

CITY and COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

To be voted on at the
GENERAL ELECTION
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1964



Published under provisions of Section 183 of the
Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Chas. A. Rogers
Registrar of Voters.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

In order to avoid congestion and possible delay at the
polls on election day voters are urged to:

1. KEEP THE POLLING PLACE CARD ENCLOSED HERE-
WITH. MARK YOUR CHOICES FOR THE VARIOUS OF-
FICES AND PROPOSITIONS. TAKE THE CARD WITH YOU
TO THE POLLS AND YOU CAN COMPLETE YOUR VOT-
ING IN LESS THAN TWO MINUTES.

2. Vote early, if possible.

Chas. A. Rogers
Registrar of Voters.

Permanent registration is maintained by VOTING.

INDEX

Proposition	Page
A Log Cabin Ranch Bonds, 1964; \$1,300,000	7
B School Bonds, 1964; \$31,465,000	10
C Fire Department Bonds, 1964; \$4,890,000	12
D Recreation and Park Bonds, 1964; \$9,450,000	15
E Charter amendment relating to employees' leaves of absence....	18
F Charter amendment relating to monetary limits on public works contracts	21
G Charter amendment relating to salary of Board of Supervisors	22
H Proposition relating to construction of low-rent housing projects	26

ORDINANCE CALLING SPECIAL BOND ELECTIONS

(PROPOSITIONS A-B-C-D)

FILE NO. 281-64-2

ORDINANCE NO. 239-64

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1964, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: \$1,300,000 FOR IMPROVEMENTS AND ADDITIONS AT LOG CABIN RANCH, LA HONDA, CALIFORNIA; \$31,465,000 FOR ADDITIONS TO AND IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING SCHOOL PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; \$4,890,000 FOR ADDITIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS TO THE PLANT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; \$9,450,000 FOR ADDITIONS TO AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE RECREATION AND PARK SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF, PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 3rd day of November, 1964, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

(a) LOG CABIN RANCH BONDS, 1964.

\$1,300,000 to pay the cost of improvements and additions at Log Cabin Ranch, La Honda, California, including a school, buildings, and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the improvement of Log Cabin Ranch.

(b) SCHOOL BONDS, 1964.

\$31,465,000 to pay the cost of buildings, lands, structures and all other works, properties and appurtenances necessary or convenient for school

purposes within the City and County of San Francisco, including additions to and reconstruction, replacement, remodeling and improvement of existing school properties.

(c) FIRE DEPARTMENT BONDS, 1964.

\$4,890,000 to pay the cost of additions and improvements to the plant of the fire protection system, including a Fire Department headquarters building, new fire stations, reconstruction and improvements of existing fire stations, land, and all works, property and structures necessary or convenient for the improvement of the plant of the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

(d) RECREATION AND PARK BONDS, 1964.

\$9,450,000 to pay the cost of additions to and improvement of the recreation and park system of the City and County of San Francisco, including land, buildings, facilities, equipment and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for additions to and improvement of the recreation and park system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolutions and in the amounts specified:

Log Cabin Ranch Bonds, Resolution No. 431-64, \$1,300,000; School Bonds, Resolution No. 432-64, \$31,465,000; Fire Department Bonds, Resolution No. 432-64, \$4,890,000; Recreation and Park Bonds, Resolution No. 430-64, \$9,450,000.

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolutions, and each thereof, are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements, and each thereof.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election to be held Tuesday, November 3, 1964, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places

and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Chronicle on or about October 13, 1964.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, each to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballots as separate propositions:

(a) "Log Cabin Ranch Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of \$1,300,000 for improvements and additions at Log Cabin Ranch, La Honda, California."

(b) "School Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of \$31,465,000 for the acquisition, construction and completion of new schools and improvements to existing schools."

(c) "Fire Department Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of \$4,890,000 for additions and improvements to the plant of the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco."

(d) "Recreation and Park Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the amount of \$9,450,000 for additions to and improvements of the recreation and park system of the City and County of San Francisco."

To vote for any proposition where ballots are used, and to incur the bonded indebtedness to the amount of and for the purposes stated herein, stamp a cross (X) in the blank space to the right of the word "Yes." To vote against any proposition and thereby refuse to authorize the incurring of a bonded indebtedness to the amount of and for the purposes stated herein, stamp a cross (X) in the blank space to the right of the word "No."

Where voting machines are used at said special election said voting machines shall be so arranged that any qualified elector may vote for any proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "Yes" under or near a statement of the proposed proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for the proposition, and by pulling down a lever over the word "No" under or near a statement of the proposed proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, shall constitute a vote against the proposition. Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with the provisions of law.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 6 per centum per annum, payable semi-annually.

The votes cast for and against each of said respective propositions shall

be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on any one of such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same become due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Chronicle, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Approved as to form:

THOMAS M. O'CONNOR,
City Attorney

Passed for Second Reading—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, Aug. 17, 1964.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Ferdon, McCarthy, Tamaras, Tinney.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

Read Second Time and Finally Passed—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, Aug. 24, 1964.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Ferdon, McCarthy, Tamaras, Tinney.

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

Approved August 26, 1964.

JOHN F. SHELLEY, Mayor

PROPOSITION A

Log Cabin Ranch Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of \$1,300,000 for improvements and additions at Log Cabin Ranch, La Honda, Calif.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "A"

Log Cabin Ranch Bonds

Proposition "A" will fight juvenile delinquency.

This measure will finance construction of a desperately needed rehabilitative ranch school for younger San Francisco delinquent boys, aged

10 to 15, on city-owned property in the Santa Cruz Mountains near La Honda. Of its \$1,300,000 cost, it is expected that the State of California will reimburse San Francisco in the amount of \$300,000 upon completion of the project, and will thereafter contribute \$95 per month per boy to its operation.

