137-3rd Ave., Housewife
Stephen Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director Patient Advocacy
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

CANDIDATES FOR COMM. COLLEGE BOARD

ROBERT R. BACCI

My address is 2478 - 23rd Avenue

My occupation is Lawyer

My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: A graduate of the University of San Francisco, I have an active law practice, I serve as Secretary of the Geary Blvd. Merchants Association, and am a Council of District Merchants delegate to two City environmental project advisory committees.

As a third generation San Franciscan, I am concerned about the quality of education in San Francisco and feel I can make a substantial contribution to improve the standards and direction of the Community College System. I will focus on a return to the kind of basic education that will properly qualify its students for jobs that are available in today's San Francisco job market.

Robert R. Bacci

The Sponsors for Robert R. Bacci are:

Adolphus Andrews III, 2611 Divisadero, Real Estate Investments
James J. Bourgart, 1 Aztec, Legislative Aide
Agnes I. Chan, 10 Miller Place, Consultant
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Bruce Dingwall, 35 Buckingham Way, Manager
Edward Galletti, 187 Avila St., Service Club President
Ruth Church Gupta, 1910 Green St., Attorney
Mike Henderson, 3550 Cabrillo St., Small Business Owner
Gregory P. Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, President, Library Commission
Henry Jefferson, 27 Williar, Area Housing Manager
Robert O. Johns, 4347-20th Ave., Association Manager
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner
Mildred W. Levin, 251 San Anselmo Ave., Attorney
John Lo Schiavo, S.J., Xavier Hall, U.S.F. University President
Charles Meyers, 1789 Eucalyptus Dr., Public Relations Consultant
Bertha S. Nelson, 527-26th Ave., Public Relations Director, Wine Co.
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific, Managing Partner Investment Company
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Merchant Association President
Leslie Payne, 343 Tara St., Parole Agent
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Business Owner
John A. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Chairman, Financial Institution
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Parking Authority Chairman
John W. Stark, 2595 Washington St., Transportation Analyst
John E. Sullivan, 101 Glenbrook Ave., Lawyer
William F. Terheyden, 61 Toledo Way, Attorney
Dorothy Vuksich, 177 San Aleso Way, Fundraiser
Marguerite A. Warren, 1746-32nd Ave., Semi-retired
Frederick J. Whisman, 3601 Clement St., Superior Court Officer
Shirley C. Yawitz, 245 Yerba Buena, Lawyer

MIKE S. BERNICK

My address is 378 Golden Gate

My occupation is Professor/Agency Director

My qualifications for office are:

1. Strong background in education: Adjunct Faculty Member at University of San Francisco and Golden Gate University; Training at Harvard (B.A.), Oxford (B.Phil.), U.C. Berkeley (J.D.).

2. Director of San Francisco Renaissance Employment & Economic Development: An economic development agency that establishes job training programs and small businesses, and aids San Franciscans into steady jobs.

3. Ideas for Better Education: Strengthen the literacy and vocational training that can lead to steady jobs; strengthen the solid, traditional academic courses that can lead to higher educational opportunities.

With experience and ideas, I'll help the Community Colleges work better for San Francisco.

Michael S. Bernick

The Sponsors for Mike Bernick are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Ella Brown, 1532 Shafter, Director Hunters Point Neighborhood Facility
Dorothy Casper, 870 Bush Street, Homemaker
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins Street, Electrical Engineer
Christina Chen, 2233-44th Ave., Housewife/Teacher
W. Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Andrew Colvin, 1959-30th Ave., Attorney
Joseph Driscoll, 330 Taraval, Firefighter
Timothy Dupre, 5235 Diamond Heights, Dir. Booker T. Washington Center
Zuretti Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery, Business Person
Licardo Hernandez, 40 Harper, Director of City Agency
Dr. Eugene Hopp, 33 Heather Avenue, Physician
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Dir. ILWU
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club, President, Board of Supervisors
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Avenue, Attorney/Civil Service Comm.
Leland J. Lazarius, 2277 Clay Street, Judge, Superior Ct., Retired
William J. Lowenberg, 125 Santa Ana, Real Estate
Esther Marks, 125 Upper Terrace, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay Street, Lawyer
Deborah J. Petrie, 1150 Kearney, Planner
Isadore Pivnick, 2290 Stockton, School Administrator, Retired
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Nurse/Director Filipino Center
Terence A. Redmond, 342-5th Ave., Attorney
John F. Rothmann, 629 Arguello, Consultant
Eduardo Sandoval, 756-27th Street, Attorney
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Kevin Starr, 445 Chestnut, Journalist/Educator
Byron F. Wong, 1554-38th Ave., Attorney

CANDIDATES FOR COMM. COLLEGE BOARD

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 2727 - 41st Avenue

My occupation is Incumbent member of Community College Board/Commissioner Workers' Compensation Appeals Board.

My qualifications for office are: As a member of the Community College District for ten years, I am proud of my record and my efforts to increase student and community involvement. The Community College has expanded facilities and extended services to the entire community, establishing a Chinatown and downtown centers. Twenty years in adult teaching has confirmed my views and beliefs of the need and value of adult education. All, regardless of age, sex, religion, racial or ethnic background have had an opportunity to continue their education — in this rapidly-changing and increasingly complex technical society this must continue in these days of economic and fiscal uncertainty.

Robert E. Burton

The Sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Booker T. Anderson, 1175 Ellis, Governing Board Member, SCCD
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th Street, College Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader Street, Planning Commissioner
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco

Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Shirley C. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business and Civic Women's Organization

Lulu M. Carter, 2037 Fulton Street, Teacher/Chair Black Caucus

John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon Street, Banker

Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Former Pres. Mexican American Political Assoc.

Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner

Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., College Teacher

Peter M. Finnegan, 555 Post Street, Member, Board of Governors, Calif. Community Colleges

JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., College Business Teacher

James Herman, 635 Connecticut Street, President ILWU

Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant

Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood Street, Supervisor, San Francisco County

Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair

Theodore G. Kaplanis, 600-18th Ave., English Editor

Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon Street, Supervisor

Jean E. Kortum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist

Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero Street, Union Business Agent

John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors

Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator

John Riordan, 1426 Willard, Lawyer

Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Assistant Director

Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney

Hiram E. Smith, 345 Monticello, Director-Legal Services Program

Stanley Smith, 411 Felton Street, Union Official

Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor

ROBERT A. Da PRATO

My address is 374 Laidley

My occupation is Physician

My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am an advocate of individual liberty and a completely voluntary society. If elected, I will:

- work for a Community College system funded entirely by user fees and individual or business donations.

- enthusiastically seek out teachers who attract such voluntary financial support by the excellence and relevance of their instruction.

- oppose all coercive (tax) funding of Community College programs. There is no fair way to spend money extorted through taxation. Each working person — not government — knows best how to spend his/her own hard-earned income.

Vote for Doctor Robert Da Prato for the Community College Board.

Robert A. Da Prato

The Sponsors for Robert A. DaPrato are:

Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert St., Civil Liberties Attorney

Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Activist

George Landis O'Brien, 1506-8th Ave., Economist

Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes, Abortion Rights Activist

Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist

Justin Raimondo, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist

Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President

Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist

Dena M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator

Kathleen O'Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse

Judith Goeltz, 130 Clifford St., Publisher

William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist

Anna B. Couchman, 24 Carmel St., Registered Nurse

Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak, Process Server

Ronald W. Dorsey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant

Francis S. Goeltz, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot

Edward Lee Holder, 374 Laidley St., Systems/Analyst

Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm. Mail Receiving Agent

Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student

Albert Winslow, 1200 Treat St., Salesman

Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant

Richard Winger, 3201 Baker, Ballot Access Consultant

Pennie L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student

Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student/Photographer

Sean Galin, 1608 Sacramento, Rock Star

Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist

CANDIDATES FOR COMM. COLLEGE BOARD

CAROLE MIGDEN

My address is 561 - 28th Street

My occupation is Fiscal Planner/Administrator

My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: As executive director of Operation Concern, a mental health clinic located at Pacific Medical Center, I work daily with budgets and proposal writing for funding.

The Community College system in San Francisco faces grave financial cutbacks in the coming years. My experience in fundraising and budget analysis is critically needed on that board.

When elected I pledge:

- to secure full-time lobby presence in Sacramento to ensure adequate state funding
- to develop additional revenue sources from the public and private sectors
- to maintain the wide range of college programs presently available which meet the needs of our diverse student population.

Carole Migden

The Sponsors for Carole Migden are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County
Sally Brunno, 110 Hoffman Ave., Library Advocate
Donna J. Caravelli, 158 Granville Way, Parent
Agripino R. Cerbato, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Sam Duca, 116 Wawona St., Assessor
Ann Eliaser, 3074 Pacific Ave., Consultant
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores Street, Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Marcia L. Hunt, 146-15th Ave., Public Affairs/Information S.F.U.S.D.
Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Edith Arnstein Jenkins, 456 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Albert V. Lannon, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 827-24th Ave., Dir. Japanese Comm. Youth Council
Milton F. Reiterman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Thomatra N. Scott, 191½ Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Facilities Management
Arlo Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fundraiser
Evelyn L. Wilson, 2159-42nd Ave., Parliamentarian
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Member Community College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis Street, Economist/President Asian Inc.

DR. LELAND MOGLEN,

M.S.; J.D.

My address is 1216 Taylor, #24

My occupation is Public Health Administrator

My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I have been a civil servant for the City and County of San Francisco for over nine continuous years. My life and career is dedicated to public service. I have two graduate degrees from highly accredited local institutions. One is a Master of Science in Business Administration, 1981, from San Francisco State University. The other is a Doctor of Jurisprudence from San Francisco Law School, 1982. I have founded a labor union which is registered with the City & County of San Francisco to prevent the intrusion of political interests into the objective Civil Service System.

Leland Moglen

The Sponsors for Leland Moglen are:

George Quan, 1842 Mason, Sr. Management Assistant
Michael Williams, 1212-10th Ave., Personnel Officer
Jonathan Tsao, 1216 Taylor St., Architect
John M. Decrescenzo, 3024 Laguna, Group Insurance Manager
Gregory L. Johnson, 1716 Fillmore St., Supervisor
Marvin Hall, 1570 Palou Ave., Data Anal. Coordinator
Alice Willis, 169 Serano Dr., Administrative Assistant
JoAnne Jennings, 748 Cayuga Ave., Administrative Assistant
Patricia Zecher MacLachlan, 1338-29th Ave., Medical Assist.
Alfred Kielwasser, 163 Park St., Medical Examiner Assist.
David P. Lewis, 300 Buchanan, Civil Servant
Truman Dennis Bryan, 18-A Norfolk, Eligibility Worker
Helen G. Kairy, 766-30th Ave., Clerk Typist
Babrara A. Proctor, 1216 Taylor, Sales
Jan B. Cacia, 1216 Taylor St., Sales
Juan P. Merjil, 314 Kearney, Health Worker
Susan Rogers, 1660 Sacramento St., Secretary
Mary Pat Cedor, 1567-44th Ave., Storekeeper
Marilyn Sperber, 2665 Chestnut St., Eligibility Worker
Richard J. Trevors, 2423-41st Ave., Medical Records Technician
Philip Gamon, 4118 Moraga St., Receptionist
Patricia J. Decrescenzo, 3024 Laguna St., Accounting Secretary
Elizabeth Liu, 680 Lombard, Pharmacist

CANDIDATES FOR COMM. COLLEGE BOARD

JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 1426 Willard Street

My occupation is Incumbent

My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: Lawyer and father of two sons, Liam and Sean. I was elected to Board since 1972 and served as President, Vice-President and thrice Chairperson of the Finance Committee. The District has over 68,000 students. It has a first rate faculty. The educational cost per student is the lowest in the State. I was Administrative Assistant to Congressman Jack Shelley and part time instructor at University of San Francisco Law School. I serve on these Boards: Council of Civic Unity, A.D.A. and the Irish Literary and Historical Society. I served as Commissioner, San Francisco Social Services Department.

John Riordan

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamonte, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vuksich, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Moncada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

SAL ROSSELLI

My address is 349 Lexington Street

My occupation is Business Manager

My qualifications for office are: Ex-officio College Board Member representing 70,000 San Franciscans attending classes, office holder in statewide Community College associations, City College Valedictorian, Curriculum Committee Chair, former Student Body President.

I'm committed to finding solutions for our District's crises in education, funding and morale.

We must make educational excellence — not politics — our top priority by improving basic academic programs and providing training for existing jobs.

We must lobby the State Legislature more effectively, pursue federal dollars more aggressively and develop new fundraising appeals to foundations and corporations.

We must have open meetings and fair hiring policies to restore educational integrity and revive faculty morale.

Sal Rosselli

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp. App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary I. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fot Theodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.
Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Marguerite Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.

CANDIDATES FOR COMM. COLLEGE BOARD

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street, #12

My occupation is Executive Director, YMCA

My qualifications for office are: I was born in San Francisco and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a Master's Degree in social work. Since 1959, I've served the City through the Council of Churches, United Way, SPUR, Human Rights Commission, and other organizations. I have top-level management experience with Self-Help for the Elderly, Asian Inc., and am presently a YMCA Executive Director.

Mayor Feinstein appointed me to fill the vacancy on the College Board when Judge Lillian Sing left. I intend to use my experience to ensure that the college provides the best possible education for students.

Alan S. Wong


The Sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., President, S.F. Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Community Board Member,
President

Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commission
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Educator and Bank Manager
Carlota Testidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Pres. Civil Serv.
Comm.

Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Drive, Dentist
John Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820 - 47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood, Board of Supervisors, Member of
Eugene S. Hopp, M.D., 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona, Bank Officer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Supervisor
Dick Pabich, 79 Uranus Terrace, Advertising Consultant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., State Board of Equalization,
Retired

John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board Member
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Richard Sklar, 1 Presidio Terrace, Public Official
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Social Worker
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Supervisor
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister Glide Church
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., College Board Member
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist



QUICK! What's a good way to have some fun, help your neighbors, and make some extra money?

ANSWER:

Work at the polls on election day. Apply now in Room 155 City Hall.

快! 有什麼好方法是樂趣的, 幫助鄰居, 同時可以增加收入?


答案:

選舉日在投票站工作! 請即往市政廳一五五室申請。

RAPIDO! Cual es una buena manera de divertirse, ayudar a sus vecinos y ganar dinero?

RESPUESTA

Trabaje en los lugares de votacion el día de las elecciones. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldia de la Ciudad, ahora mismo!



SFPD Citizen Complaint Office

PROPOSITION A

Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department has an Internal Affairs Division within the Department. This Division, staffed by police officers, investigates citizen complaints against police officers and makes recommendations for action to the Chief of Police. There is a civilian investigator who also investigates complaints and reports to the Police Commission.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would create an Office of Citizen Complaints in the Police Department. The Director, appointed by the Police Commission, and the investigators and hearing officers shall never have been members of the Police Department. The Office shall investigate citizen complaints of police misconduct and shall recommend action to the Chief of

Police. This proposition does not eliminate the Internal Affairs Division. It does not prohibit the Department from investigating and taking action now permitted by the Charter. The Office shall make monthly summaries of complaints and quarterly reports concerning possible changes and amendments in Department policies and practices.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Citizen's Complaints within the Police Department.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want complaints by citizens to continue to be handled by the Internal Affairs Division and the civilian investigator.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, the increase in the cost of government would be determined by the Office of Citizen Complaints' approved annual budget. For fiscal year 1982-83 the cost increase could not exceed \$625,000 adjusted thereafter for inflation.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On May 24 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, John Molinari, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP A
BEGINS ON PAGE 86**

SFPD Citizen Complaint Office



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITON A

A YES vote on Proposition A will give us more police protection, increase the cost-effectiveness of the Police Department, and improve relations between citizens and the police.

In 1981, San Franciscans spent more than \$850,000 to have 16 police officers behind desks investigating citizens' complaints in the Police Department. Prop. A requires the Police Commission to hire trained civilian investigators to do this work, putting those 16 police officers on the street where they are needed to prevent crime.

Civilian investigators' salaries will cost the city less than those of police officers, whose benefits cost four times those of other city employees. Prop. A will limit the budget for investigating citizens' complaints to 60% of what was spent in 1981 — reducing the cost of these investigations by over \$350,000. That is money which will be spent for salaries of police officers who are back on the street. And the city will still have competent, fair investigations of complaints against the Police Department.