A major social problem confronting San Francisco today is juvenile delinquency with its frightening implications in terms of wasted lives, broken homes, overt crime and lost human resource. There is a critical need for the means of correction and rehabilitation of those younger children who become involved in behavior that represents the first tentative step toward delinquency and crime.

The effect of rehabilitative treatment of some delinquents through intensive counseling, supervision and training, coupled with discipline, at the present Log Cabin Ranch for older boys, 15 to 18 years, has made it possible to return home the great majority of them, committed to that ranch school, to useful, productive lives in their families and communities, and averted the terrible cost of continuing delinquency.

A similar home for younger boys is vitally necessary, and it is this need that Proposition "A" is designed to fill. The private institutions which in the past have housed some of them have now either reached their own saturation levels or, in many cases, no longer provide the service. The Juvenile Court estimates that approximately 200 younger boys in the past year were returned to inadequate homes or committed to a distant State institution because there was no such facility open to them.

To assure rehabilitation, it is essential that the younger boys be separated from older delinquents. The proposed ranch school, operated separately from the present Log Cabin Ranch, will provide accommodations for about 100 boys between 10 and 15. Its program will include full school classes, organized work, recreation and intensive individual counseling, intended to redirect and reshape the attitudes of youngsters whose proneness to delinquency all too often is rooted in parental neglect, personal defiance or community inadequacies.

The ranch school was planned by the Juvenile Court and Juvenile Justice Commission in cooperation with the San Francisco School Department and the California Youth Authority, and will be set in a healthful, rural environment near enough to San Francisco to preserve and improve family relationships.

Proposition "A" has been endorsed by:

The Judges of the Superior Court of San Francisco	The Guardsmen
Judge Walter Carpeneti, Presiding Judge of the Superior Court	San Francisco Bar Association
Judge Melvyn I. Cronin, Superior Court, Presiding over the Juvenile Court	San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Juvenile Justice Commission	Big Brothers, Inc., of the San Francisco Bay Area
San Francisco County Grand Jury	Kiwanis Club of Mission—San Francisco
Volunteer Auxiliary of the Youth Guidance Center	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union No. 6
Police Commission of City and County of San Francisco	Thomas F. Strycula, Chief Probation Officer, Juvenile Court
League of Women Voters of San Francisco	San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO, by George W. Johns, Secretary
Episcopal Diocese of California, by Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, Bishop	Dr. Arthur H. Coleman
Very Reverend Msgr. James B. Flynn, General Director, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of San Francisco	J. K. Choy, Manager, S.F. Federal Savings Loan Association
	Ngai Ho Hong
	The San Francisco Community Council for Youth

Stephen C. Brown, President, San Francisco Community Council for Youth	Charles F. Sweigert, M.D.
Carlton B. Goodlett, Ph.D., M.D.	Lim P. Lee
Edgar D. Osgood	Mrs. J. D. Zellerbach
Donald B. King	Samuel Ladar
William S. Solari, Jr.	Federation of Public Employees
Mrs. George T. Cameron	Ransom S. Cook
Cyril Magnin	Jerd F. Sullivan
Helen Bissinger Bloch	Phillip Burton, Member of Congress
Fred H. Merrill	Putnam Livermore
Amos E. Schermerhorn	Golden Gate Breakfast Club
Richard Leonards, M.D.	The Very Rev. C. Julian Bartlett, D.D., Dean, Grace Cathedral

On August 31, 1964, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 3, 1964, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Casey, Ertola, Ferdon, McCarthy, Moscone, Tamaras, Tinney.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION “A”

Log Cabin Ranch Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of \$1,300,000 for improvements and additions at Log Cabin Ranch, La Honda, California.

Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a fifteen year basis, and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1964-1965 assessment roll as the basis for calculating the effect upon the tax rate, in my opinion, the approximate cost and effect on the tax rate would be as follows:

Bond redemption	\$1,300,000
Interest requirement	364,000
Total debt service requirement	<u>\$1,664,000</u>
Based on a three year construction program	
average annual debt service requirement for	
17 years	\$ 97,882
Estimated annual operations costs based on	
report prepared by Juvenile Court	344,555
Estimated 5 year average annual maintenance	
cost based on report prepared by Department	
of Public Works.....	9,130
	<u>\$ 451,567</u>
Less, under present law, annual State of Cali-	
fornia Youth Authority subsidy and payments	
to be received from responsible relatives as	
estimated by the Juvenile Court.....	<u>133,000</u>
Net annual recurring costs which are equiva-	
lent to one and ninety four hundredths (1.94)	
cents in the tax rate.....	<u>\$ 318,567</u>

HARRY D. ROSS, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION B

School Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of \$31,465,000 for the acquisition, construction and completion of new schools and improvements to existing schools.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION B

Vote "Yes" on Proposition B for School Bonds

Over 100,000 pupils are enrolled in the 130 schools of the San Francisco Unified School District. Generally, the buildings are modern, but a number are antiquated and inadequate, going back in age to the beginning of this century. Shifting populations and neighborhoods require building some new schools where the children now are.

This bond issue is to provide new schools and additions to present ones where justified, to replace old buildings past practical use, and to rehabilitate and modernize others. It has been eight years since a bond issue for school buildings was presented to the voters.

In keeping with the rights of all children, it is our obligation to give them the educational advantages to which they are entitled. Among other things this includes clean, modern, and safe buildings.