Being a cop is tough work — and the vast majority of our police officers do a good job. But San Franciscans are entitled to get a thorough, fair investigation of complaints against the Police Department when they have problems. It is difficult for police officers to investigate and recommend discipline against fellow police officers. Having trained civilians investigate complaints will be more impartial, and fairer for police officers and citizens.

Propositon A will NOT create a Civilian Review Board or a new bureaucracy. The Police Chief and Police Commission will still make decisions about discipline and police policy. Proposition A means they can do that with unbiased information.

Proposition A is a fair, responsible and cost-effective plan that San Franciscans have supported for many years.

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for professional law enforcement.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will:

- Put more police officers on the street fighting crime.
- Provide fair, efficient, professional investigators of citizens complaints.
- Save taxpayers in investigative costs.
- Help reward professional conduct in our police force and improve its respect in the community.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Assemblyman
Jeff Brown
Public Defender
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louis Hop Lee
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A


Proposition A would, after 1985 when a court ordered consent decree expires, allow a savings in salary costs that could be well over \$400,000 when high priced police officers are replaced with less expensive civilian investigators.

Furthermore, Proposition A will provide professional and unbiased investigations of complaints against police officers. Currently, police officers accused of misconduct are investigated by fellow officers. That's just not fair for the officer or for the person making the complaint.

Lastly, when only police officers can be used to investigate other police officers, an atmosphere of mistrust is engendered, as some think that they cannot be impartial because of the personal and professional friendships that develop between the investigator and the accused.

Proposition A makes fiscal sense and is just good government. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto



SFPD Citizen Complaint Office

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A to ensure fair and impartial handling of citizen complaints against the police department.

Complaints of police misconduct are now investigated by police officers assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (I.A.B.). Proposition A would mandate the creation of an Office of Citizen Complaints (O.C.C.) staffed by professional civilian investigators, hired through civil service. Proposition A also affords persons filing complaints — and the accused officer — a hearing before a civilian hearing officer.

Proposition A will promote efficient, cost-effective investigation of citizen complaints: the O.C.C.'s budget is limited to 60% of the I.A.B.'s budget. The supervisory-rank police officers now staffing the I.A.B. can be reassigned to law enforcement work.

Most important, Proposition A will give the public and the police greater confidence that the complaint-resolution process is impartial. It is difficult for police officers to investigate complaints against co-workers. And complainants often feel intimidated or frustrated when one police officer investigates a complaint against another.

Police officers also will benefit, because O.C.C. investigations, unlike those of the I.A.B., will not be

subject to questions regarding favoritism, impartiality and fairness.

Proposition A does not create a civilian review board. The Police Commission, composed of five citizens appointed by the Mayor, will continue to manage the Police Department and serve as a disciplinary review board. Proposition A would not shift the department's disciplinary powers, which remain with the Police Chief and Commission. But Proposition A will better equip the Commission to carry out its responsibilities by providing a civilian investigative staff, the benefit of a hearing record, and the findings of a hearing officer in disciplinary cases arising out of citizen complaints.

Proposition A will not cripple the police in fighting crime. It does not change the police officer's authority to take necessary steps, including use of reasonable force, to apprehend criminal suspects.

For professional law enforcement, a stronger Police Commission and more public confidence in the S.F.P.D., vote Yes on A.

Submitted by:

Bar Association of San Francisco
Barristers Club of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A

I urge you to vote for the Office of Citizen Complaints. Vote YES on Prop. A.

Doris M. Ward

Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reject Moscone-Milk "killer-cop" Dan White: YES on "A" ... Defeat BART Board's Eugene Garfinkle (whom Dan White ballot-sponsored in 1978).

— MOSCONE MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

Leland Tam

PRESIDENT OF MOSCONE MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEEMEN OPPOSE!

- BART Candidate *Robert Silvestri*
- Republican Committeeman *Terence Faulkner*
- *David Sigal*

Don't demoralize policemen!!! VOTE NO.

Robert Silvestri

— BART Candidate
(Republican Committeeman)

Terence Faulkner
(Republican Committeeman)

SFPD Citizen Complaint Office



ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This is another ludicrous Hayden-Fonda "Committee for Economic Democracy" proposal embraced and sponsored locally by Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker. This charter amendment would add a totally redundant additional layer of bureaucracy to municipal government; \$625,000 worth of "fat" APPOINTIVE jobs the FIRST year!

It is absolutely irrational! The described functions of the "POLICE COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT" are precisely the Charter designated responsibilities of our

EXISTING Police Commission; a commission that has recently redoubled it's efforts to satisfy ALL citizen complaints promptly.

Surely our numerical minority of leftist Supervisors can "dream up" more creative ways to THROW AWAY \$625,000 each year, FOREVER! We urge a NO vote

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The concept of this proposal is not a new one, but rather a product of the 1960's that has been abolished in nearly every major metropolitan police department in the country. Similar proposals have proven to be ineffective and costly without any discernible benefit to the department or the community in cities where these proposals have been tried.

The proponents of Proposition A would like our citizens to believe that complaints of misconduct against your police officers are not being investigated properly, and that disciplinary action is not being administered. These assertions are misleading, and in fact, incorrect. As a direct result of complaints lodged against police officers during the past six years, over six hundred officers have been reprimanded, suspended and terminated by the Chief or the Police Commission.


Recent changes within the police department now provide that **all investigations** are reviewed or re-investigated by a **senior civilian investigator** as well as reviewed by five Civilian Police Commissioners. These newly installed safeguards are working to the satisfaction of our citizens, as well as providing a sound mechanism for the effective administration of discipline.

SUCCESS DOES NOT COME EASY. Why add another layer of bureaucracy that will have an initial cost of \$625,000 that will rise dramatically year after year. Proposition A may sound like a "cure-all", but as an Administrator with thirty years of experience, I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and will have little if any benefit to the citizens we are serving.

Vote NO on Proposition A

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

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



Muni Acquisitions

PROPOSITION B

Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 cent of each \$100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The budget for the Municipal Railway (Muni) may not include money for capital costs for more than $\frac{3}{4}$ of one cent on each \$100 of taxable property. When capital costs are more than this limit, the extra money needed must be raised by the sale of bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would remove the present limit of $\frac{3}{4}$ of one cent on each \$100 of taxable property when budgeting for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other necessary equipment.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to remove the present limit on the City's ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present limit on the City's ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.

NOTE

Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Lee Dolson, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT
OF PROPOSITION B
BEGINS ON PAGE 87.**

Muni Acquisitions



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Your YES on "B" vote will allow us to move quickly to buy the necessary additional vehicles for the Muni and thus relieve the heavy overcrowding on some of our heaviest travelled lines.

Presently, a section of the Charter dating back to 1932 requires that we use expensive Bond funds for the Muni's capital needs. That may have made sense then, but it does not make sense fifty years later. All it does is to tie our hands, forcing us to use a slower and far more expensive way of getting busses on the streets than is necessary.

Everyone would agree that paying for what we buy out of current revenues is far cheaper than to be forced into long term borrowing at today's astronomical interest rates, yet, unless you vote YES on "B"

we will be forced to borrow money to pay for Muni buses even while we have the cash on hand to pay for them right now.

Your YES on "B" vote will allow us to buy vehicles to relieve the terrible overcrowding on many Muni lines as soon as we have the funds to do so. And the funds are on hand, yet they cannot be used to buy the busses, trolleys and trains we need unless Proposition B passes.

I believe that the Muni's need for vehicles is critical and immediate. I hope that you join me in voting YES on "B" so that we may quickly and economically move to replace and increase the Muni's fleet.

VOTE YES ON "B".

Dianne Feinstein

Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

An obsolete Charter provision prevents the City from buying a fleet of buses to relieve our overcrowding on the Muni Railway. It is a 50-year-old roadblock that obstructs solutions to present-day trans-

it needs in our city. Removing this antiquated legal barrier will enable the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to deal more effectively with today's urgent transit needs. **Vote yes for progress.**

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP B WAS SUBMITTED

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!

Únicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre de 1982, usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando \$43, o como inspector, ganando \$52.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.



Industrial Development Financing

PROPOSITION C

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no authority in the San Francisco Charter that allows the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to finance industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in financing the acquisition, construction, improvement, and equipping of facilities for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses. The repayment of the bonds or notes would be made by the private parties. The bonds or notes would create no liability or

debt for the City. They would not obligate the Board of Supervisors to levy any taxes or make any appropriation for their repayment. The issuance of the bonds or notes is not subject to a vote of the people.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell 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 affect the cost of government.

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT
OF PROPOSITION C
APPEARS ON PAGE 88.**

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On August 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Lee Dolson, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

Industrial Development Financing



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON C

As the author of the legislation which allowed San Francisco to take advantage of a new State law that, for the first time, permitted local governmental entities to make use of industrial development bonds, I urge you to vote Yes on Prop. C.

This will enable the City to market such bonds by itself rather than be forced to utilize cumbersome State procedures.

Submitted by:

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would help us attract and retain industry in San Francisco and thus to provide the jobs that go with economic development.

Proposition C would allow the City and County to sponsor the issuance of Industrial Development Bonds. The proceeds of these tax free bonds would be used exclusively to help finance additional industrial and commercial businesses which will generate both "blue collar" and "white collar" jobs for our people.

Due to today's high interest rates, many local businesses cannot expand. Many persons wishing to develop industrial complexes or businesses cannot do so. Proposition C would allow the City to issue tax exempt bonds and to lend the proceeds on a long

term basis to qualified applicants. Thus, new jobs which we so desperately need for San Franciscans will be generated.

The taxpayers of the City have absolutely **no risk** in these bonds. The purchaser of the bonds looks exclusively to the borrower for repayment. Hundreds of other cities throughout the land are now helping small businesses and helping themselves by using this method of creating industrial growth and jobs. It is high time we join them and put an end to a competitive disadvantage which we now suffer.

For Jobs . . . Vote Yes on C.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Tax exempt industrial development bonds are used by municipalities, nationwide, to attract new industry and commercial development to their cities. (Some even grant ten-year property tax moratoriums!).

San Francisco has been remiss in its past failure to utilize this government-sponsored financial tool in fostering local development of increased industrial activity.

This Charter Amendment permits San Francisco's Industrial Development Authority to SPONSOR these

bond issues for local small business firms. The "full faith and credit" of San Francisco is not in jeopardy and the City is not, in any way, liable for repayment of these bonds.

This measure will mean more "blue collar" jobs for San Franciscans and an increase in our property tax base. It will reduce San Francisco's dependence upon tourist business.

Vote "YES" on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Don't give the Supervisors a blank check. Vote "NO"!!!

Bob Geary
BART Board Candidate (Democratic Committeeman)

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner



Surviving Spouse Health Benefits

PROPOSITION D

Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System Fund for active and retired employees. The City does not contribute anything for spouses of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would provide that the City contribute to the Health Service System Fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least

one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System Fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately \$579,000.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 12 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT
OF PROP D APPEARS
ON PAGE 89.**

NOTE

Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Surviving Spouse Health Benefits



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The city now contributes part of the cost of providing health care to active and retired employees of the City & County. The subsidy ends on the death of the employee.

PROPOSITION D provides for an extension of the city aid to the surviving spouse to help them meet ever-increasing medical and hospital costs.

PROPOSITION D insures that the surviving spouses SHALL PAY AS MUCH BUT NOT MORE for health care than that charged those active and retired employees who fortunately have not suffered the loss of their loved ones. The number of surviving spouses involved is approximately 1200 and the cost is minimal.

It is particularly gratifying to surviving spouses that the Health Services System trustees, the Board of Supervisors and citizen groups throughout the com-

munity have enthusiastically endorsed PROPOSITION D.

On behalf of our deserving surviving spouses, the organization of Retired Employees of the City & County strongly urges YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Gerald Gallagher, President

Retired Employees City, County of San Francisco

Endorsed by:

John L. Molinari

Board of Supervisors

Louise H. Renne

Board of Supervisors

Richard D. Hongisto

Board of Supervisors

Lee Dolson

Board of Supervisors

Wendy Nelder

Board of Supervisors

Carol Ruth Silver

Board of Supervisors

Harry G. Britt

Board of Supervisors

Nancy G. Walker

Board of Supervisors

Willie B. Kennedy

Board of Supervisors

Doris M. Ward

Board of Supervisors

F. Walter Johnson

Pres. Health Service Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This Charter Amendment, if successful, will lighten the heavy financial load being shouldered by the category "Surviving Spouse" in the Health Service System. A situation that should have been corrected years ago. These individuals, either husband or wife, must continue to carry on alone, rearing a family, fighting inflation and just striving to survive.

When the City worker passes on, the first jolt the surviving spouse receives is 50% (one-half) of the retirement benefits, and this only if the employee was qualified for retirement, otherwise the survivor receives only what was contributed to the retirement system by the deceased.

The next setback is the withdrawal of City subsidy for Health Care — the fight for survival becomes more intense.

There are but 1200 individuals in this category — the cost to the taxpayer to partially subsidize their health plan is insignificant.

Compassion is the word. The voters of this City have always helped the underdog. We urge you to help this small group with a "YES" vote.

Unanimously endorsed by the Health Service Board.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

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



Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION E

Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System for City employees pays retirement benefits to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement payment stops when the surviving spouse remarries.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that a City employee's surviving spouse, aged 60 or older, who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee. Retirement payments which stopped when a surviving spouse remarried shall start again, unless the surviving spouse remarried before age 60 or married a retired or active City em-

ployee. The surviving spouse will not be paid for the time between remarriage and the date this Proposition becomes effective. Retirement benefits would stop if the surviving spouse remarries a second time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a City employee's surviving spouse who remarries after reaching age 60, unless that surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefits to stop when the surviving spouse remarries.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Lee Dolson, Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT
OF PROPOSITION E
APPEARS ON PAGE 89.**

NOTE

Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At present many retired city employees are living on very small pensions. When death takes their mate they are left alone with an income that in many cases is pitifully small. When the widows and widowers of these deserving retired city employees who have given so much to this city reach this sad state, they should at least be able to remarry and retain their retirement

allowances — after all, they helped earn it. If we can find any of the milk of human kindness in ourselves we certainly should find it in ourselves to be kind to these retired widows and widowers!

Vote yes on E.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION E

Under existing statutes in San Francisco, the widow of a City employee cannot remarry and continue to receive the reduced retirement allowance as the benefit-sharing spouse of the employee. The penalty for remarriage (termination of the allowance for the remainder of their life) was based on the age-old concept in pension plans of one "provider" and one "dependent" in a marriage. In our present day society, threatened or actual loss of a guaranteed retirement benefit for any reason is viewed as an infringement on the freedom of an individual to choose her/his own lifestyle. The penalty would be a particularly cruel restriction on those elderly surviving spouses who would hope to rebuild their shattered lives in the companionship of a second marriage in their later years. It is noteworthy that the Social Security, the Federal Employees Retirement and Rail-

road Retirement Systems now allow the surviving spouse to remarry at age 60 without terminating their retirement allowance. Proponents of Proposition "E" are asking the voters of San Francisco in this legislation to abolish the discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. In meetings with committees of the Board of Supervisors, agreement was reached on certain revisions which are included in the text of the finally approved Charter Amendment and which specify that: A SURVIVING SPOUSE AT OR AFTER AGE 60 CAN REMARRY ONE TIME ONLY AND PROVIDING FURTHER THAT THERE CAN BE NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS OR BENEFITS PAID TO SURVIVING SPOUSES.

Vote "YES" on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As a Retired City Employee I urge all voters to end discrimination for surviving spouses.

Having had 44 years of service, and paying my share to provide a continued allowance for my spouse in the event of death, which would continue for the remaining years of my spouse's life, without any extra funding for her benefit. If the desire is to remarry and provide the comfort of security and companionship and safety, so be it.

Why penalize a person and take away the allowance that already has been funded and provided? Only one remarriage after age 60 would be allowed and no retroactive funds would be paid.

The Social Security, the Federal and Railroad Retirement Systems allow remarriage after age 60.

The Controller Farrell, Quote: "The costs cannot be

accurately determined."

Spousal Retirement benefits, the spokesman said "Quote" "The eventual costs are difficult to peg because it's a new field. We have no actuarial data."

"We also do not know how many people the plan would affect."

The Data Processing have the information on every active, retired and beneficiary to provide how many it would affect.

The Chief Actuary retired July, 1982 and stated that the cost should be minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by:

William T. Reed

PAST PRESIDENT S.F. RETIREMENT BOARD
PAST PRESIDENT RETIRED EMPLOYEES CITY & COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO



Supervisors' Salary

PROPOSITION G

Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of \$23,924 per year?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors consists of eleven members. Each member of the Board is paid a salary of \$9,600 per year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G provides that each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors would be paid a salary of \$23,924 per year.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be paid a salary of \$23,924 per year.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to continue to be paid a salary of \$9,600 per year.

Controller's Statement on "G"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by \$157,564.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Lee Dolson, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE

Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face type**; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

2.100 Composition and Salary

The board of supervisors shall consist of 11 members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ((\$9,600)) **\$23,924** per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of \$5,000. (End)

Supervisors' Salary



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

G MEANS GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government requires good people. But, as any recruitment officer or personnel director will tell you, you can only attract good people if you have a reasonable and updated compensation schedule.

San Francisco voters recognized that fact back in 1964 when they voted to increase the Board of Supervisors salary to \$9600 — an amount that **exceeded** the then \$8343 average salary of supervisors in the other nine Bay Area counties.

Today, almost two decades later, San Francisco's supervisors still receive the same \$9600. In contrast, the average salary of the supervisors in the other Bay Area counties increased to \$25,931. While the salary of San Francisco's supervisors has remained stagnant, the Board's responsibilities have become manifestly more serious and significant. In 1964, the Board of Supervisors dealt with a \$276,000,000 budget. The budget for 1982-83 is approximately \$1,330,000,000.

Such financial responsibility requires talent and expertise — attributes which many constituents recall having been represented in greater abundance on Boards of the past when the \$9600 salary meant

something. But what kind of talent can you expect to attract with a salary that today allows a family of four to qualify for food stamps?

VOTE YES ON G

Prop G will increase supervisors' salaries to \$23,924:

—This is the amount, as certified by the Budget Analyst, that supervisors would be earning currently if their 1964 salaries had kept pace with the most conservative Consumer Price Index, compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor.

—This is an amount that is under but still consistent with the \$25,931 average for supervisors' pay in the other Bay Area counties.

—This is an amount that has been offset by some \$70,000 in cuts that the Board recently made in its own budget.

—This is an amount that will encourage better qualified candidates, whose values we share, to run for the Board.

FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT VOTE YES ON G

Submitted by:

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

A Supervisor currently makes \$9,600.00 a year. His or her Administrative Assistant makes \$23,672.00 and the Legislative Aide makes \$23,070.00.

This is incredible when Supervisors in other jurisdictions are making over fifty thousand dollars a year!

To do this job effectively requires a minimum of forty hours a week. Conscientious Supervisors must devote every weekend reviewing pounds of documents delivered to their homes every Friday afternoon so they can be totally familiar with the issues to be debated the following Monday. They must also attend eight committee meetings a month. The balance of their time is devoted to satisfying constituent's complaints, preparing legislation, and hopefully devoting a few hours towards earning some outside "part-time" income.

As matters now stand, only the independently wealthy, or wild-eyed irrational zealots, driven by an insatiable desire for political power, aspire to this office.

We will never be able to attract credible, highly intelligent, competent businesslike candidates for Supervisor while the salary remains so penurious.

Remember, this Board is running a \$1.3 billion dollar a year corporation for you! While \$23,924 a year is certainly no princely sum, at least the officeholders no longer will be eligible for welfare and food stamps at the modest increase in salary being proposed. This is tax money well spent!! Vote YES!

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

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.



Supervisors' Salary

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Eighteen years ago salaries were set for members of the Board of Supervisors at \$9,600 per year. Because of inflation the purchasing power of this salary has actually dwindled to \$3,200 per year. With no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no per diem, essentially no extra income or benefits from serving as Supervisor, our representatives on the Board face a very real financial burden.

As a past member of the Board of Supervisors, I realize that the job is virtually impossible unless an

individual has an outside source of income. This fact of life eliminates a large number of people of average means from even considering running for this office. Also, the demands of being a responsible Supervisor dictate that there is little or no time to moonlight on another job.

I strongly urge you to correct this financial imbalance by voting YES ON G. After 18 years, it's the responsible thing to do.

Dianne Feinstein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G

The San Francisco City Charter requires that any pay increase to be given members of the Board of Supervisors, must be approved by the voters. The Supervisors' current salary of \$9,600 per year was granted by the voters in 1967. It is clearly time to consider an increase.

Proposition G is a simple straightforward pay raise based on inflation. It has no fancy formulas or hid-

den benefits. Voters retain the right to grant any future increases.

The current salary of \$9,600 per year requires an unreasonable sacrifice by those who serve in that office. A higher salary would encourage more citizens of average means to seek public office. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Gregory Hurst

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON G

In the past 50 years there have been only two increases in the original \$2400 salary of supervisors established by the 1932 Charter: 1) in 1956 when the electorate doubled the pay to \$4800 and 2) in 1964 when the pay was increased to the current \$9600 level. No other increase has been made in the almost two decades which have since elapsed. Now, the effects of inflation have reduced the buying power of that \$9600 to a mere \$3958 making what was once a respectable salary a mere "token."

By not changing the salary of supervisors to reflect the increases in living expenses which have occurred over the past 18 years, San Francisco is selling itself short in terms of the quality of people it attracts to run for its Board of Supervisors.

Taxpayers in the other eight Bay Area counties have long recognized the need to have their supervisors' salaries keep abreast of inflation. The average salary in the neighboring jurisdictions today is \$25,931. While these other counties have only five

supervisors, all have city council members in profusion. Thus, the taxpayers in these counties pay far more for their local legislators, including council members (an average of \$277,500 in salaries and fringes per county) than San Francisco's taxpayers whose 11 supervisors act as both a city council and county legislature and whose combined salaries and fringes total only \$111,485.

VOTE YES ON "G"

MAKE A LONG OVERDUE ONE-TIME COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN SUPERVISORS' SALARIES.

Michael Laderman
San Francisco Common Cause
Kamini Gupta
William Reed
Sam Duca
Cynthia Landi
Catherine Scanlon
James Stark
William Murray
Emmet Condon
Alessandro Baccari

Nicholas Sapunar
William Best
Priscilla Scannell
Dennis Antenore
Valerie Pope
Janet Wentworth
Don Kates
Leo Murphy
Frank Aiello
Victorino Hermoso
Willis Hannawalt

Supervisors' Salary



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The last salary change for members of the Board of Supervisors was nearly 20 years ago. Right: during that period there has been no increase in the salary of San Francisco Supervisors. The result of inflation over the past 20 years is that what **\$9,600 (that's the salary of your Supervisors)** would buy in 1964 now buys only about **\$3,500** worth of groceries.

Approving this increase in Supervisors' pay is reasonable, fair, and is a way to insure good government in San Francisco. Average San Franciscans would consider serving on the Board of Supervisors — but at the current salary, they can't. This proposed increase does not even make up for inflation. But it would make it possible for people who are not independently rich — people who have to support themselves by working — also to be Supervisors.

For San Franciscans to be assured that high quality people — people who are well-equipped to run this City as it should be run — will continue to be elected to the Board of Supervisors it is necessary that

they not have to take a vow of poverty to serve their City.

This proposal would increase the salary of Supervisors to \$23,924 per year. This is a hard and fast figure, and it cannot be increased by anyone but the voters of San Francisco. It will allow the voters to continue to have the control over the salary of the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Supervisors at \$9,600 per year get less than any of the other nine Bay Area counties. The salaries for Supervisors range from \$16,500 in Napa County to \$35,771 in San Mateo County.

Voting YES ON G will make sure that good and hard-working San Franciscans can afford to be members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. It is the way to be sure that we don't have government for and by only the independently wealthy.

Vote YES ON "G".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

YES ON G

We, the citizens of the neighborhoods of San Francisco, support a salary increase for the members of the Board of Supervisors to reflect the cost of living increases that have occurred over the past 18 years.

Robert and Cheryl Arenson
Judith Thorson
Martin A. Fellhauer
Camille F. Reed
James V. Ahern
Ernest and Barbara Munoz
Louis and Violet Sozzi
Maxine and Walter Crombie
David and Carol Mullin
Aloysius J. Smyth
Joan Willemssen
Raymond and Clare White
Rene and Emolyn Codis
Harry Soden
Henry Jebe
Harry and Marge Stein
Albert and Mary Groth

Evelyn Stanfield
Isabelle Burns
Thomas and Mary De Natale
John and Ann Halla
Edward O'Donnell
Thomas and Margaret Carroll
Frank and Bessie Flaherty
Mary Kane
Margaret Farbstein
John and Madeline Sheerin
William and Irene Keating
Joseph and Agnes Mibach
Dorothy Nissley
Caroline Benn
Eleanor Davis
Rory Flood
Gail Inlander

Ramona Dougherty
Josephine B. Ramus
Martha and Maurice Wolohan
Lawrence V. Eppinette
Ann Fogelberg
Doug and Joan Fenton
Margot McCormick
Barbara Lee Marie Elvander
Frank and Maud Carli
Rita Dallimonti
Hazel Laine
Dora Gonzales
Francis and Geraldine Shannon
Marian Woods
Mary Bottom
Katherine Fogarty
Joseph A. Carew
A.J. Kane
Anne McHale
Carole Allison
Stephen Garibaldi
Helen Vargas
Frank Linney
Laura Moffitt
John Oliva
Bernie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavellini

Robert Galusha
Kenneth Payeh
Ann Gary
Cheryl Martel
Frank Naccarato
Ruth Passen
Enola Maxwell
Hal Cruzan
Walter G. Jebe
Miriam Steinbeck
Gerold Gallagher
John Thompson
Frank Lueibello
Veronica Murray
Helen Nongnier
Frances Condon
Frances and Rudy Hallberg
Helen and Clarence Rosenstock
William and Ethel Best
Walter and Kathleen Glynn
Walter and Fern Feyling
Richard and Evelyn Wilson
Robert Todd
Lloyd and Verna Ricci
Loma Follett
William McGrath



Supervisors' Salary

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

As San Franciscans we are long overdue in addressing the issue of Supervisor's salaries. A yes vote on PROPOSITION G is, simply, the responsible thing for us to do.

THE PROBLEM

- The salary for members of the Board of Supervisors has not been raised from \$9,600 per year since 1964. During the past 18 years the cost of living has tripled; as a consequence the actual purchasing power of the current salary is roughly \$3,200 per year (if housing costs are included in the inflation factor).
- Present members of the Board of Supervisors, although highly qualified, may not be able to continue to serve unless we do something now to correct the financial hardship this imposes. In addition, highly qualified candidates, in the future, may not be able to run for the Board of Supervisors and

serve the city.

- People of average means cannot afford to run and serve on the Board of Supervisors because the current salary is so out of line with what it costs to get by today.

THE SOLUTION

- A realistic cost of living increase based on an amount somewhat less than the actual inflation rate.
- Action on this issue by passing Proposition G before we get further and further behind compounding the problems now facing us.

A yes vote on G will resolve an 18-year-old problem and get us back on the track of good government in San Francisco. Join me in voting YES ON G, after 18 years it's the responsible thing to do.

Cyril Magnin

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on "G"

Are you aware what it takes to operate our present Board of Supervisors? Thirty-three persons with an annual salary of \$600,952.

Let's break it down:

Eleven supervisors at \$800 per month		
— \$9,600 annually	11 x \$9,600	\$ 105,600
Eleven administrative aides at \$1960		
per month — \$23,582 annually times 11		259,402
Eleven legislative aides at 1786 per		

month — \$21,450 annually times 11	235,950
Total	\$ 600,952

If they would eliminate one member of their staff the taxpayers could afford an increase for a part-time supervisor. However, there is no indication noted in the proposition that this might occur. If it is not in writing, it is not valid.

VOTE NO ON "G"

Edna Mae Martin
Senior Citizen

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Why not limousines?
Why not yachts?
Why not Elizabeth Ray?
Vote "NO"!!!

BART Board Candidate *Bob Geary* (Democratic Committeeman)
Former City Commissioner *Terence Faulkner*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

What QUENTIN KOPP said about Proposition J (a defeated 1980 measure to raise Supervisors' pay to 25% of the Mayor's salary): "The City is facing a dire financial crisis ... Proposition J ... is the wrong idea at the wrong time."

Proposition J would have given Supervisors a 61%

pay hike in 1980. Proposition G will grant them a 120% pay increase now. Like Proposition J, G is the wrong idea at the wrong time.

— BART Candidate *Robert Silvestri*
(Republican Committeeman)
— *Terence Faulkner* (Republican Committeeman)

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

"Miscellaneous" Employees' Retirement



PROPOSITION H

Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees pay a percentage of their salaries to the City's Retirement System. For city employees hired before November 2, 1976, the amount of the payment is based on several factors. They include the age of the employee at the time of employment, an assumed retirement age of 60, and a total contribution from the employee that will pay one half the pension. The amount of the employee's contribution changes according to economic conditions and actuarial surveys.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H provides that city employees who joined the Retirement System before November 2, 1976,

would pay a fixed 7½% of their pay to the City's Retirement System. This proposition does not apply to police officers and firefighters, who are members of separate retirement plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a fixed 7½% of their salaries to the Retirement System.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a flexible amount into the Retirement System. This amount is figured on an individual basis.

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately \$630,000 commencing July 1, 1983.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Harry Britt, Lee Dolson, Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

**THE FULL LEGAL
TEXT OF PROP H
BEGINS ON PAGE 62**

NOTE

**Your polling place location appears
on the back cover of this pamphlet
(see "arrow").**



"Miscellaneous" Employees' Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is designed to provide stability and uniformity in the setting of employee rates of contribution to the Retirement System.

The Retirement System currently administers six separate pension plans, five of which provide "Fixed" employee rates of contribution. The remaining plan, covering some 11,000 miscellaneous members, provides for fluctuating, varied rates of contribution based on "age at entry" into the plan.

Basing rates of contribution on "age at entry" is an out-dated method. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary has advised the Board that a "fixed" rate of contribution would better serve both the members of the System and the taxpayers of San Francisco. Currently, "age at entry" rates are affected by actuarial and economic assumptions, which are subject to continuous change with each valuation of the System.

Proposition H will preclude these continuous changes. It will set the rate at 7½% for members covered under Section 8.509, a rate greater than that

paid by all other members of the System. It will provide proper funding of the System by allowing the City's rate to be set without interference created by the current choice of assumptions on member rates. More importantly for San Francisco taxpayers, there will be savings in the future resulting from the simplification of the plan. Those savings cannot be estimated at this time but such savings could be greater than the projected initial years' cost.

Proposition H will bring San Francisco into line with other major public employee plans which have changed to fixed employee rates of contribution, including the California State Public Employees Retirement System, the State Teachers' Retirement System and other major California cities.

Proposition H will provide an equitable, fair and responsible method for setting member rates of contributions. Proposition H will relieve taxpayers of unnecessary and expensive administrative and actuarial cost.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions 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 ((double parentheses)).

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, 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-fourth 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 payment is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workmen's 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,

(Continued on page 90)

Police Retirement



PROPOSITION I

Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers belong to one of two different plans that cover retirement, disability and death benefits. Officers become eligible for retirement benefits at the age of 50, after a minimum of 25 years of service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I creates a new retirement and disability plan for police officers. Officers hired after November 1, 1982, would belong to this plan. Officers hired before November 1, 1982, would be able to change from their present retirement and disability plan to the new one.

Under the new plan officers could retire after 20 years of service. There would be

no minimum age requirement for benefits.

An annual cost of living increase paid to a retired officer would equal half of the annual salary increase paid to active officers who hold the rank at which the officer retired.

Disability payments would be set on a sliding scale, depending on the severity of the disabling injury.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want a new retirement and disability plan for police officers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing retirement and disability plans for police officers.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

Based on actuarial analysis by the City Retirement System, the proposed initiative Charter amendment would, in my opinion, increase the cost of government by approximately \$17 million.

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I
BEGINS ON PAGE 94.**

How Prop I Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition I had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 27,932 signatures which they turned into the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,820 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.



Police Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition L (November 2, 1976), which passed by a slim margin of the vote (5%), reduced retirement/disability benefits for police officers hired after that date. Over 40% of the sworn officers in the department today receive substantially lower benefits than their peers hired prior to 1976.

In a 1979 Federal Court Decree, guidelines were established regarding the hiring practices of the Civil Service Commission and the San Francisco Police Department pertaining to women and minorities. Goals were established to insure their fair representation within the department. It is precisely these people however, who have been adversely affected by the reduction of benefits contained in Prop. L.

Nearly 30,000 voters in San Francisco recently signed petitions in favor of putting Proposition I on the November ballot. Prop. I would correct the inequity of having two officers who perform the same difficult and often dangerous duties compensated at two substantially different levels. In addition, it would rectify survival (spouse and/or dependents) benefits currently being offered for those who die in the line of duty.