New Schools

Four entirely new schools are included in this program—an elementary school and a senior high school for the rapidly developing Diamond Heights neighborhood; a small junior high for the Potrero Hill area and one for the Visitacion Valley neighborhood, neither of which has a junior high school. All of these are justified by population growth trends.

The three secondary schools would relieve the present over-crowded junior and senior high schools. For all four of these new schools the Board of Education has access to unimproved property.

Additions to Schools

Enrollment increases call for additions to two elementary schools, Bret Harte and El Dorado, and to the City College (San Francisco's only junior college). An additional building is in keeping with the policy to add facilities to the one college campus as the enrollment increases. The present enrollment of over 8,000 students will reach beyond 10,000 within three years.

Replacement of Old Schools

Four elementary schools to be replaced, and the years built are: Paul Revere Annex (1917), Starr King Annex (1913), Burnett Annex (1910), and Grattan (1912). Also to be replaced is the Cabrillo Elementary School, a wooden structure built 40 years ago as temporary. These will be replaced on their present sites.

A sum is also included to replace with permanent classrooms approximately 50 temporary and dilapidated bungalow classrooms now scattered in various school yards over the City.

Rehabilitation and Modernization

The program includes major renewal work on older buildings, the improvement of physical facilities to meet modern educational and safety standards. These projects are more extensive than the continuous maintenance program that is provided through the regular annual budget.

Financing the Bond Issue

San Francisco gets no benefit from the California State School Bond Issue (State Proposition 3), as these funds are limited to school districts which have reached their maximum bonded indebtedness, and are therefore unable to provide the school buildings they need. This is not true of San Francisco.

The Mayor's Bond Screening Committee has approved the necessity for passage of this school bond issue NOW.

The Rights of All Children

In planning this building program a major objective of the Board of Education has been to see that children of all races have modern school facilities. The right of every child to equal educational opportunities has been the guide. The projects in this program have met the Board of Education's standards for racial fairness. San Francisco is interested in all of her children, and none should go to a school in buildings that are a hazard to health, safety, and morale.

In a world that daily grows more complex, high educational standards play an increasingly important role. The investment in the education of the young is our best safeguard for the future. San Francisco has an excellent staff of well-trained teachers, but this is not enough.

Give our children enough classrooms—and adequate school housing.
Vote YES on Proposition B.

Bert W. Levit, Chairman
Citizens Committee for San Francisco
School Bonds

Mrs. Stuart Dodge, President
San Francisco Second District
California Congress of Parents and
Teachers

James E. Stratten, President
San Francisco Board of Education

Harold Spears
Superintendent of Schools
San Francisco Unified School District

Proposition "B" has also been endorsed by:

The San Francisco Municipal Conference, consisting of the following organizations:

Apartment House Associations
Consolidated, Inc.

Building Owners and Managers Association
California Northern Hotel Association

Down Town Association

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce

San Francisco Real Estate Board

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO, by George W. Johns, Secretary.

On August 31, 1964, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 3, 1964, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Casey, Ertola, Ferdon, McCarthy, Moscone, Tamaras, Tinney.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION "B"

School Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of \$31,465,000 for the acquisition, construction and completion of new schools and improvements to existing schools.

Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a fifteen year basis, and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1964-1965 assessment roll as the basis for calculating the effect upon the tax rate, in my opinion, the approximate cost and effect on the tax rate would be as follows:

Bond redemption	\$31,465,000
Interest requirement	8,810,200
Total debt service requirement	<u>\$40,275,200</u>
Based on a five year construction program, average annual debt service requirement for 19 years	\$ 2,119,747
Estimated additional annual operating and maintenance costs based on report prepared by the San Francisco Unified School District	<u>\$ 88,000</u>
Net annual recurring costs which are equiva- lent to thirteen and forty five hundredths (13.45) cents in the tax rate	<u>\$ 2,207,747</u>

HARRY D. ROSS, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION C

Fire Department Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of \$4,890,000 for additions and improvements to the plant of the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "C"
Vote Yes on Proposition "C"

Proposition "C" authorizes \$4,890,000 in bonds to:

1. Construct an urgently needed Headquarters for the San Francisco Fire Department;
2. Continue and complete the firehouse construction and reconstruction started with the 1952 Firehouse Bonds.

There will be no increase in Fire Department payroll costs because of this bond issue.

Vote Yes on Proposition "C"

For the past 50 years, your Fire Department has been occupying "temporary" quarters in the basement of the City Hall. This space must be vacated to accommodate the city's new Electronic Data Processing Center.

A headquarters site in the Civic Center area is already owned by the Fire Department. Construction will start shortly after approval of Proposition "C".

Vote Yes on Proposition "C"

The 1952 Firehouse Bonds resulted in the construction of 14 new fire stations and the reconstruction of 11 fire stations. Proposition "C" will provide funds to build 6 more new fire stations and to reconstruct 8 additional fire stations.

In every case, the fire station to be replaced or reconstructed is either obsolete, a poor earthquake risk, or both.

Our construction program is based on surveys already made by competent architects and structural engineers. Estimates for this bond issue are current, and they are projected to the dates of probable construction.

The average age of the 6 fire stations to be replaced is over 55 years; the oldest one was built in 1896. The average age of the 8 stations to be reconstructed is over 44 years.

A **YES** vote on Proposition "C" is a vote for—

1. An urgently needed Headquarters for your Fire Department;
2. Safe and adequate fire stations.

Vote Yes on Proposition "C"

WILLIAM F. MURRAY
Chief of Fire Department

Approved and endorsed by—

Fire Commission City and County of San Francisco

President: Philip Dindia

Vice-President: Robert Grosso

Commissioner: Don C. Silverthorne

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

On September 8, 1964, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 3, 1964, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Ferdon, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, Tamaras, Tinney.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION "C"

Fire Department Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of \$4,890,000 for additions and improvements to the plant of the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a fifteen year basis, and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1964-1965 assessment roll as the basis for calculating the effect upon the tax rate, in my opinion, the approximate cost and effect on the tax rate would be as follows:

Bond redemption	\$4,890,000
Interest requirement	1,369,200
Total debt service requirement.....	<u>\$6,259,200</u>
Based on a five year construction program, average annual debt service requirement for 19 years	\$ 329,432
Estimated 5 year average annual maintenance cost based on report prepared by Department of Public Works	<u>13,412</u>
Net annual recurring costs which are equiva- lent to two and nine hundredths (2.09) cents in the tax rate.....	<u>\$ 342.844</u>

HARRY D. ROSS, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION D

Recreation and Park Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the amount of \$9,450,000 for additions to and improvements of the recreation and park system of the City and County of San Francisco.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "D"

San Francisco Recreation and Park Bonds

Vote Yes on Proposition "D"

San Franciscans have long been proud of their parks and recreational facilities which are renowned the world over. Proposition "D" is a \$9,450,000 bond measure which will provide for the extension and urgently needed rehabilitation of our recreational and park facilities.

Vote Yes on Proposition "D"

Proposition "D" provides funds for critical demands in certain areas for playgrounds, park developments and swimming pools. Proposition "D" will provide for modernization and improvement of certain existing recreational facilities. Proposition "D" will provide for protective neighborhood park and playground lighting for public safety at night.

Vote Yes on Proposition "D"

Certain conditions have existed in Golden Gate Park for many years that require substantial corrections. Proposition "D" will complete the entire irrigation system of Golden Gate Park; restoration of Strawberry Hill and Stow Lake; replacing of badly deteriorated park roads; general relandscaping of the entire Chain of Lakes area; installation of drainage systems; establishment of bicycle paths, and the addition of nine holes to the self-supporting existing 9-hole golf course.

The second largest park in San Francisco, McLaren Park, will continue to be developed with passage of Proposition "D".

Vote Yes on Proposition "D"

Proposition "D" includes the construction of two new swimming pools, one at Mission Playground and the other at Funston Playground. Here it is interesting to note that users of the City's existing pools and swimming areas increased by 1,568,972 men, women and children during 1963-64.

Vote Yes on Proposition "D"

Virtually every San Franciscan will benefit directly and indirectly by passage of Proposition "D", as will be noted by a brief listing of additional important projects made possible by the bond measure: **South Park:** rehabilitate the rundown facility to provide a children's area, restrooms and open space for children and adults. **Folsom Playground:** additional land for recreation and construction of a modern recreation center. **Crocker-Amazon:** a new building on the playground to provide evening-hour activities for teenagers and adults.

Vote Yes on Proposition "D"

Sunset District: creation of athletic fields containing three soccer pitches, a running track and a fieldhouse. **Balboa Stadium:** night lighting to permit attendance of league games in the evening. **Rossi Playground:** construction of a neighborhood recreation building to serve the Laurel Hill, Anzavista, Central and Inner Richmond Districts. **Douglass Playground:** a new clubhouse to replace the old, dilapidated clubhouse built in the early 1920's.

Vote Yes on Proposition "D"

Lafayette Playground: addition of a small children's playground, a mothers' section and a tennis court. **Buena Vista Park:** development of two children's areas plus reconstruction of roads and paths. **Alice Chalmers, Miraloma and Merced Heights Playgrounds:** enlargement of these three recreation buildings to accommodate the large numbers of children and adults of the neighborhoods. **Alamo Square:** construction of a small recreation building and children's area, and other improvements. **Chinese Playground:** replacement of the inadequate building by a two-story structure better able to meet the demands of this most heavily populated and congested district.

Vote Yes on Proposition "D"

Your support for Proposition "D" is an investment in maintaining the City's beauty and recreational opportunities for the benefit of all San Franciscans. The following, among many others, urge you to vote YES on Proposition "D":

Hon. John F. Shelley, Mayor
The Recreation and Park Commission:
Mr. Walter A. Haas, President
Mr. William M. Coffman, Vice President
Mr. Peter Bercut
Mr. John F. Conway, Jr.
Mrs. Carmen J. Dominguez
Mrs. Keene O. Haldeman
Dr. Francis J. Herz
California Soccer Football Association
Citizens' Committee for More Golf Courses
in San Francisco
Federation of Public Employees

San Francisco City & County Employees
Union, Local 400, AFL-CIO
San Francisco Council of District
Merchants Associations
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Citizens Committee for Passage of
Proposition "D":
Mr. Reed O. Hunt, Chairman
Mr. Thomas E. Feeney
Mr. Louis Garcia
Mr. Yori Wada
Mr. H. K. Wong

On September 8, 1964, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 3, 1964, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Ferdon, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, Tamaras, Tinney.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "D"

Vote "No" on Proposition "D"

No adequate survey of the recreation and park needs of the people of San Francisco has been made. Proposition "D" reflects this lack of study.

Proposition "D" will not provide more green areas in our congested city, but will, in many cases actually destroy trees and green areas by paving, bulldozing and cluttering our parks with poorly designed buildings. Only one small piece of land would be acquired by this bond issue, and this would be used for recreation, and not park purposes.

"D" is "Pork Barrel" politics, with projects appearing in virtually every district with no real examination of need.

Existing facilities are poorly maintained. \$639,810 annually, or 4 cents on the tax rate would be needed to maintain the new facilities proposed in this ill-conceived proposition.