The challenge of effective law enforcement in today's society of high and rising crime rates requires competent men and women from all backgrounds and walks of life. At a cost of approximately .99 cents a month, you can help create one fair system of compensation and at the same time help the San Francisco Police Department become competitive in recruiting the finest people for the job.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Bob Barry
President S.F. Police Officers Association
Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore
Gordon Lau
Former Supervisor
Phillip Burton
Member of Congress
Chuck Ayala
Director, C.Y.O.
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
John Foran
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A yes vote on Proposition I will raise future police officers to the same level of disability and retirement benefits as officers hired before November 1976. We now have two disability and retirement systems for the Police Department — one being substantially inferior to the other, despite the reality that all officers perform the same duties under the same difficult cir-

cumstances. Prop. I will unify the present system, providing equal treatment for all officers.

Vote yes on Prop. I.

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly Assemblyman, 17th District
Doris Ward
Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will have a great influence on the future of the San Francisco Police Department. As your Assemblyman, I have always focused my efforts in the areas of equality for every person. Most people are unaware of the division within the ranks of the San Francisco Police Department. The department is now recruiting women and minority candidates to enter as new officers; yet upon being hired, they are not afforded the same retirement protections, or disability

benefits when injuries are sustained, as senior officers. This is not fair as they are providing us with the same quality law enforcement as senior officers. When Proposition I passes, it will create a fair and just system of retirement and disability within our police department.

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District

Police Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A Yes vote on Proposition I is a must if San Francisco professes to treat the minority members of San Francisco Police Department in an equitable manner. Under the current pension system being offered by the city, all the officers who joined the Department after 1976 are subjected to lower compensation than those who had joined prior. Minority officers are being affected disproportionately due to the fact that the majority of them were hired after 1976.

The city and county is having difficulty retaining its officers due to its inability to compete with other jurisdictions which offers better compensation. The min-

ority officers of San Francisco are being actively recruited by other jurisdictions which desires their activity and ability to handle minority problems. As a result, many San Francisco trained minority officers have joined the ranks of other jurisdictions. It costs approximately \$30,000 to successfully train a new officer. The failure of this city to retain these officers will cost the city a lot more than the new pension plan. Please vote yes on Proposition I to correct the present inequity and save the city money.

Nelson Lum

President

Northern California Asian Peace Officers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

FIGHT CRIME! Vote "YES"!!!

BART Board Candidate *Bob Geary*
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman *Arlo Hale Smith*
Republican Committeeman *Terence Faulkner*

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP I WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official of the City of San Francisco.

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to
vote on election
day, November 2nd.
Bilingual workers
are especially
needed. Apply in
Rm. 155 City Hall.

找工作?
何須再找呢?

於十一月二日選舉日
在投票站協助
公民投票! 特別
需要雙語言人士
請立即往市政廳
一五五室申請。

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
¡NO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos
a votar el día de las
elecciones, el 2 de
noviembre. Se necesitan
personas bilingües
especialmente. Obtenga
una solicitud en la
Oficina 155 de la
Alcaldía de la Ciudad.



Police Overtime

PROPOSITION J

Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When a police officer works overtime or works on a holiday, the officer gets one hour's pay for each extra hour worked or gets one hour off for each extra hour worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J provides that when a police officer works overtime or on a holiday the officer shall be paid for time and one-half or shall be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked. The officer may choose to be paid or to take the time off.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of time and one-half or to be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of one hour's pay or one hour off for each extra hour worked.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately \$1,250,000.

NOTE

Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").

How Prop J Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition J had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 29,010 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,860 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT
OF PROP J APPEARS
ON PAGE 99**

Police Overtime



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION FOR BALLOT INITIATIVE

Time & One Half for Overtime & Holiday

The members of the San Francisco Police Department are requesting a change in the rate of pay Sworn Officers receive for working overtime and holidays.

Sworn Officers currently receive straight time for working overtime and holidays. Proposition J will increase this rate of pay from straight time to time and one half for every hour of overtime or holiday they work.

Time and one half is a justified compensation for the work our police officers perform. In addition, time and one half for overtime and holidays is the common rate of pay for many police departments in this

state. Increasing overtime and holiday benefits for San Francisco police officers will help our department maintain a competitive edge with other police departments in this state.

The San Francisco Police Department is currently losing many of their officers every year, many of whom are transferring to other departments that offer better benefit packages. If we are to keep our well trained police officers in San Francisco, we need to provide adequate compensation for the work they perform. I encourage you to join me in supporting Proposition J.

VOTE YES ON PROP. J

Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore of the Assembly
Gordon Lau
Former S.F. Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is a simple issue of allowing our police officers to be paid at the same rate of pay for overtime as other city and state law enforcement agencies. These dedicated people deserve to be treated equally and fairly. Proposition J is equal and fair.

Please join with me by voting yes on Proposition J.

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District
Chuck Ayala
Director C.Y.O.
Phillip Burton
Member of Congress
5th Congressional District

John Foran
State Senator
6th District
Jo Daly
San Francisco Police
Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J will change the rate of pay for overtime and holidays for members of the Police Department. The change will bring the Police Department up to a comparable level to other local law enforcement agencies and other city employees.

Join with me and vote yes on Proposition J.

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Assemblyman, 17th District
Doris M. Ward
Supervisor
C/C San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Dear Concerned Citizen:

I would like to ask your support for Proposition J. This measure would bring the San Francisco Police Department up to the standards the City has set for other City employees. Proposition J will allow members of the Police Department who work overtime and holidays to be paid at the same rate as

street sweepers, plumbers and other City employees. A Yes vote will bring equality to the Police Department.

Join me with a Yes Vote on Proposition J. Show our devoted officers that they are as important as other City employees.

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police



Police Overtime

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Put yourself in the uniform of the San Francisco Police Officer for just one moment. You have now just joined one of the finest major police departments in the United States. We deal with every major crime imaginable on a daily basis. We have a tremendous work load that requires our officers to work over their normal eight hour day and on holidays. Crime knows no time limitations or holidays, yet our officers rise to meet the challenges every time crime rears its

ugly head. The Charter, written decades ago, prohibits these dedicated officers from receiving time and one half pay for overtime or holidays. Proposition J will change the charter and compensate the police officer for holidays and overtime worked at the same rate as all other local police departments and the same as most other city employees.

San Francisco Police Officers Association
Bob Barry, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

FIGHT CRIME! Vote "YES"!!!

BART Board Candidate *Bob Geary*
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman *Arlo Hale Smith*
Republican Committeeman *Terence Faulkner*

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP J WAS SUBMITTED

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

CAPITULO I. OPORTUNIDAD DE EMPLEO


Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 2 de noviembre. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabajaré auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral.

Pida una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía, Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.

第一章：工作良機

你可以在十一月二日三藩市選舉日工作。特別歡迎雙語言人士應聘。在你鄰近投票站協助選民投票。請往市政廳（潤街夾高街）一五五室申請。

Electric Utility Ownership



PROPOSITION K

Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The company that provides electricity for San Francisco is privately owned. The Charter provides that public utilities can be acquired and owned by the city.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco. The process includes public hearings to determine what will be included in a study. The study would include the cost to acquire the facilities, revenues, consumer rates, management and how the ownership change would take place. The Public Utilities Commission will award the contract

for the study, which is to be completed by June 10, 1984. When the study is completed, the voters, at the next general election, will decide if the city will acquire and operate the electric utility.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the electric utility that serves San Francisco to continue under private ownership.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by \$500,000 to 700,000 in 1982-83 to pay for a feasibility study.

In addition this measure provides for submission of the question of acquisition of the electric utility, bond authorization and related matters at the November 1984 general election.

Based upon data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the current estimated acquisition cost of the electric system would exceed \$800 million. Additional costs of condemnation, asset valuation, litigation, debt ser-


vice and related items cannot be accurately determined at this time, but would be substantial.

Based upon current city debt service rates and amortization periods and data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the total cost of acquisition could exceed \$1.4 billion. The income to the city or lowered rates to subscribers, if any, cannot be determined at this time.

How Prop K Got on Ballot

Proposition K was an initiative ordinance. Filed on August 3, it contained 11,820 valid signatures. 9,679 signatures are needed to qualify for the ballot.

TEXT OF "K" — SEE PAGE 99



Electric Utility Ownership

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Over the past five years, PG&E has raised your electricity rates 157%! Rate increases last winter caused economic hardship for many, and PG&E plans to ask for another billion dollar rate increase this fall. Additionally, cost overruns at PG&E's Diablo Canyon and Helms Creek plants will cost consumers \$3 billion. If you think there must be a better way to light your home, you're right. There is.

Across America, over 2,200 communities own and operate their local electric utilities. In California 21 "public power" cities provide cheap, efficient service to their residents — often at rates less than half what PG&E charges us.

Proposition K calls for a feasibility study to determine what benefits we can expect from public ownership of our electricity system, as well as the best methods to ensure dependable, efficient, and economical service. After the completed study is publicly reviewed, we will vote on whether we want a public power system in San Francisco.

BENEFITS

Lower Rates. A municipal utility can charge lower rates than PG&E because it doesn't pay stockholder profits or advertise. And, unlike PG&E, we have no

incentive to build costly plants, whose power fuels suburban sprawl, not the stable city energy market. Economies realized by the utility would go back to residents, through lower rates, decreased taxes, increased services, or all three. Decisions about our energy future and energy sources would be made publicly.

BUT CAN SAN FRANCISCO RUN AN ELECTRICITY SYSTEM?

The answer is: We already do. Since 1925 San Francisco has operated a hydroelectric plant, Hetch Hetchy, in the Sierras. Power from that plant is currently sold to other cities and industrial concerns. Our city's hydro plant is one of the most efficient in the country; if we owned the distribution system in town, Hetch Hetchy's cheap hydropower would go to city residents instead of non-city users.

We think it makes good sense to go "public power". And the first step, under law, is a thorough, impartial study. WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES to get the facts.

Vote YES on K.

SAN FRANCISCANS FOR PUBLIC POWER
Charlene Clarke, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Smart consumers should shop around before they decide. The following rates are current and for a typical 500 kilowatt monthly bill:

Palo Alto (public)	\$11.06
Redding (public)	\$12.35
Santa Clara (public)	\$14.50

Sacramento (public)	\$15.00
San Francisco (PG&E)	\$34.28

Vote YES on K.

CONSUMER ACTION
Kay Pachtner, Co-director

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Yes on K

Gary Aaronson
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Rob Baker
Robert Barnes
Bernice Biggs
Black Political Caucus
Al Borvice
Supervisor Harry Britt
Dale Butler
Lulu Carter
Manuel Ceballos
Rev. Harry Chuck, Jr.
Citizens for Representative Government
Citizens Party of San Francisco
Gene Coleman
Ina Dearman
Conny Ford


Eulalio Frausto
Corinne Frugoni
Richard Gaikowski
Golden Gate Alliance
Dan Goldstein
Dr. Zuretti Goosby
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Vincent Hallinan
Sue Hestor
Joe Hughes
Espanola Jackson
Candice Jensen
Judy Kaplan
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
David Looman

Thomas McCarthy
Leonel Uriarte Monterey
Anne Moore
Robert Moore
Arthur Morris
Jack Morrison
Nob Hill Neighbors
Michael Nolan
Richmond Involved in Safe Energy
San Franciscan Democratic Club
San Francisco County
Democratic Central Committee
Cynthia Sharpe
Frances Shaskan
Stanley Shields
James Shoch

Sierra Club, San Francisco Group
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Regina Sneed
South of Market Alliance
Charles Starbuck III
Peter Stern
Ida Strickland
Susan Swift
Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee
Joel Ventresca
Supervisor Nancy Walker
W.A.P.A.C.
Karen Werner
Rev. Cecil Williams
Lawrence Wong
Michael Wong
Caran Wyland

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

Electric Utility Ownership



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PG&E claims its San Francisco properties are worth more than \$1 billion. The State Board of Equalization values PG&E's electric facilities at only about \$200 million. Which figure is right? Proposition K asks that this question and others like it be answered by a thorough, impartial study.

There is credible evidence that public ownership of the electric utility would benefit San Franciscans. At the same time, the supply of electricity is a technical and at times confusing issue. If you are confused, remember — the purpose of the study is to end the

confusion. We can only make a rational decision when we have the facts.

Support the study. Vote YES on K.

Esmond Coleman, CPA

Eugene Coyle, Ph.D.

Economist

Douglas Dowd, Ph.D.

Professor of Economics

John Hardesty, Ph.D.

Economist

Michael Kieschnick, Ph.D.

Economist

Richard Liebes, Ph.D.

Economist

Marc Lumer, CPA

J.B. Neilands, Ph.D.

Professor

Mark Northcross

Fiscal and Energy Consultant

Lee Schultz, CPA

Dick Van Aggelen, CPA

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Cut your utility bills. Vote "YES"!!!

BART Board Candidate *Bob Geary*

(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman *Arlo Hale Smith*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "K"

Oh brother. If you think PG&E is inefficient, wait 'til you see what happens when you turn the task over to City Hall. Nip this one in the bud. Vote no.

Darrell J. Salomon

Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON "K"

Proposition K is the first step in an attempt to force the City and County of San Francisco to buy and operate its own electric utility system. It is undoubtedly in large part a reflection of dissatisfaction with increasing gas and electric rates. It is also an idea born from the notion that in this day and age, the City and County of San Francisco could buy all of the plants and equipment of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company necessary for City Hall to operate an electric utility system.

I am convinced it would not work. The cost of the consultants the City would have to hire to conduct a study of the feasibility of what is called "municipalization" of P.G. & E.'s utility system is estimated by the Controller as \$500,000 to \$700,000. If you ask me, the actual expense would be more.


Then the City would be mandated to throw good money after bad because, regardless of the findings of the feasibility study, Proposition K requires another election — on "municipalization" and the issuance of bonds. The cost of buying the P.G. & E. plant and

equipment could be over \$1,000,000,000. According to our Controller, it could, in fact, exceed \$1,400,000,000. Additionally, we'd have to pay interest on bonds of at least \$100,000,000. Furthermore we'd be paying approximately \$35,000,000 a year for salaries, supplies and replacement equipment. Could we afford it? We can't. We might have been able to do so back in the 1930's, before inflation and the P.G. & E. system increased so tremendously, but San Francisco voters rejected the notion 11 times in the period between 1927 and 1941.

VOTE NO ON "K"

I abhor the spectacle of increasing gas and electric rates. That's why I successfully authored the ordinance to eliminate the city's utility tax on the lifeline segment of your gas and electricity bill. However, this is an imprudent and unworkable approach. It's a billion dollar mistake waiting to happen. Passage of it could result in more taxes, less reliable electric service to consumers and even reduced City services in other areas. I intend to vote against Proposition K. I urge you to do the same.

Quentin L. Kopp



Electric Utility Ownership

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K. It is a waste of your money. Prop. K would require that we spend a considerable sum of your hard earned dollars — no one yet knows how many — on a “feasibility” study to tell us something we already know and have known for years.

What we are asked to “study” is whether the taxpayers ought to purchase P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities so that these become a part of the City’s bureaucracy and then later to convert them to “consumer ownership.”

Consideration of buying out P.G.&E. in San Francisco has been before the Board of Supervisors in 1971, in 1974 and again in 1979. Each time the Board has turned down further consideration of the plan. Bond issues for this purpose have been placed before the people at least eight times prior to 1942, in days when it might have been economically realistic. Each time the voters rejected the proposal.

This “feasibility” study will tell us what we already know, that it will take a bond issue of many hundreds of millions of dollars to buy out P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities. For all that, it would provide no guarantee that the rates for San Franciscans would be any less than the rates allowed by the State Public Utilities Commission today since there is little likelihood that a city hall bureaucracy could run a gas and electricity distribution system any more efficiently than the private sector.

The costs of this study would be paid for by fares collected from the riders of the Muni, payments on your water bill and the revenues of the City’s Hetch Hetchy system. We have far better, more important things to do with those dollars than pay for another useless study.

VOTE NO ON PROP. K

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Is the City in such fantastic financial condition we can afford to commit over **ONE BILLION DOLLARS** of the taxpayer’s money for the acquisition of P.G.&E.’s local electrical distribution facilities? Do you think we need a \$700,000 “consultant contract” to tell us (presumably stupid!) taxpayers and consumers the obvious answer to that question? Supervisors Britt, Walker, and Silver, who endorsed this measure, evidently think so!