Most of the "improvements" included in "D" would cost from \$50,000 to \$200,000 and should be financed on a current basis.

Vote "No" on Proposition "D"

This argument is sponsored by the Green Spaces Committee of the Alamo Square Association.

ROBERT P. WELLS, President

**CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION "D"**

Recreation and Park Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the amount of \$9,450,000 for additions to and improvements of the recreation and park system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a fifteen year basis, and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1964-1965 assessment roll as the basis for calculating the effect upon the tax rate, in my opinion, the approximate cost and effect on the tax rate would be as follows:

Bond redemption	\$ 9,450,000
Interest requirement	2,646,000
	<u>\$12,096,000</u>
Based on a five year construction program, average annual debt service requirement for 19 years	
	\$ 636,632
Based on a report submitted by the Recreation Park Department, the annual increase in oper- ating and maintenance costs, including addi- tional personnel, is estimated to be	
	<u>\$ 639,810</u>
Net annual recurring costs which are equiva- lent to seven and seventy eight hundredths (7.78) cents in the tax rate.....	
	<u>\$ 1,276,442</u>

HARRY D. ROSS, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION E

Amends Section 153: Provides employees with right to indefinite leave of absence when employed as full time salaried officer or employee of employee union.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 153 thereof to provide that employees may receive an indefinite leave of absence to accept full time employment as salaried officer or employee of employee union.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 3, 1964, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 153 thereof, to read as follows:

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

Leaves of Absence

Section 153. Leaves of absence to officers and employees of the city and county shall be governed by rules established by the civil service commission, provided that leave of absence to any officer or employee for the purpose of leaving the city and county, taking a position outside of the city and county service, or accepting a position in some department or office of the city and county other than the one in which he is employed and where the duties are in no way related to the duties covered by his civil service classification, shall be limited to six (6) months; and provided, further, that no limit shall be placed on a leave of absence granted to enable an officer or employee to accept promotion to a non-civil service position in the same department in which he holds civil service status, or promotion to co-related work in another department or office of the city and county, or to accept full time employment as a salaried officer or employee of an employee organization, the majority of whose membership are employees of the city and county.

Leaves of absence shall be granted to officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco and non-certificated officers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District for service in the armed forces of the United States or the State of California or for service on ships operated by or for the United States government in time of war and for such time thereafter as may be provided by rule of the civil service commission, but not to exceed two (2) years after the proclamation of peace, except in case of disability incurred while in active service with the armed forces or the merchant marine when such disability shall extend beyond such period.

Whenever any officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, or any non-certificated officer or employee of the San Francisco Unified School District shall, by order of the government of the United States or by lawful order of any of its departments or officers, or by lawful order of the State of California, or any of its departments or officers, be

directed in time of peace to report and serve in the armed forces of the United States, or in the armed forces of the State of California, said officer or employee shall be entitled to a leave of absence from his office or position during the time of such service and for a period not to exceed three (3) months after the expiration thereof. Officers and employees entering or being inducted into any of the services requiring military leave as provided in this section shall file with the civil service commission a copy of the orders necessitating such service prior to the effective date of the leave of absence. Leaves granted pursuant to the provisions of this and the preceding paragraph of this section shall be designated "military leaves."

The board of supervisors may, on the recommendation of the civil service commission, provide by ordinance that leaves of absence shall be granted to officers and employees during time of war or during any emergency declared by the President of the United States, for other service directly connected with the prosecution of the war or national defense or preparedness. Leaves granted under authority of ordinances enacted pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph shall be designated "war effort leaves."

In time of emergency declared by the President of the United States or by the Congress, or while any act authorizing compulsory military service or training is in effect, the board of supervisors, upon the recommendation of the civil service commission, may provide by ordinance that subject to rules of the civil service commission, leaves of absence shall be granted to officers and employees of the City and County of San Francisco and non-certificated officers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District, for sea duty as licensed officers aboard ships operated by or for the United States government.

Any officer or employee on military leave, who, prior to such leave, has been appointed to a permanent position in the city and county service, shall be entitled to resume such position at the expiration of his leave, and in determining and fixing rights, seniority, salary and otherwise, which have accrued and shall inure to the benefit of such officer or employee, the term of military leave shall be considered and accounted a part of his service under the city and county.

Persons serving in the armed forces of the United States or the State of California during time of war or during any emergency lawfully declared by the President of the United States, who have standing on an eligible list, shall retain their places thereon, and upon presenting an honorable discharge or certificate of honorable active service from such military service within the period of time and subject to the conditions as prescribed by rules of the civil service commission, shall be preferred for appointment for a period of four (4) years after the proclamation of peace or the termination of said emergency in the order of standing upon such register at the time of entering such military service and before candidates procuring standing through an examination held subsequent to the entrance of such eligibles into the military service. If while in said military service the names of such persons are reached for certification to permanent positions, appointments shall be made to serve until such persons in the military service shall present to the civil service commission an honorable discharge or certificate of honorable active service within the period of time and subject to the conditions as prescribed by rules of the civil service commission, but not more than one (1) year after the date of discharge of each such eligible, when they shall be certified and assume the duties of positions in said class and their certification to said positions for all purposes of seniority shall be deemed to

be the date when their names on such eligible lists were reached for certification, provided that each appointee to a position shall serve such probationary period as is required in section 148 of this charter, and provided that such employee while serving on such probation shall be permitted to participate in any promotive examination to which his classification is eligible but shall not be entitled to certification by virtue of such promotional examination prior to satisfactory completion of said probationary period and provided further that no such persons shall be certified to entrance positions in the uniformed ranks of the police and fire departments under this provision who are more than thirty-five (35) years of age unless the names of such persons were reached for certification to such positions before such persons reached said age.

Persons who participate in a regular written civil service examination and who by reason of their active services in the Army, Navy or Marine Corps are unable to complete all parts of the examination and who present their orders or other competent proof of service in the same manner as is required of eligibles, shall acquire standing on eligible lists in accordance with the relative excellence attained by participation in the part or parts of the examinations already completed; provided that upon presenting their honorable discharges or certificates of honorable active service within the time limits specified in this section covering eligibles, they must qualify in the remainder of the examinations. When qualified they shall be certified as of the date they would have been reached for certification in accordance with the relative excellence attained by their participation in the entire examination.

The civil service commission shall adopt rules to govern the administration of leaves as herein provided and to govern lay-offs occasioned by the return of officers, employees, or eligibles who have been appointed and granted leave or certified as provided in this section.

All leaves of absence granted under Rule 31.2 of the civil service commission are hereby ratified and approved.

For the purpose of certifications, appointments, leaves or any other matters concerning the rights of persons who are serving or have served in the armed forces of the United States or the State of California, the provisions of this section shall be retroactive to September 16, 1940, and any persons heretofore granted military leaves for any purpose other than to enter the armed forces of the United States or the State of California shall be deemed to have been granted war effort leaves by the civil service commission in accordance with the provisions of this section.

The civil service commission by rule and subject to the approval of the board of supervisors by ordinance, shall provide for leaves of absence, due to illness or disability, which leave or leaves may be cumulative, if not used as authorized, provided that the accumulated unused period of sick leave shall not exceed six (6) months, regardless of length of service, and provided further that violation or abuse of the provisions of said rule and ordinance by any officer or employee shall be deemed an act of insubordination and inattention to duties.

Ordered submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, Aug 24, 1964.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Casey, Ertola, Ferdon, McCarthy, Tamaras, Tinney.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter Amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

PROPOSITION F

Adds Section 95.1: Authorizes Board of Supervisors to determine the monetary limits, not to exceed \$5,000, within which public works or improvements may be done by contract, written order, or directly by the city and county.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by adding Section 95.1 thereto relating to public works contract procedures.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on November 3, 1964, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by adding Section 95.1 thereto, so that the same shall read as follows:

Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Section 95.1. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Charter and in particular the provisions of Section 95, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed five thousand dollars (\$5,000), within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in Section 95 and Section 88.

Ordered submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, Aug. 31, 1964.

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Casey, Ertola, Ferdon, McCarthy, Moscone, Tamaras, Tinney.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter Amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "F"

Proposition "F" authorizes the Board of Supervisors to establish monetary limits, not to exceed \$5,000, within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the City and County. The monetary limit for these public works contracts is now \$2,000, as amended in the Charter in 1946.

Since 1946 the construction cost index has increased 270% and the \$2,000 limit is not realistic today. As a result there are undue delays in securing formal contracts for the smaller construction projects.

Vote Yes on Proposition "F"

Proposition "F" will allow the Board of Supervisors, the duly elected representatives of the people, to make changes in the monetary limit by ordinance, not to exceed \$5,000, as conditions warrant. This practice is in line with good fiscal management policy and is in the public interest.

Proposition "F" does not change any of the controls set up in the Charter other than the monetary limit. Thus the taxpayer is protected.

Proposition "F" will not cost the taxpayer a penny. In fact, it will save the taxpayers money by simplifying office work, and by reducing the time required to get construction jobs started. More small firms will be encouraged to submit bids for City and County construction jobs.

Vote Yes on Proposition "F"

This change is recommended as a constructive step forward by the Chief Administrative Officer, other city officials, the Blyth-Zellerbach Committee; and is endorsed in principle by leading business groups and the San Francisco Municipal Conference.

The following, among others, urge you to vote YES on Proposition "F":

Thomas J. Mellon, Chief Administrative Officer
Associated General Contractors
San Francisco Electrical Contractors Association, Inc.
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Associated Plumbing, Heating and Cooling Contractors
San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Electrical Industry Trust
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO,
George Johns, Secretary

Sherman P. Duckel, former Chief Administrative Officer
San Francisco Municipal Conference:
Apartment House Assns. Consolidated, Inc.
Building Owners & Managers Assn.
California Northern Hotel Assn.
Down Town Assn.
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Real Estate Board

On September 8, 1964, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 3, 1964, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, Tamaras, Tinney.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

PROPOSITION G

**Amends Section 10: Fixes salary of Board of Supervisors.
Repeals obsolete language.**

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 10 thereof, relating to salaries of members of the board of supervisors.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 3, 1964, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 10 thereof so that the same shall read as follows:

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

Number, Compensation and Meetings of Supervisors

Section 10. The board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. ((, provided that for the period January 8, 1932 to January 8, 1934, the board shall consist of fifteen members.)) Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ((forty-eight hundred dollars (\$4,800))) **ninety-six hundred dollars (\$9,600)** per year, and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of five thousand dollars (\$5,000).

At twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January next following their election, the newly elected and continuing members of the board of supervisors shall meet at the legislative chamber in the City Hall, and thereafter regular meetings shall be held as fixed by resolution. The supervisors constituting the new board shall, on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.

The meetings of the board shall be held in the City Hall, provided that, in case of emergency, the board, by resolution, may designate some other appropriate place as its temporary meeting place. The board shall cause a calendar of the business scheduled for each meeting to be published and shall keep and publish a journal of its proceedings. Notice of any special meeting shall be published at least twenty-four hours in advance of such special meeting.

Ordered submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, Aug. 31, 1964.