Would anyone **REALLY** want a horde of **NEW** Civil Service employees in full control and management of our electric power distribution system? Doubtless, they would provide the same superb, efficient management skills and “round the clock” courteous, personalized service we have all experienced with the operation of the Municipal Railway, the “economical” construction of “**SUPER SEWER**”, and the prompt repairs of our pot-holed streets!

Conservationists might well argue that millions of kilowatt hours could be saved! With typical City operation, the lights and power would likely be off half the time! If operated like the Muni, the proposed enterprise would only lose six dollars for every three dollars the City would collect! The taxpayers will cheerfully make up the multi-million dollar losses!

As matters now stand, the P.G.&E. paid over to the

the City last year:

Utility Users Taxes	\$15,887,456
Property Taxes	\$5,612,385
Franchise Taxes	\$2,436,841
Payroll Taxes	\$3,170,346

**TOTAL TAXES PAID OVER
TO THE CITY BY PG&E. \$27,107,028**

Because of long term contracts with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts, plus the Airport, The Muni Railway, and several other major power customers, San Francisco has **NO EXCESS POWER FOR SALE!** Even if we terminated **ALL** existing profitable power supply contracts, only **TWENTY PERCENT** of Hetch Hetchy’s output is available for any proposed municipal distribution operation. The City would still have to purchase **EIGHTY** percent of the entire City’s needs, wholesale from P.G.&E., mark it up, then **RETAIL** this power to us. Substantially higher electricity costs would be inevitable!

This irresponsible “Municipal Power” foolishness has been overwhelmingly rejected by San Francisco’s voters **NINE TIMES** in the past! Let’s save \$700,000 and make it a **TENTH!** We strongly urge a **NO** vote!

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

Electric Utility Ownership



ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

It is vital for San Francisco's continued economic progress that our City have a reliable, efficient electric utility system. Proposition K threatens our ability to be certain that residential and commercial consumers will have the electricity they need at an affordable price.

Proponents claim that Proposition K will help cut our electric utility bills. They state that because the City will own the utility we can set rates as we wish.

Nothing could be further from the truth!

The fact is that there is **no way the City can own and operate an electric utility without a substantial increase in rates over their current levels.** The money to pay for the purchase of equipment, legal battles over the acquisition, a staff of 1,200 employees, huge operating costs, administrative expenses and all the other associated costs have to come from somewhere. That "somewhere" is our pockets.

If Proposition K passes, we will have taken a first step toward establishing another municipally operated utility. Not only will we squander hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer monies to pay a consultant for another "feasibility study" but we will have

thrown our City's hard-won fiscal stability into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, the passage of Proposition K will result in less economic growth in San Francisco and less economic opportunity for everyone who lives here. Every working man and woman in our City is concerned about high utility bills. But that doesn't mean that anyone wants to take an irresponsible step that could result in higher energy costs, raise taxes, cost thousands of jobs, jeopardize a vital "lifeline" service and inevitably reduce our quality of life.

Don't sacrifice our City's future on the flawed altar of "municipal ownership." We urge you to look closely at Proposition K and to vote NO on November 2.

Jack McNally
Business Manager/Financial Secretary
International Brotherhood of
Electrical Workers
Local Union 1245

Stan Smith
Secretary-Treasurer
Building Trades Council AFL-CIO

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, the proposed municipal takeover of the electric utility serving San Francisco is an all-time loser designed to overspend and waste the taxpayers' money. It is a proposal that has been considered and rejected by the Board of Supervisors and the voters more than nine times in the past. Before you decide on this issue, think about just a few of the costly elements of municipalization. We would pay for:

***Legal fees and costs** to decide on the value of the current owner's property (as much as \$15 million).

***Acquisition** of the property (at least \$1 billion in bonded indebtedness).

***Principal and interest** costs over the life of the bonds in excess of \$140 million per year.

***At least 1200 new employees** (about \$35 million a year in salaries).

***A huge new City administrative staff.**

***Facilities and equipment** for these employees including office buildings, warehouses, trucks, a service center and supplies.

Where would the money for these costly items come from? Unsurprisingly, taxpayers and consumers

would pick up the costs — in higher taxes and higher utility rates — and would be left with fewer city services and a municipally operated electric system. At the same time, San Francisco would lose about \$5 million a year in taxes and fees now paid by the current utility owner.

In fact, much of the money we would pour into this municipal system would go into the pockets of Wall Street financiers and bondholders across the country — the people who would buy the high interest-bearing bonds the City would be forced to issue to buy and set up a municipal electric system.

It doesn't require a "feasibility study" that will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to know that Proposition K is a colossal waste of taxpayers' money and a sure step toward fiscal havoc for San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Proposition K.

Del Dawson
Steve Stratton
Preston Cook
Ruth Kadish
Naomi Gray
Tom Hsieh

San Franciscans for Responsible Energy Policies

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



Electric Utility Ownership

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "K"

15,500 names were submitted as an initiative measure to subject the voters to a proposal to acquire our own electric system. They hope to sway approximately 329,238 registered voters to vote the destiny for 670,000 persons living in San Francisco. They might get away with it if the history of our voting record is maintained.

You get what you don't vote for. Here is a proposal that could lead to a bonded indebtedness of almost TWO BILLION DOLLARS if it passes. San Francisco does not need the agony of trying to run

another municipally owned entity. Need I remind you of the muni railway. We own the water department, airport and Hetch Hetchy and what revenues do we derive from them? We plow back all the surplus (if any) into non-revenue producing departments to keep them afloat.

This is a no, no. Do your civic duty and vote this down once and for all. It has been rejected many times by City Hall. Do it again.

VOTE NO ON PROP. "K"

Marguerite A. Warren
Taxpayer

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is dangerous to the financial health of our City. Beyond the folly of spending good money for another consultant study the City could lose significant revenues and fall deeply into debt. Further, some 1200 employees might be added to the City's payroll. If the City were to operate the electric distribution system it would have to pay fair market value to purchase utility properties within the City. The price of this purchase, start-up and transition costs, bond covenants and the like have been estimated at over \$1 billion. A bond issue in that amount would place an enormous strain on our fiscal health. In addition, the utility's franchise payments as well as

payroll and property taxes amounting to some \$4 million per year would be lost to the City. More importantly, a \$10 million profit from sale of Hetch Hetchy power to big businesses and to irrigation districts would be lost each year.

After all of this, there is no guarantee that rates would be reduced! And there is no reason to expect continued good service from a City-operated system. Proposition K is a bad idea that could erode the City's financial stability. Please, vote NO on K!

Supervisor John L. Molinari
Chair, Finance Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

When your lights go out would you rather call PG&E or City Hall???

— BART Candidate *Robert Silvestri*

(Republican Committeeman)
Terrence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)

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

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

City Hall Ramps



PROPOSITION L

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The federal and state governments have set standards for access to public buildings for disabled persons. Plans are underway to build an access ramp at the Van Ness Avenue entrance of City Hall.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would make it city policy not to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you do not want the City to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City hall.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to be able to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

Controller's Statement on "L"

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and the project abandoned, in my opinion, it could reduce the cost of government by approximately \$600,000.

How Prop L Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition L had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Terry Francois, the proponent of the initiative petition, had gathered 12,010 signatures which his group turned in to the Registrar on August 9th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,080 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

YES = No Ramps
NO = Build the Ramps

NOTE

Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.



City Hall Ramps

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Please take special note: If you DON'T want the ramps built, vote YES. If you WANT the ramps

built, vote NO.

Terry A. Francois

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

If you agree that, since there is already a Grove Street access ramp, a Van Ness Avenue ramp which could cost over a half million dollars should not be built, vote "Yes" on Proposition "L". Preserve the beauty of our historic city hall. Vote "Yes" on "L".

COMMITTEE FOR A VOTERS RAMP DECISION

Terry A. Francois

Sylvia Brown Jensen

Eleanor Rossi Crabtree

Albert Meakin

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L. Halt squandering of taxpayers' money for ANOTHER ramp on City Hall. Preserve San Francisco's world famous architectural gem. Vote YES on L.

PARENTS AND TAXPAYERS, INC.

Maurine Koltugin, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

It is unconscionable to spend over \$600,000 of the Taxpayer's dollars to pour tons of concrete for a one hundred and thirteen foot long grotesque ramp sloping upward to the elevated Van Ness entrance to City Hall.

The "Can't use the side door" fixation of a few militant activists should not be permitted to DESTROY the beautiful appearance of this jewel of a building. Moreover, an assymetrical Van Ness Avenue ramp, running 113' uphill directly across the front of the Northern half of the building, creates unnecessary

unloading and parking problems for the SEVERELY HANDICAPPED!

Logic and common sense dictates that far more convenient "off-street" access, at minimum cost, can be provided at the better protected Grove Street entrance without DESTROYING the magnificence of this world renowned architectural masterpiece!

I strongly urge a YES vote!

Lee S. Dolson,

Member, Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

The proposed DEFAACEMENT of our magnificent City Hall, an architectural masterpiece, is intolerable!

An unobtrusive, concealed concrete ramp, gently sloping DOWNWARD BELOW GRADE, from Grove Street, meets all Federal Standards for dramatically improved handicapped access at HALF THE COST, including new power operated entrance doors!

Why spend THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND EXTRA TAX DOLLARS on "symbolism" to placate a handful of unreasonable, intractable, "costs be

damned" career agitators? Agitators who clamored to spend well over a million dollars to "butcher" the main Polk Street facade! Fortunately, there wasn't enough money available for this wild-eyed proposal.

Easy access for the handicapped? Certainly! Defacement of the building? Unacceptable. Vote YES for far less costly, aesthetically sensible Grove Street handicapped access!

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

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.

City Hall Ramps



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Construction of ramp and remodeling of Van Ness entrance to City Hall at estimated cost of \$600,000 (actual cost probably double) would be wasteful misuse of public funds and cause permanent and inexcusable defacement of the most beautiful of City Halls

... A NATIONAL LANDMARK.

Grove Street entrance, carefully and sensitively improved, will provide entry meeting legal requirements and be safer and more convenient.

TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL, Inc.
Ramona Albright, Vice President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Why wreck historic landmarks???

Robert Silvestri

— BART Candidate *Robert Silvestri* (Republican)

Committeeman)

— *Terence Faulkner* (Republican Committeeman)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Direct and equal access to City Hall is a fundamental civil right. Proposition "L" denies civil rights to people with disabilities. Ramping a main entrance at City Hall is essential to at least 23% of our residents, who are elderly or disabled.

For seven years architects, preservationists, community residents, fiscal and urban planners developed 10 alternative access designs. A plan emerged with Historic Preservation Council approval which is consistent with cost constraints and enhances the architectural integrity of City Hall through main entrance access. Proposition "L" would prevent implementation of these constructive efforts.

Proposition "L" is an end run around previous decisions, planning, policies, and laws of city, State and Federal governments to keep disabled people from having main entrance access to City Hall.

Vote NO on "L" for Equal Access!


Organizations for identification

Endorsements for Ballot Arguments Against Proposition L

Board of Directors, San Francisco Independent Living Project
Rev. Pat Lewis, C.C.S.P. Vicar for the Handicapped, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Judy Forsberg, Bernal Heights Association
Charles Lamb
Eugene Coleman; Canon Kip
Kathi Smith, Disabled Democratic Club
Chelsea Baylor
Arlene Chew Wong, Multiple Sclerosis Society
John King, UCPA
Geraldine Johnson, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Jeff Mori
Lawrence Marcelino

Wil Leong, SF Pretrial Diversion Project
Ralph Hurtado, MALDEF
Susan Brier
Dorothy Joseph
Wilson Chang
Bob Bustamonte, Coalition of Hispanics for Employment Services
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Rev. Dr. Norman Leach, Mayor's Council on Disabilities Concerns
Jerry Klein, Hospital Workers, Local 250
Noemi Sohn
Weslia Whitfield
Lucile Lockhart
Edwin S. Sarsfield, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services
Julie Kavanaugh
Cindy Kolb, Director, Disabled Student Services, SFSU
Gay Blackford, National Association for Visually Handicapped
Paul Goodellaw
Mollie & Sam Gold
Joan Dillon, Immediate Past-President, SEIU Local 400
Sodonia Wilson, Educator
Jack Trujillo
Jane McKastle Murphy
Kathleen Lammers, Gray Panthers
Tim Wolfred, Community College Board
Arthur Morris, Theatre Rhinoceros
Dmitri Belser
Pat Christianson
H. David Sokoloff, FAIA, President, Sokoloff/Bennett Associates
Robert Herman, Architect
Philip Burton, Member of Congress
Arnold Lerner, AIA Architect
Hank Wilson, Hotel Owner
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor John Molinari
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Harry Britt
Susan Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Susan Rutberg

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



City Hall Ramps

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Your "NO" vote on Proposition L will mean that the physically disabled of our city will have equal access to our beautiful City Hall. The carefully designed access walkway located at the Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall will be a harmonious addition to this magnificent building. It will be available for use by everyone. Your "NO" vote on Proposition L will assure its timely construction.

The design for the walkway was considered by The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, our Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and Art Commission, the Historic Preservation Officer of the State of California, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a Federal council. The people who serve these organizations are chosen because of their artistic or architectural interests or experiences. Each one of these agencies agreed that the walkway would not deface City Hall as claimed by the proponents of

this proposition.

The City has spent considerable funds in developing the walkway plan. This money, approved by the Board of Supervisors, was used to assure us that the walkway would be a fitting architectural addition to City Hall. I believe we have achieved that objective. Your NO vote on Proposition L will mean that these funds were not spent needlessly.

I have outlined for you the thoughtful process used in reaching our decision on the walkway. We think it was the right one. Your NO vote will make it possible to proceed with the project without further delay and inconvenience to the physically disabled. **VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L.**

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Let Senior Citizens and the Handicapped enter City Hall and participate in Government. Vote "NO"!!!

BART Board Candidate, *Bob Geary* (Democratic Committeeman)
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman

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

OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it's possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

OCTOBER 30, 31 and NOVEMBER 1

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

**(Look under "Official Advertising"
or "Legal Notices")**

Hotel at Carl & Hillway Sts.



PROPOSITION M

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The parcels of land in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center listed in this initiative are now zoned for residential use.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a Declaration of Policy that asks the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center. The proposed hotel would have 200-225 bedrooms, a restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop and banking facilities.

Thirty housing units would be built for sale or rental. At least 135 parking spaces would be provided.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to ask the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to zone the area under the present laws.

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and implemented, in my opinion, some increases in Real Property, Hotel Tax and other revenues may occur.

NOTE

Your precinct localon may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

How Prop M Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition M had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the initiative petition had gathered 16,971 signatures, which he turned in to the Registrar on August 13th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 12,220 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP M
BEGINS ON PAGE 100.**



Hotel at Carl & Hillway Sts.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR MOVEMENT VOTING YES ON THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the undersigned, are active members of the labor movement in San Francisco, and as such, are greatly concerned over the current high unemployment in San Francisco, as well as the soaring cost of health care.

The unemployment level in the building trades unions in San Francisco is 25% where it was only 3% one year ago. Moreover, there is no end in sight to the slowdown in construction and thus every effort must be made to encourage quality development.

The health care cost for our members is soaring, becoming an ever increasing problem to provide the continued high level of quality care which we are able to currently provide.

Because of our concerns for providing jobs for those now unemployed, for lowering health care cost without a reduction in health care quality, for providing lodging for family members for hospitalized patients, and above all, for encouragement to those in-

terested in quality and innovative growth, we urge you to support the medically oriented lodging facility by voting YES on Proposition M.

Jack Goldberger, Labor Consultant
Charles Lamb, President, Hotel Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union Local 2
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer San Francisco Building Trades Council
Lawrence Mazzola, President San Francisco Building Trades Council
John Lappin, International Officer I.B.E.W.
Robert Morales, Secretary-Treasurer Teamsters Local 350
Betsy Blom, Business Representative Dept. Store Employees # 1100
James Ballard, President AFT Local 61
Madelyn Samarzes, Business Representative Teamsters Local 856
John Estes, President Teamsters Local 85
Robert McDonnell, Business Representative Laborers Local 261
Mike Hardeman, Business Representative Sign and Display Local 510
Patricia Jackson, President SEIU Local 400

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

NEIGHBORS SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the residents and neighbors living in close proximity to this proposed medically oriented recuperation and lodging facility, welcome and enthusiastically support the development of this project.

The building of this facility as proposed in this initiative will not only add to the beauty and quality of our neighborhood, but increase the opportunity for our children and neighbors to find jobs close to home.

Specifically, we support this project for the additional following reasons:

1. This medical lodging facility is ideally situated to act as a buffer zone between the University of California Complex and the closed and dilapidated Polytechnic High School, thereby, upgrading the neighborhood.
2. This project is sensitively designed and architec-

turally attractive and compatible to existing structures, adding to the aesthetics of our community.

3. Construction of this facility with its added parking space will reduce traffic congestion in the area.
4. The medical lodging facility will also include 30 housing units replacing the current 11 houses; thus, adding to San Francisco's housing stock and tax base.
5. The proposed use of this project's site is no different than the current use; thus, the character of the immediate neighborhood will not be changed.

If you believe in the merits of this project as we do, then please join us and help us by voting Yes on M.

John Clark
Michael Tuggle
J. E. O'Guin
Patrick Conley
Dorothy Campbell
Helen O'Connell

William Sepatitis
David Finn
Sylvia Durrance
Lyle Conley
Wilfred Willis
June Sanchez

Hotel at Carl & Hillway Sts.



ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PHYSICIANS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED AND LODGING FACILITY:

VOTE YES ON M.

We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons who practice in the immediate area, wish to go on record in support of the **medically oriented lodging facility**.

We know from first hand knowledge that this facility is badly needed to benefit patients and relatives of patients who come to the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Hospital Complex. There are no facilities of this type now available for use by these sick patients and their friends or relatives. The proper use of this facility will not only decrease medical care costs, but will add substantial revenue to the city and will provide many needed jobs.

We urge you to vote **Yes on M**.

Robert Allen, Jr., M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery
E. Trent Andrews, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Ernest Bates, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Crowell Beard, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Andrea Blum, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of
Obstetrics and Gynecology

William Breall, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine
Devron Char, M. D.
Associate Professor of Ophthalmology
Reuben Clay, Jr., M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of
Obstetrics and Gynecology
Marcus Conant, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Herbert Dedo, M. D.
Professor of Otolaryngology
Vice Chairman, Department of Otolaryngology
Alfred de Lorimier, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Chairman of Pediatric Surgery
William Ehrenfeld, M. D.
Professor of Surgery
Paul Fitzgerald, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of
Medicine and of Metabolic Research
Alexander Hirschfeld, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry
Jay Kaiser, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Radiology
Malcolm Powell, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of
Radiology and of Medicine
Howard Shapiro, M. D.
Samuel Stegman, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
John Sullivan, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Theodore Tromovitch, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Edwin Wylle, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Vice Chairman
Department of Surgery

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO TAX PAYERS ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY.

VOTE YES ON M

This privately owned, medically oriented project will NOT be an additional burden on San Francisco's taxpayers! Just the opposite! Hundreds of thousands of dollars of NEW tax revenues will paid TO THE CITY, each year, forever!

It will substantially reduce TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED medical costs by getting recovering patients

out of \$358.00 a day hospital rooms (Intermediate Care is \$786.00 and Intensive Care is \$1,116.00 a day!), and into relatively low cost accommodations ACROSS THE STREET from the U. C. Medical Center.

Further, compassion dictates that sleeping facilities, CLOSE AT HAND, be available for the relatives of seriously ill and dying patients. We recommend a **YES vote on M!**

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



Hotel at Carl & Hillway Sts.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CONCERNED CITIZENS VOTING YES ON M, THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

San Francisco is known throughout the world as a city of new ideas. A city where innovation and creativity have become a hallmark.

In keeping with these traditions, San Franciscans are being asked to consider the exciting new designs for a **recuperation and medically oriented lodging facility** to be located adjacent to the University of California Medical Center.

The proposed lodging facility will significantly reduce the cost of health care by allowing patients who are being treated at the University of California Medical Center to be treated as an out-patient or discharged earlier and housed in this medically oriented lodge at a fraction of the cost.

Moreover, this facility would also provide lodging for the relatives of patients who want to be close to their loved ones during their time of need, rather than having to commute from a location many miles away.

Other aspects of this project are equally exciting and certainly contribute to the prosperity of San Francisco. The added parking provided by the Lodge will reduce traffic congestion around the U.C. Medical Center; the additional 30 housing units to be built will add to San Francisco's housing stock; the increased tax revenue; and the creation of numerous jobs at a time when unemployment is critically high are all good reasons in and of themselves to support this project, not to mention the additional consideration of its humanitarian services.

We feel proud and honored to be part of this innovation to improve and economize health care delivery systems. We encourage San Franciscans to lead the rest of the country by approving the completion of this project by voting **YES on Proposition M.**

George Chinn

Guy Cherney

Ted Soulis

Gene Prat

William Conroy

Ernest McNabb

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL:

VOTE YES ON M

As President of S.H.A.R.P., the largest and oldest neighborhood organization in the Sunset District and upper Sunset Heights, representing over 1400 people, and in close proximity to the proposed **Medically Oriented Lodge**, I enthusiastically support this project. The merits of this project are numerous. This project is innovative, futuristic and unquestionably needed. It will provide lodging for visiting relatives of patients which is undeniably needed. It will reduce health care costs by allowing many people to stay in a medical lodging type facility after surgery or awaiting test results etc., rather than a hospital. Severe hardships, of which I have personally witnessed, could be minimized or hopefully eliminated. The traffic congestion will be reduced because of the added parking and

elimination of the current to and fro transportation of these people who are currently staying in high priced hotels in other areas of San Francisco.

Since the project is privately financed and constructed, it will add greatly to San Francisco's tax base and provide much needed jobs for residents of the neighborhood. Moreover, the project is beautifully designed and will upgrade the neighborhood, acting, as an excellent buffer between the residential houses and the Parnassus Heights Medical Building, the U.C. garage and the abandoned Polytechnic High School, all of which form its boundaries.

Join me and other members of S.H.A.R.P. in supporting this much needed medical facility. **Vote Yes on M.**

George Morris, President, S.H.A.R.P.

Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People

Hotel at Carl & Hillway Sts.



ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I urge all of our citizens who are interested in protecting our neighborhood zoning procedures to vote **"NO" on Proposition "M."** Your **"NO"** vote will assure that you will continue to have a voice before the City Planning Commission regarding any zoning changes in your neighborhood.

Proposition "M" is supported by a group of developers who wish to profit from the construction of a hotel and related commercial uses in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood near the University of California Medical Center. Their project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission at a public hearing. Because these developers did not get their way before the Commission, they placed this proposition on the ballot by petition. You made your voices heard at City Hall before the City Planning Commission in opposition to the hotel project. I urge you to once again make your voices heard by voting **"NO" on Proposition "M."**

When the hotel project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission, the sponsors appealed that decision to the Board of Supervisors. They withdrew their appeal before the Board of Supervisors could act on it. Why? I can only assume that they did not have the votes on the Board of Supervisors to override the disapproval by the City Planning Commission. They are now appealing to you, the voters of this city, to grant them a privilege which was denied to them by the City Planning Commission.

Proposition "M" is not good for neighborhood zoning or planning. A **"NO" vote on Proposition "M"** will safeguard our neighborhoods and reaffirm the public hearing process as provided by the City Charter

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a self-serving, special interest proposition. The City Planning Commission rejected a hotel project here three years ago. It believed that the project was too big for the neighborhood and that the project would cause traffic congestion and the removal of inexpensive housing.

Proposition M is a precedent-setting circumvention of public review procedures and neighborhood participation in zoning decisions. Zoning by petition is bad for the city and bad for residents most affected by proposed changes.

Vote No on Proposition M to protect the Charter's public hearing process and to keep your voice alive in neighborhood zoning. **VOTE "NO" ON M**

Submitted by:
City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Former Member of the Board of Supervisors, John Bardis Urges You to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

I strongly urge all San Franciscans to **VOTE NO** on Proposition M.

VOTE NO to stop developers from by-passing the Board of Supervisors and City Planning Commission.

VOTE NO to save scarce affordable housing from demolition.

VOTE NO to prevent developers from destroying a family residential neighborhood.

VOTE NO to uphold the residential zoning laws protecting your neighborhood and all residential districts in our city.

John Bardis
Former Member of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Member of the University of California Board of Regents Says Vote No on Proposition M

I encourage all San Franciscans to vote No on Proposition M. Both the neighborhoods and the University of California, San Francisco oppose this unwarranted and unneeded commercialization of the

residential neighborhood which surrounds the San Francisco campus.

Yori Wada
Member, Board of Regents
University of California



Hotel at Carl & Hillway Sts.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M. Proposition M, if passed, will set a precedent which will endanger every neighborhood in the City.

PROPOSITION M IS A DEVIOUS TACTIC. In 1978 the owner of some 16 parcels of residentially zoned and used land in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood attempted to build a commercial hotel complex two blocks from Golden Gate Park. People were evicted from their homes and plans were made to demolish 52 housing units on the site. After a series of hearings both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors rejected the project. Now, the developer is attempting to reverse the previous decision without any new public hearings.

PROPOSITION M IS A SELF-INTERESTED COMMERCIAL PROJECT, NOT MEDICALLY ORIENTED. Read the policy statement in full. You

will see that this is a straight forward commercial project. No mention is made in the text of the measure to a supposed "medically oriented" use of the commercial hotel.

PROPOSITION M IS BROADLY OPPOSED. No one wants a commercial hotel, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facility, parking garage, and other "ancillary commercial areas" in the midst of this residential neighborhood: not the neighbors, not the City and not U.C. Medical Center.

PROPOSITION M IS BAD FOR YOU. Vote "NO" on this special interest spot rezoning. Vote "NO" on this proposition and save your neighborhood, your street and your home from being the victim of some future such measure.

Douglas J. Engmann

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Nearby Neighborhood Organizations endorse the above argument against Proposition M.

EDGEWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
FRANCISCO HEIGHTS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
GOLDEN GATE HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
INNER SUNSET ACTION COMMITTEE
INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE
MOUNT SUTRO DEFENSE COMMITTEE
SPEAK
STANYAN-FULTON STREET NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
SUNSET NEIGHBORS UNITED
TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL
WOODLAND AVENUE ASSOCIATION

San Francisco Civic Associations

SAN FRANCISCO BLACK POLITICAL CAUCUS
BEIDEMAN AREA NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP
COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
CONSUMER ACTION
DUBOCE TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
EAST MISSION IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
EUREKA VALLEY PROMOTION ASSOCIATION
LA RAZA EN ACCION LOCAL
NOB HILL NEIGHBORS
PACIFIC HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
RICHMOND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION
SAN FRANCISCAN DEMOCRATIC CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Although more low cost, fair priced rooming accommodations are needed for out-of-town patients (and their families) undergoing diagnosis and treatment at UCSF, there is no need for a luxury highrise hotel. A luxury highrise hotel would commercialize a legally zoned residential neighborhood and further increase traffic congestion in the area. This is a devious and exploitative initiative. Its submission as a citywide bal-

lot issue is an attempt to circumvent strong neighborhood objections and the considered judgements of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. A luxury hotel would not be affordable by the vast majority of the out-of-town patients who seek medical care at UCSF.

Nicholas L. Petrakis, M.D.

Chairman, Dept. Epidemiology & International Health

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhood urges a No vote. It allows destruction of moderate cost housing to build a hotel. This proposal mis-uses the initiative process. We urge you to vote NO.

N. Arden Danekas

Chairman, Housing Committee

Jonathan D. Bulkley

President

Hotel at Carl & Hillway Sts.



ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

As Chancellor Emeritus, a member of the faculty of the University of California, San Francisco and Berkeley for 48 years, and a 45 year resident of the neighborhood where Dr. Rider's Hotel is proposed, it is my observation that this commercial hotel will not meet the needs of out-of-town patients and their families who come to UCSF for care. First, there is a definite need for some sort of **low cost** accommodation for these patients and their families, who come to UCSF from northern and central California and from all over the country for special diagnosis and treatment afforded by this tertiary medical center. But commercial hotel rates are too high for most of these people.

Second, my understanding is that this hotel would provide only 135 parking spaces for 200 to 225 bedrooms. The parking ratio is far too low in view of the fact that parking is needed not only for the patient and his or her family but for other visitors. The area's major problem is parking. This would greatly worsen the traffic and parking problems in this already congested area. Third, this is a residential neighborhood, and a commercial hotel does not belong on this site.

John B. de C. M. Saunders, M.D.
Chancellor Emeritus and Professor Emeritus
University of California, San Francisco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The private developer behind this measure previously asked the City for a big up-zoning of his property to permit building a large hotel in an area zoned for residential use. He was emphatically turned down by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Now he is asking you, the voters, to ask the City to change its policy for his benefit at the expense of others living in the area. His hotel and its bar, restaurant, convention facilities and inadequate parking seem less likely to serve patients and their relatives than conventioners and tourists. The facts are: The area is already seriously over-congested, with unsolved traffic and parking problems. The adjacent University of California has agreed to limit its own growth. The need is for quiet, reasonably priced accommodations. This proposition asks for spot rezoning that would circumvent the City Master Plan and set a

dangerous precedent that would be followed by developers in other residential areas.

The above ballot argument is endorsed by the following medical doctors, health professionals, and neighbors:

*Laura Bock
Dr. Robert Brigante
Dr. Kenneth Brown
Dr. Francis Chamberlain
Dr. Joan Cucek
Mile Cucek
Dr. Mary Dallman
Dr. Peter Dallman
Norma Dennes
Dr. Richard Dennes
Dr. Roberta Fenlon
Jean Ferdinandsen
Nan Freitas
Ann Gilliam
Harold Gilliam
Dr. Sadjia Greenwood
Richard Harrington
Granger Hill*

*Ellen Huppert
Peter Huppert
Dr. Lester Jacobson
Paul Johnson
Jackie Lalanne
Dr. Jennifer LaVail
Dr. Matthew LaVail
Margaret Northcott
Kenny O'Hara
Alvin Pelavin
Marion Robertson
Burton Rockwell
Nicky Salan
Dr. Donald Sandner
Mary Sandner
Dr. Alan Skolnikoff
Suzanne Skolnikoff*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I am an inner Sunset resident and a Professor at UCSF. I urge a **no** vote on Proposition M. My observation as a doctor seeing patients is that low-cost transient accommodations are important. There is already under renovation nearby, on Stanyan Street, a

hotel facility in a commercial zone. UCSF and the surrounding residential neighborhood do not need a high-cost commercial business venture requiring special legislation.

Alan J. Margolis, M.D.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Don't let multimillionaire-speculator Dr. Rider ruin Golden Gate Park's skyline. Vote "NO"!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

3.530 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 appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars (\$1200). 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. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission, 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 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 police commission may in their discretion designate the rank or ranks from which appointments to such exempt ranks or positions shall be made. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position above the rank of captain as may be created hereunder shall be designated only from the civil service rank of captain. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the police commission shall have power 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 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.

3.530-2 Office of Citizen Complaints

The police commission shall have the power and duty to appoint a director of the office of citizen complaints who shall hold office at its pleasure. The appointment shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. The director shall never have been a uniformed member or employee of the department. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall be the appointing officer under the civil service provisions of this charter for the appointment, removal or discipline of employees of the office of citizen complaints.

The police commission shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize, and manage the office of citizen complaints. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the office of citizen complaints shall include investigators and hearing officers. No full-time or part-time employee of the office of citizen complaints shall have previously served as a uniformed member of the department. Subject to rule of the police commission, the director of the office of citizen complaints may appoint part-time hearing officers who shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. Compensation of said hearing officers shall be at rates recommended by the police commission and established by the board of supervisors or contract approved by the board of supervisors.

Complaints of police misconduct or allegations that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty shall be promptly, fairly, and impartially investigated by staff of the office of citizen complaints. The office of citizen complaints shall investigate all complaints of police misconduct or that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty, except those complaints which on their face clearly indicate that the acts complained of were proper and those complaints lodged by other members of the police department. The office of citizen complaints shall recommend disciplinary action to the chief of police on those complaints that are sustained. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall schedule hearings before hearing officers when such is requested by the complainant or member of the department and, in accordance with rules of the commission, such a hearing will facilitate the fact-finding process.

(Proposition A, Continued)

Nothing herein shall prohibit the chief of police or a commanding officer from investigating the conduct of a member of the department under his or her command, or taking disciplinary or corrective action, otherwise permitted by this charter, when such is warranted; and nothing herein shall limit or otherwise restrict the disciplinary powers vested in the chief of police and the police commission by other provisions of this charter.