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Casey, Ertola, Ferdon, McCarthy, Moscone, Tamaras, Tinney.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter Amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "G"

Proposed charter amendment, Section 10, relating to compensation for members of the Board of Supervisors.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "G"

and assure a well-merited increase in salary for the members of the Board of Supervisors.

Conducting the affairs of the City and County of San Francisco is a big business—the largest business in Northern California. Although the position of Supervisor is nominally part-time, as it is in all other counties, each mem-

ber devotes substantially more than 40 hours a week to the conscientious service of his constituents and the community.

The demands upon local government become more numerous and complex every day. Our Supervisors are responsible not only for the laws and policies and plans which vitally affect every phase of life within the City and County, but also for the maintenance of a vigilant, active participation in State and Federal legislative processes in order to safeguard our interests.

The average annual salary for a Supervisor in the seven California counties (including neighboring Alameda, San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties) whose population is generally comparable to San Francisco's, is \$10,809, compared to the \$4800 now paid our Board members.

Our Supervisors are the only ones in California who function both as County Supervisors and City Councilmen. In other counties, the Supervisors' duties are exclusive of city affairs, which are handled by Councilmen. It is significant that in the seven comparable counties, a total of 276 Councilmen greatly aid the Supervisors by legislating on city affairs, a duty which our Supervisors assume without any Councilmanic assistance.

Here is a comparison of total salaries paid to Supervisors and Councilmen in comparable counties, with those paid to San Francisco's Supervisors:

County	Total Salary Supervisors and Councilmen
Alameda	\$ 82,720
Orange	116,700
San Bernardino	74,000
San Diego	113,850
San Mateo	82,800
Santa Clara	60,310
Sacramento	49,800
AVERAGE	72,522
San Francisco	\$ 52,800

Since 1912, San Francisco's Supervisors have received only one increase in salary. It would be difficult if not impossible to recall any other position, public or private, which has had only one salary increase in the past 52 years.

The salary increase proposed by this charter amendment represents only a third of a penny in the annual tax rate!

The Supervisors of San Francisco by every standard of fairness deserve a salary more nearly commensurate with the high level of their services and contributions to the community, and in conformity with the recognition accorded Supervisors in other comparable counties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "G"

A "Yes" vote on Proposition "G" is endorsed by:

Associated General Contractors
 Associated Plumbing, Heating, and Cooling Contractors of San Francisco
 Building Owners & Managers Association
 Dennis Carey
 Carmens Union, Division 1380, AFL-CIO
 Civil Service Association of San Francisco

Down Town Association
 Federation of Public Employees
 Ernst M. Feibusch
 James Leo Halley, former member of Board of Supervisors
 Hospital and Institutional Workers Union, Local 250, AFL-CIO
 International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union
 Municipal Carmens Union, Local 250, TWU, AFL-CIO
 Municipal Improvement League
 Retail Dry Goods Association of San Francisco
 Retired Miscellaneous Municipal Employees League of San Francisco, Inc.
 Henry R. Rolph, former member of Board of Supervisors
 San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL
 San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
 San Francisco City and County Employees' Union, Local 400, AFL-CIO
 San Francisco City and County Municipal Employees Union, Local 747, AFL-CIO
 San Francisco Council of District Merchants Associations
 San Francisco Electrical Contractors Association, Inc.
 San Francisco Fire Fighters, Local 798, AFL-CIO
 San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
 San Francisco Police Officers Association
 San Francisco Real Estate Board
 J. Joseph Sullivan, former President of Board of Supervisors
 John F. Sullivan
 William J. Varley
 Veterans Political Council
 Mrs. Kathleen Wormuth
 Martin Wormuth, Vice President, San Francisco Employees Retirement System
 International Brotherhood of Teamsters, San Francisco Area
 Mrs. Ralph Duhagon
 Honorable Milton Marks
 Malachy Ruane
 Stephen A. Zellerbach

On September 8, 1964, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 3, 1964, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Moscone, Tamaras, Tinney.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183 **PROPOSITION "G"**

Amends Section 10: Fixes salary of Board of Supervisors. Repeals obsolete language.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, the increase in the cost of government would be \$52,800.00 annually.

Based on the 1964-1965 assessment roll, \$52,800.00 is equivalent to thirty two hundredths (0.32) of one cent in the tax rate.

HARRY D. ROSS, Controller
 City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION H

Shall the Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco develop, construct, and acquire within the City and County of San Francisco, with Federal financial assistance and/or State public body financial assistance, a low-rent housing project or projects of not to exceed in the aggregate twenty-five hundred (2500) dwelling units for living accommodations for persons of low income, including dwelling units designed specifically for eligible elderly persons of low income?

FILE NO. 343-64-1

RESOLUTION NO. 498-64

DIRECTING REGISTRAR OF VOTERS TO PLACE ON THE NOVEMBER 3, 1964, BALLOT A PROPOSAL FOR A LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECT CONSISTING OF 2500 DWELLING UNITS TO BE DEVELOPED AND CONSTRUCTED BY THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

WHEREAS, The Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco did, at a meeting held on the 7th day of August, 1964, adopt Resolution No. 1423, requesting that the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco place on the November 3, 1964, ballot for approval by the electors of the City and County of San Francisco a proposal for a low-rent housing project consisting of 2500 dwelling units to be constructed by said Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, It is recited in said Resolution No. 1423 of said Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco that the Public Housing Administration, San Francisco Regional Office, made a survey of the current low-rent housing needs in the City and County of San Francisco wherein it is established that the current need in the City and County of San Francisco is for an additional low-rent housing project consisting of 2500 dwelling units; and