The office of citizen complaints shall prepare in accordance with rules of the police commission monthly summaries of the complaints received and shall prepare recommendations quarterly concerning policies or practices of the department which could be changed or amended to avoid unnecessary tension with the pub-

lic or a definable segment of the public while insuring effective police services.

In carrying out its objectives the office of citizen complaints shall receive prompt and full cooperation and assistance from all departments, officers, and employees of the city and county. The director of the office of citizen complaints may also suggest and the chief of police shall require the testimony or attendance of any member of the police department to carry out the responsibilities of the office of citizen complaints.

The annual appropriations for all costs of the office of citizen complaints shall not exceed sixty percent of the costs incurred by the police department internal affairs bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1981, adjusted annually therefore for inflation. *(end)*

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face**; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.205 Powers and Duties of the Board of Supervisors

On or before June 30th of each year the board of supervisors shall, except for equipment and capital improvements, enact an interim appropriation ordinance and an annual salary ordinance in accordance with a procedure set forth by ordinance, provided, however, that the interim appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance so enacted shall reflect the rates of compensation established by section 8.401 of this charter, and not later than August 25th of each year shall amend said ordinances pursuant to sections 8.404 and 8.405 of this charter.

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ten days after receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may, by a two-thirds vote of all members thereof, shorten, extend or otherwise modify the time fixed in this section or in sections 6.200, 6.202, 6.203 or 6.206 of this charter for the performance of any act by any officer, board or commission.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, and may without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services contained in the proposed budget, but shall not increase any amount or add any new item for personal services or materials, supplies, or contractual services, for any department, unless requested in writing so to do by the mayor, on the recommendation of the chief administrative officer, board, commission or elective officer, in charge of such department.

The board of supervisors may increase or insert appropriations for capital expenditures and public improvements, but shall do so only after such items have first been referred to the department of city planning and a report has been rendered thereon regarding conformity with the master plan. It shall be the duty of the department of city planning to render its reports in writing within thirty days after said referral. Failure of the department of city planning to

render any such report in such time shall be deemed equivalent to a report.

The budget estimates of expenditures for any utility, within the estimated revenues of such utility, shall not be increased by the board of supervisors.

In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimate and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency.

Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for the acquisition of **Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles.** Proposed expenditures for other additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs shall ((in amount not to)) not exceed three-quarters of one cent (\$.0075) on each one hundred dollars (\$100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, **other than for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles,** the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent (\$.0075) on each hundred dollars (\$100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county provided further that proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions of other capital costs in excess thereof, **except for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles,** shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.407(a) of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th day of July, nor later than the first of August of each year the board of supervisors shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall adopt the annual appropriation ordinance accordingly, which

(Proposition B, Continued)

shall supersede the interim appropriation ordinance.

6.407 Utility Revenues and Expenditures

(a) Receipts from each utility operated by the public utilities commission shall be paid into the city and county treasury and maintained in a separate fund for each utility. Appropriations from such funds shall be made for the following purposes for each such utility in the order named, viz: (1) for the payment of operating expenses, pension charges, and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance and accident reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require; (2) for repairs and maintenance; (3) for reconstruction and replacements as hereinafter described; (4) for the payment of interest and sinking funds on the bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extensions; (5) for extensions and improvements, and (6) for a surplus fund. The board of supervisors shall transfer to the general fund each year an amount equal to the annual interest and redemption or sinking fund on general obligation bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extension of any utility under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission.

(b) The salaries and general expenses of the commission or bureaus thereof not chargeable to a specific department shall be apportioned fairly among the departments under the control of the public utilities commission in such manner as the commission may deem appropriate, and such apportionment shall be shown as expenses of such department.

(c) For the purpose of computing net income, the public utilities commission, on the basis of an appraisal of the estimated life and the then current depreciated value of the several classes of property in each utility, shall determine the amount of reasonable annual depreciation for each utility. During the fiscal year 1937-1938 and at least every five years thereafter, the commission shall make an appraisal or may revise the last preceding appraisal of the value and probable

useful life of each of the several classes of property of each utility, and shall, on the basis of said appraisal, redetermine the amount of the reasonable annual depreciation for each utility.

(d) For the purpose of providing funds for reconstruction and replacements due to physical and functional depreciation of each of the utilities under the jurisdiction of the commission, the commission must create and maintain a reconstruction and replacement fund for each such utility, sufficient for the purposes mentioned in this section, and in accordance with an established practice for utilities of similar character, which shall be the basis for the amount necessary to be appropriated annually to provide for said reconstruction and replacements.

(e) If any accumulation in the surplus fund of any utility shall, in any fiscal year, exceed 25 percent of the total expenditures of such utility for operation, repairs and maintenance for the preceding fiscal year, such excess may be transferred by the board of supervisors to the general fund of the city and county, and shall be deposited by the commission with the treasurer to the credit of such general fund.

((f) Any budget of expenditures for any public utility in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed \$.0075 on each \$100 valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to \$.0075 on each \$100 valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county and provided further than proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.205 of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.)) (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

7.311 **Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness for financing the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.**

(a) The board of supervisors may, by resolution, from time to time authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness to assist private parties in the financing or refinancing of the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses or other facilities and activities incidental to such industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities or for the purpose of refunding such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall be pursuant to procedures adopted by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The repayment of principal, interest and other charges on such financial assistance by the private parties receiving such assistance shall be the sole source of monies

pledged for repayment of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issues under the provisions of this section shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the City and County of San Francisco or a pledge of the faith and credit of the City and County of San Francisco, but shall be payable solely from funds specified in this section. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall not directly, indirectly, or contingently obligate the board of supervisors to levy or to pledge any form of taxation whatever or to make any appropriation for their payment.

(b) Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the board of supervisors to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under any other applicable provision of this Charter or any other applicable provisions of the general laws of the State of California.

(c) All legislation necessary for the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under this section shall not be subject to the voter approval requirement of section 7.300.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System((.)), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

The City and County, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purpose, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of Section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of Section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contribu-

tions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in Section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with Sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

If in the election of November 2, 1982 two or more propositions amending Section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.514-1 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years, and further provided that the provisions of this section shall be applicable only to the first such marriage.

Any allowance heretofore terminated by reason of the remarriage of a surviving spouse shall be reinstated in the amount which had been terminated and shall be payable hereafter to said surviving spouse, subject to the provisions of the first paragraph herein.

Neither the preceding paragraph nor this section in its entirety shall give a surviving spouse, or the successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system. (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSITION H

(Continued from page 70)

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 departments 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 interest at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection (G) hereof, may retire for 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 sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent 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 sixty-five 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 sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having

attained the age of fifty 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):

Age at Retirement	Percent for Each Year of Credited Service
50	1.0000
50¼	1.0250
50½	1.0500
50¾	1.0750
51	1.1000
51¼	1.1250
51½	1.1500
51¾	1.1750
52	1.2000
52¼	1.2250
52½	1.2500
52¾	1.2750
53	1.3000
53¼	1.3250
53½	1.3500
53¾	1.3750
54	1.4000
54¼	1.4250
54½	1.4500
54¾	1.4750
55	1.5000
55¼	1.5250
55½	1.5500
55¾	1.5750
56	1.6000
56¼	1.6250
56½	1.6500
56¾	1.6750
57	1.6700
57¼	1.7250
57½	1.7500
57¾	1.7750
58	1.8000
58¼	1.8250
58½	1.8500
58¾	1.8750
59	1.9000
59¼	1.9250
59½	1.9500
59¾	1.9750

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed seventy-five 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 to

(Proposition H, Continued)

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 section 8.514 of the 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 thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that as to any member within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, 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 calculation 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 ten 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 forty 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 sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty 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 (1) 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 workmen's compensation laws of the State of California.

(E) If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:

(1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection (E), a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his contributions and interest credited thereon.

(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 for 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 eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen 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 eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen 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 a 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

(Proposition H, Continued)

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 eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any 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 deposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars (\$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 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 $\frac{3}{4}$ 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 contribution 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 of 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 services 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 therefore 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) ("The rate of contribution of each member under this section shall be based on his nearest age at the effective date of his membership in the retirement system. The normal rate of contribution of each member, to be effective from the effective date of membership under this section, shall be such as, on the average for such member, will provide, assuming service without interruption, under subsection (B) of this section, one-half of that portion of the service retirement allowance to which he would be entitled if retired at age sixty or higher age after rendering ten years of service for retirement under that subsection. No adjustment shall be included in said rates because of time during which members have contributed at different rates. Members' rates of contributions shall be changed only in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for changing contribution rates of other members.

(2) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under this section, a sum determined by applying the member's rate of contribution to such compensation. Amounts which would have been deducted in the absence of the limit

(Proposition H, Continued)

on such deductions according to service credited, shall be paid to the retirement system following the removal of such limit, in manners and at times approved by the retirement board. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contributions 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 this section or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in subsections (E) and (F) of this section, provided that the portion of the salaries of the teachers as provided in section 8.507, paragraph (a), as a basis for fixing the contributions to be made, and the benefits to be received, by the teachers under the retirement system shall be determined by the method provided in section 8.507, paragraph (a), and shall not be less than eighty percent of the total salary received by the teachers, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.))

There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one half 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 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 the 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 (5), 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) 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.

(Proposition H, Continued)

(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 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 therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983. (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION I

NOTE: All Sections Are New.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

8.590 Members of the Police Department after November 1, 1982

Those persons who become members of the Police Department as defined in Section 8.590-1, on or after November 2, 1982 shall be members of the system subject to the provisions of sections 8.590, 8.590-1, 8.590-2, 8.590-3, 8.590-4, 8.590-5, 8.590-6, 8.590-7, 8.590-8, 8.590-9, 8.590-10, 8.590-11, 8.590-12, 8.590-13, 8.590-14, 8.590-15 (which shall apply only to members under section 8.590) in addition to the provisions contained in section 3.670 to 3.674 both inclusive, and section 6.314, 8.500, 8.510, 8.518, and 8.520 of this charter, notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this charter, and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of section 8.544, 8.559 or 8.586.

8.590-1 Definitions

The following words and phrases as used in this section, section 8.590 and sections 8.590-2 through 8.590-15, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meanings:

"Retirement allowance," "death allowance" or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, or upon the day following the date of death, as the case may be, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member the Act of the State of California, shall mean the remuneration payable in cash, by the city and county, without deduction except for absence from duty, for time during which the individual receiving such remuneration is a member of the police department, but excluding remuneration paid for overtime.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member received compensation without interruption throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of

remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the police department, he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," "death allowance" and "death benefit."

"Final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earnable by a member during any two consecutive years of credited service in which his average compensation is the highest.

For the purpose of sections 8.590 through 8.590-15, the terms "member of the police department," "member of the department," or "member" shall mean any officer or employee of the police department employed after November 1, 1982 who was or shall be subject to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements of members of the uniformed force of said department and said terms shall further mean persons employed after November 1, 1982 at an age not greater than the maximum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform duties now performed under the titles of criminologist, photographer, police woman or jail matron provided, however, that said terms shall not include any person who has not satisfactorily completed such course of training as may be employed by the Police Department prior to assignment to active duty with said Department.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and 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 this 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 interest at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(Proposition I, Continued)

8.590-2 Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10, may retire for 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 sixty-five years. A member retired after meeting the service requirement in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to forty (40) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three (3) per cent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy per cent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.590-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser 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 election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.590-3 Retirement for Incapacity

Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, shall be retired. If he is not qualified for service retirement, he shall receive a retirement allowance in an amount which shall be equal to the same percentage of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1, as his percentage of disability is determined to be. The percentage of disability shall be as determined by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board of the State of California upon referral from the retirement board for that purpose; provided that the retirement board may, by five (5) affirmative votes, adjust the percentage of disability as determined by said Appeals Board; and provided, further that such retirement allowance shall be in an amount not less than forty (40) per cent nor more than eighty (80) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1. Said allowance shall be paid to him until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at retirement, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date based on the final compensation as defined in section 8.590-1, he would have received immediate-

ly prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such final compensation.

If, at the time of retirement because of disability, he is qualified as to service for retirement under section 8.590-2, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would receive if retired under section 8.590-2, but not less than forty (40) per cent of said final compensation. Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for performance of his duty, by reason of a cause not included under the provisions of the immediately preceding sentences, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and one-half per cent of the final compensation of said member as defined in section 8.590-1 for each year of service, provided that said allowance shall not be less than thirty (30) per cent of said final compensation; provided, however, that if such member has completed at least 20 years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance he would have received if he retired under section 8.590-2 as of the date of retirement for such incapacity. The questions of retiring a member under this section may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of the Police Commission, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to the service in the rank and position he occupied at the time of his retirement.

8.590-4 Death Allowance

If a member of the police department shall die before or after retirement by reason of an injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, a death allowance, in lieu of any allowance payable under any other section of the charter or by ordinance, on account of death resulting from injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, shall be paid, beginning on the date next following the date of death, to the surviving spouse throughout their life or until their remarriage. If the member, at the time of death, was qualified for service retirement, but had not retired, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance which the member would have received if he had been retired for service on the day of death, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of the final compensation earnable by said member immediately preceding death. If death occurs prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be equal to the final compensation of said member at the date of death, until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement, had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at death, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, based on the final compensation he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such monthly final compensation. If he had retired prior to death, for service or for disability resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance of the member, except that if he

(Proposition I, Continued)

was a member under section 8.590 and retirement was for such disability, and if death occurred prior to qualification for the service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be reduced upon the date at which said member would have qualified for service retirement, in the same manner as it would have been reduced had the member not died. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse would have received had they lived and not remarried shall be paid to the child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. Should said member leave no surviving spouse and no children under the age of eighteen years, but leave a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse following the death of a member unless they were married to the member prior to the date of the injury or onset of the illness which results in death.

8.590-5 Payment to Surviving Dependents

Upon the death of a member of the police department resulting from any cause, other than an injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, (a) if his death occurred after qualification for service retirement, under section 8.590-2, or after retirement for service or because of disability which resulted from any cause other than injury received in, or illness caused by performance of duty, three-fourths of his retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service at the time of death or three-fourths of the retirement allowance as it was at his death, as the case may be, shall be continued throughout life or until marriage, to his surviving spouse, or (b) if his death occurred after the completion of at least twenty (20) years of service in the aggregate, three-fourths of the retirement allowance to which he would have been entitled under section 8.590-2 shall be continued throughout life or until remarriage to his surviving spouse, or (c) if his death occurred after retirement for disability by reason of injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, his retirement allowance as it was at his death shall be continued throughout life or until remarriage, to his surviving spouse, except that, if death occurred prior to qualification for service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be adjusted upon the date of which said member would have qualified for service retirement, in the same manner as it would have been adjusted had the member not died, or (d) if his death occurred after completion of at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, an allowance in an amount equal to the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled pursuant to section 8.590-3 if he had retired on the date of death because of incapacity for performance of duty resulting from a cause other than bodily injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty shall be paid throughout life or until remarriage to his surviving spouse. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder,

or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which surviving spouse would have received had they lived and not remarried shall be paid to his child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. Should said member leave no surviving spouse and no children under age of eighteen years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse unless she was married to the member prior to the date of injury or onset of the illness which results in death if he had not retired, or unless she was married to the member at least one year prior to his death if he had retired.

As used in this section and section 8.590-4, "surviving spouse" shall mean and include a spouse who has remarried since the death of the member, but whose remarriage has been terminated by death, divorce or annulment within five years after the date of such remarriage and who has not thereafter again remarried.

The surviving spouse, in the event of death of the member after qualification for but before service retirement, may elect before the first payment of the allowance, to receive the benefit provided in section 8.590-8, in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be continued to her under this section, if there be no surviving spouse, the guardian of the eligible child or children may make such election, and if there be no such children, the dependent parent or parents may make such election. "Qualified for service retirement," "Qualification for service retirement" or "Qualified as to age and service for retirement," as used in this section and other sections to which persons who are members under section 8.590 are subject, shall mean completion of twenty (20) years of service, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10.

8.590-6 Adjustment of Allowance

Every retirement or death allowance payable to or on account of any member under section 8.590 shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1983, and on July 1 of each succeeding year by an amount equal to fifty per cent of any increase or decrease, respectively, in the rate of remuneration attached to the rank or position upon which such retirement or death allowance was based; provided, however, that no allowance shall be reduced below the amount being received by a member or his beneficiary on June 30, 1983, or on the date such member or beneficiary began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.

8.590-7 Adjustment for Compensation Payments

That portion of any allowance payable because of the death or retirement of any member of the police department which is provided by contributions of the city and county, shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors, by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits, payable by the

(Proposition I, Continued)

city and county to or on account of such person, under any workers' compensation law or any other general law and because of the injury or illness resulting in said death or retirement. Such portion which is paid because of death or retirement which resulted from injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, shall be considered as in lieu of all benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to or on account of such person under such law and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligation of the city and county to pay such benefits.

8.590-8 Death Benefit

If a member of the police department shall die, before retirement from causes other than an injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, or regardless of cause, if no allowance shall be payable under section 8.590-4 or 8.590-5 preceding, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system. 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 the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system.

8.590-9 Refunds and Redeposit

Should any member of the police department cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement or transfer to another office or department, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar terminations of employment of other members of the retirement system. If he shall again become a member of the department, he shall redeposit in the retirement fund, the amount refunded to him. Contributions, with interest, which are credited because of service rendered in any other office or department and which will not be counted under section 8.590-10, to any person who becomes a member of the retirement system under this section, shall be refunded to him forthwith. Should a member of the police department become an employee of any other office or department, his accumulated contribution account shall be adjusted by payments to or from him as the case may be to make the accumulated contributions credited to him if he had been employed in said other office or department at the rate of compensation received by him in the police department and he shall receive credit for service for which said contributions were made, according to the charter section under which his membership in the retirement system continues.

8.590-10 Computation of Service

The following time shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member of the police department for the purpose of determining whether such member qualified for retirement and calculating benefits, excluding, however, any time, the contributions for which were withdrawn by said member upon termination of his service while he was a member under any other charter section, and not

redeposited upon reentry into service:

(1) Time during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a member of the police or fire department.

(2) Time during and for which said member was entitled to receive compensation under section 8.559 and 8.586 if said member elects to transfer as specified in 8.590-14.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraph (1), by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States of America, or by reason of any other service included in section 8.520 of the charter, during any war in which the United States was or shall be engaged or during other national emergency, and for which said member contributed or contributes to the retirement system or from which the city and county contributed or contributes on his account.

8.590-11 Sources of Funds

All payments provided for members under section 8.590 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 made to a member under section 8.590 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7½) per cent 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, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in section 8.590-8, 8.590-9 and 8.590-10.

(2) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in paragraph (1) of this section 8.590-11, to provide the benefits payable to members under section 8.590. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder 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 compensation paid during said year to persons who are members under section 8.590, said percentage to the ratio of the value on November 2, 1982, 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 to or on account of members under section 8.590 from contributions of the city and county less the amount of such contributions plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after said date, to the value on 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 valua-

(Proposition I, Continued)

tion shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

(3) 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 benefits for members under section 8.590 shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included.

8.590-12 Right to Retire

Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in section 8.590-2 as requisite to retirement, a member of the police department shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said section 8.590-2, and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

8.590-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under section 8.590 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. (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 8.590, he shall re-enter membership under section 8.590 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of subsection (a) 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 8.590. 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.

8.590-14 Right to Transfer

Notwithstanding any provisions of this charter to the contrary, any person who, on or after January 1, 1983, is a member of the Police Department, and is a member of the Retirement System under Charter Sections 8.559 or 8.586, may become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 by filing in writing with the Retirement System no later than June 30, 1984, an executed waiver of all benefits which might inure to him under Charter Section 8.559 or 8.586. This waiver must be without right of revocation and on a form furnished by the retirement system. The Retirement Board may require that this

waiver be executed by additional persons before it becomes operative. Member's exercising their right of transfer under this subsection shall leave in the Retirement System monies in their contribution account including any interest thereon.

This transfer will be effective the pay period nearest 30 days after the signing of the waiver. Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall receive service credit under Charter Section 8.590 equal to their service credit under Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the date their transfer became effective.

Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall not be subject to any of those provisions of Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the effective date of their transfer.

Provided however, that those members who exercised their right to transfer, pursuant to Charter Section 8.559-14, from membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.559 to membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.586 shall not be entitled to elect to become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 unless and until they have redeposited with the Retirement System all monetary consideration, including monies from their contribution account including any interest thereon, received from electing to so transfer.

8.590-15 Conflicting Charter Provisions

Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with the provisions of section 8.590 through 8.590-14 with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of said section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or section of said sections shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect, and shall not be changed by vote of less than a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the electorate.

8.519 Disability Benefits

Whenever any member of the police department, as defined in Section 8.590-1 is incapacitated for the performance of his duties by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by, the performance of his duty, as determined by the retirement board, he shall become entitled with respect to any one injury or illness, regardless of his period of service with the city and county, to disability benefits equal to and in lieu of his salary, while so disabled, for a period or periods not exceeding 12 months in the aggregate, or until such earlier date as he is retired, whether for service or disability.

Said disability benefit shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits payable to such person under the Labor Code concurrently with said disability benefit, and because of the injury or illness resulting in said disability. Such disability benefits as are paid in the absence of payments of any benefits other than medical benefits under the workers' compensation laws included in said Labor Code, shall be considered as in lieu of such benefits payable to such person under the said code concurrently with said disability benefits, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligations of the city and county to pay such benefits under the Labor Code.

The provisions of this section shall be administered exclusively by the retirement board, and the city and county shall pay to the retirement system during each

(Proposition I, Continued)

fiscal year an amount equal to the total disability benefits paid by said system during that year.

A member of the police department shall receive credit as service, under the retirement system, for time during which he is incapacitated for performance of duty and receives said disability benefit; provided,

however, that contributions for the retirement system shall be deducted from payments of such disability benefits paid to him. The city and county shall contribute, in addition to its other contributions provided herein, to the retirement system on the basis of said benefits in the same manner as it would contribute on salary paid to said member. *(end)*

**TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J**

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face**; deletions are indicated by *((double parentheses))*.

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in Section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, **as requested by the member**, be compensated on the basis of *((straight time))* **time and one-half** in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay **at the rate of time and one-half**.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in Section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the

period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of *((straight time))* **time and one-half** in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of Section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of *((straight time))* **time and one-half** as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay **at the rate of time and one-half** *((in the judgment of the police commission))* **as requested by the member**.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION K**

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

That, in order to bring about lower electricity rates for the residents of San Francisco, and in furtherance of the stated policy of the City and County of San Francisco, as embodied in Charter Section 3.599, which states:

"It is the declared purpose and intention of the people of the city and county, when public interest and necessity demand, that public utilities be gradually acquired and ultimately owned by the city and county,"

the following steps be taken in order to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco:

1. That within 90 days of the passage of this ordinance the Board of Supervisors shall begin hearings on the scope of a study to determine the feasibility of public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco; which hearings are to include public testimony and to be conducted at times of day conducive to the widest possible public participation. The scope of such feasibility study shall include, but not be limited to: determination of the cost of acquisition of such electric facilities as may be necessary for adequate provision of electric utility service within the city and county; determination of the potential revenue to a municipally owned system providing such services; determination of rates chargeable to consumers by such

(Proposition K, Continued)

a system; determination of the mechanisms necessary for conversion of such a system from municipal ownership to consumer ownership; and examination of models of governance and management for such a public or consumer-owned utility. The feasibility study should also consider the alternative of a system which provides electricity to the residential and industrial sections of the city and county at a lesser rate than to that portion of the city and county within the area commonly known as the "Downtown Assessment District." In addition to examining alternatives, the contractor shall make recommendations from among the alternatives, based on the criterion of cost-efficiency and such other criteria as may be suggested by the Public Utilities Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors.

2. That, after conclusion of the hearings mentioned in paragraph 1, above, and within 150 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize the acceptance of bids on the feasibility study. Bids for this study shall be accepted, and determination of a contractor shall be made by the Public Utilities Commission after public hearings concerning the qualifications of the bidders to carry out

the study in question. Within 210 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize and the Mayor shall approve such expenditure of funds from the Public Utilities Department budget as may be necessary to fund such a study, provided that such funds not be diverted from operating expenses of the Department, but instead be taken from revenues normally available for funding of studies by the Department. The contractor for such study shall be directed to complete and present the study to the Public Utilities Commission no later than June 10, 1984.

3. That, following submission of the completed feasibility study to the city and county by the contractor, the Board of Supervisors shall place the question of acquisition, including condemnation of property and bond authorization, before the people at the general election next following submission of the study.

Should any provision of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but will remain in full force and effect. Further, no provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent the accomplishment of the feasibility study called for above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY PROPOSITION M

The proposed declaration of policy reads as follows:

It shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in order to promote and protect the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare and to protect the character and stability of the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center, and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such area, to enact ordinances, resolutions and all other acts necessary to provide for the appropriate zoning and to permit the construction of a hotel for guests of not less than two hundred bedrooms or more than two hundred twenty-five bedrooms, restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facilities and other ancillary commercial areas with additional thirty housing units which can be sold at a fair market price or rented at a fair rental market price. Furthermore, there shall be provisions for off-street parking spaces for a minimum of one hundred thirty-five automobiles.

The aforesaid facilities shall be constructed in an area in close proximity to the aforesaid medical complex and medical center, which area is specifically described as follows:

That certain real property situated in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

PARCEL 1:

Portions of lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California" filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the westerly line of said lot 45; running thence easterly along said southerly line of Carl Street 36 feet; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the right and running southerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 32.664 feet, thence deflecting 90°20'34" to the right

and running westerly 35.807 feet to the westerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 89°39'26" to the right and running northerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 28.715 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 2:

PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as a whole as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 28.715 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30.234 feet; thence deflecting 89°21'10" to the left and running easterly 35.808 feet; thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30.424 feet; thence deflecting 89°26'39" to the left and running westerly 35.807 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 3:

PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 58.949 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 31.051 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the left and running easterly along the southerly line of said Lots 45 and 46, a distance of 44.798 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence

(Proposition M, Continued)

at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle southerly 5 feet, thence deflecting $90^{\circ}38'50''$ to the right and running westerly 35.808 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 4:

PORTIONS OF LOTS 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of said Lot 47, distant thereon 33.90 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 56.10 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting $84^{\circ}02'40''$ to the right and running westerly along the southerly line of said Lots 47 and 46, a distance of 30.202 feet; thence deflecting $93^{\circ}57'20''$ to the right and running northerly parallel with the easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 28.426 feet; thence deflecting $90^{\circ}16'53''$ to the right and running easterly 38.790 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 5:

PORTIONS OF Lots 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California, filed in Book "H" of Maps at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the easterly line of Lot 47, above referred to; running thence westerly along said southerly line of Carl Street 39 feet; thence deflecting $84^{\circ}02'40''$ to the left and running southerly parallel with said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 29.662 feet; thence deflecting $89^{\circ}43'05''$ to the left and running easterly 38.790 feet to the easterly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting $90^{\circ}16'55''$ to the left and running northerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 33.90 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 6:

PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 32 and 33, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights", filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 155 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 7:

PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 31 and 32, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 8:

PORTIONS OF LOTS 30 and 31, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 105 feet southerly from a point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street, running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly and parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence westerly and parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 9:


BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 80 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the easterly line of Hillway Avenue and the point of beginning.

BEING the northerly 25 feet, front and rear measurements, of Lot No. 30 of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, as per map thereof filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and of record in Book "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23.

PARCEL 10:

Lots 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, 48 and 49 as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of Parkwood Heights, San Francisco, California," which Map was filed for record in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on July 16, 1914, in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23.

Also known as **ASSESSOR'S LOTS 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42A, 43, 44, 45 and 46**, of Block 1275.



BART DISTRICTS

District #8—shaded area

NOTE

Only voters in BART District #8 will be voting on BART Candidates this year.

District #8 consists of the following neighborhoods: Sunset (part), West of Twin Peaks, Excelsior, Bernal Heights (part), Upper Market, Diamond Heights, Noe Valley, Visitacion Valley, Ingleside and Lake Merced.

On your mailing address label your four-digit precinct number appears immediately above your first name (see back cover). If the second digit of your precinct number is a 4, a 5 or a 6 (example: 0411) then you are in BART District #8.

APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

1. PRINTED NAME

LETRAS DE IMPRENTA

正楷書寫姓名

Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT.
Signature will be compared with affidavit on file in this office.

2. ELECTION DATE November 2, 1982

I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

請寄一份缺席選票給本人，以參加上述所示之選舉。本人在選舉之日

Por la presente solicito una balota de Votante Ausente para la elección indicada arriba.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:

ENVIEME LA BALOTA A:

請將選票寄給本人下址：

DATE: _____
FECHA: _____
日期: _____

Zip Code
Area Postal
郵區號碼

5. _____
Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco
申請人在舊金山登記選舉之住址

6. ☐ I prefer election materials in English
☐ Prefiero materiales electorales en español
☐ 我欲索取中文選舉資料
如果你已遷居

4. _____
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE
申請人簽名

IF YOU HAVE MOVED

Complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other than that shown on your affidavit of registration.

I moved on _____ 19____.

My residence address is _____

_____ Zip Code _____

NOTE: A voter moving within 29 days prior to this election may obtain an absentee ballot. A voter moving more than 29 days prior to this election and who did not re-register prior to the registration closing date for this election is not eligible to vote.

SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO

Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.

Me cambie el _____ de 19____.

Mi dirección es _____

_____ Area Postal _____

NOTA: Un votante que se cambia dentro de los 29 días anteriores a esta elección puede obtener balota ausente. Un votante que se cambia antes de los 29 días anteriores de la elección y que no se registra antes de la fecha final para registrarse de esta elección no puede votar.

如果你已遷居，現所居住址不是你在註冊選舉誓書上之住址，請填寫此表格。

我已在一九____年____月____日遷居

我現在的住址是：_____

_____ 郵區號碼 _____

注意：選民在此次選舉前二十九日內遷居者，可索取一份缺席選票。選民在此次選舉前遷居超過二十九日，而在註冊選舉日期截止前沒有重新註冊者，沒有資格選舉。

MAIL TO: **ABSENT VOTING SECTION**
ENVIARA: **REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE**
郵寄至: **ROOM 158, CITY HALL**
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,
TUESDAY, October 25,
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO
DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 25 Oct.,
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA
ELECCION.

申請缺席選票必須在選舉日七日之前，即11月25日星期二下午五時經由選民註冊官辦事處收到此申請表格。

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

FOR REGISTRAR'S USE ONLY
SOLAMENTE PARA USO DEL REGISTRAR
選民註冊官之川

Prec. No. _____

Pol. Affil. n/a

Ballot No. _____

Ballot Mailed _____

Ballot Returned _____

Aff. Record _____

Inspector's Notice _____

Signature and Registration
Verified as Correct:

Date

Deputy Registrar

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

CARRIER ROUTE PRESORT

ELECTION DAY: 558-3061
EVERY DAY: 558-3417

MAILING ADDRESS

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE
你投票的地方

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

Third Class

CUT OR TEAR ALONG DOTTED LINES

VOTER SELECTION COUPON

CANDIDATES		CANDIDATES		STATE PROPOSITIONS		CITY PROPOSITIONS			
Governor		Judge, Municipal Court		1	186	187	A	249	250
Lt. Governor		BART Board*		2	190	191	B	252	253
Secretary of State		Suplt. Public Instr.		3	194	195	C	256	257
Controller		Board of Ed. (1)		4	198	199	D	259	260
Treasurer		(2)		5	202	203	E	261	262
Attorney General		(3)		6	206	207	F	264	265
Board of Equalization		Comm. College Bd. (1)		7	211	212	G	267	268
U.S. Senate		(2)		8	215	216	H	270	271
Congress		(3)		9	220	221	I	273	274
State Senate*		Supervisor (1)		10	225	226	J	276	277
Assembly		(2)		11	229	230	K	279	280
		(3)		12	233	234	L	282	283
		(4)		13	237	238	M	285	286
		(5)		14	241	242			
				15	245	246			

JUDGES

YES	NO
79	80
82	83
85	86
88	89
91	92
94	95
97	98
100	101
103	104
105	106
108	109
111	112

Vote "yes" or "no" on each of the judges (circle one)

* IF APPLICABLE: This office may not appear on all ballot styles.

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

In the case of State Judges and Propositions, circle the number corresponding to "Yes" or "No." This number will appear on your ballot.

BALLOT
TYPE
0000



WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

The letter in parentheses on the second line of your address label indicates degree of wheelchair accessibility at the precinct:

- (A) Easily accessible
- (B) Accessible with assistance
- (C) Very difficult or impossible

These evaluations take into account architectural barriers only. Geographical barriers you may encounter enroute to the polls have not been considered.

Your rights as a handicapped voter appear elsewhere in this pamphlet; see index.