WHEREAS, It is further recited in said Resolution No. 1423 of said Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco that said Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, its Commission and staff, after thorough consideration of the problem of housing persons residing within the City and County of San Francisco of low income in safe and sanitary dwelling accommodations available at rents which persons of low income can afford and that said persons are forced to occupy overcrowded and congested dwelling accommodations, finds that there is an existing need for an additional 2500 dwelling units of low-rent housing; and

WHEREAS, This Board of Supervisors does hereby concur in the finding of said Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco that there is an existing need for an additional 2500 dwelling units of low-rent housing; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Article XXXIV, Section 1, of the Constitution of the State of California, no low-rent housing project may be developed,

constructed, or acquired in any manner by any state public body in the City and County of San Francisco, until a majority of the qualified electors in said City and County of San Francisco, voting upon such issue, approves such project by voting in favor thereof at an election to be held for that purpose or at any general or special election; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO:

That this Board of Supervisors does hereby approve the submission to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held therein November 3, 1964, of a proposal for a low-rent housing project or projects consisting in the aggregate of 2500 dwelling units to be developed, constructed and acquired by the Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That this Board of Supervisors does hereby direct the Registrar of Voters to place upon the November 3, 1964 ballot to be voted on by the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco the following proposal:

Shall the Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco develop, construct, and acquire within the City and County of San Francisco, with Federal financial assistance and/or State public body financial assistance, a low-rent housing project or projects of not to exceed in the aggregate twenty-five hundred (2500) dwelling units for living accommodations for persons of low income, including dwelling units designed specifically for eligible elderly persons of low income?

Adopted on date of introduction—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, Aug. 17, 1964.

Ayes: Supervisors Blake, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Ferdon, McCarthy, Tamaras, Tinney.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

Approved Aug. 20, 1964.

JOHN F. SHELLEY, Mayor

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSITION H

This proposition would authorize the Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco to develop, construct, and acquire within the City and County of San Francisco, with Federal financial assistance and/or State public body financial assistance, a low rent housing project or projects of not to exceed in the aggregate twenty-five hundred (2500) dwelling units. These units will be made available to persons of low income, including eligible elderly persons of low income, as living accommodations.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "H"

Argument in Favor of 2500 New Low-Rent Apartments

San Francisco's senior citizens deserve decent homes instead of rooms and apartments that are seriously sub-standard. Many families of low income also need decent places to live and raise their children. Not enough decent

housing is available at rents that they can afford. It can only be provided through the creation of new low-rent housing.

A recent housing study demonstrates conclusively an urgent need for at least 2500 new low-rent apartments. Such apartments will markedly relieve pressures created by inadequate housing.

No local taxes are involved in this proposal. On the contrary, the Housing Authority, which would build these new apartments, contributed \$285,049 to the City and County of San Francisco in 1963 as payment in lieu of taxes. It is anticipated that more than \$300 thousand will be paid for 1964 and it is estimated that even greater payments will be made to the City in future years. More than \$25 million in Federal funds will be spent on this new construction in payments for labor and materials, providing a substantial boost to the economy of San Francisco.

Urban renewal is benefiting our City and increasing its tax revenue greatly, but it must be recognized that older deteriorated housing in the low-rent field is being demolished by such renewal and because of other public and private improvements. The problems of finding adequate housing for persons displaced by these actions will be greatly eased by new low-rent housing.

This new housing would permit the beginning of gradual removal of 2600 worn out, temporary apartments built 20 years ago at Hunters Point, which under State law must be demolished by 1970. The new housing would be developed with an emphasis on proper design, construction and community planning.

The 2500 proposed new low-rent units are part of a comprehensive program for improving housing conditions in San Francisco. The Mayor's Housing Program for San Francisco called for a study of low-rent housing needs and urged that the needs be met. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors later overwhelmingly approved this ballot proposal for low-rent housing.

A "Yes" vote on this proposal is one more step toward the goal of providing decent homes for all San Franciscans.

The following, among many others, urge your "Yes" vote on Proposition "H".

Mayor John F. Shelley, Honorary Chairman	Mrs. John M. Douglas
Dr. Arthur H. Coleman	Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Bowe
Judge William A. O'Brien	Dr. Robert Grosso
Mr. George Johns	Rev. John Chester Smith
Mr. Daniel F. Del Carlo	Ed Rainbow
Mr. Joseph Diviny	Jack W. Sing
Bishop James A. Pike	Michael Riordan, Treasurer
Rabbi Alvin Fine	William J. Zellerbach
Mr. Austin Morris	Martha A. Gerbode
Rev. Ross F. Hidy	San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

On August 31, 1964, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 3, 1964, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Casey, Ertola, Ferdon, McCarthy, Moscone, Tamaras, Tinney.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "H"

Vote "No" on "H"—The Socialized Housing Scheme

You, the voter, are being asked to approve a request for 2,500 more socialized public housing apartments. You have not been told where these units are to be located, you have no idea what they will cost you, the taxpayer, and no idea what they will look like—because absolutely NO plans have been presented by the Public Housers.

These 2,500 public housing apartments would either be built in ugly towers such as we already have, or they would be scattered throughout our residential neighborhoods so the occupants could avoid the stigma of living in public housing. In either case, you and I must pay the difference between what the tenant pays and the extremely high cost of constructing and operating public housing. These units may cost 25 million dollars.

The San Francisco Housing Authority already operates 8,000 apartments for low income families. This proposal would increase this figure to 10,000 apartments—more than a 31% increase.

San Francisco already has the highest proportion of public housing units in the State of California—roughly four times more than the State average. Less than one half of the Counties have any public housing whatsoever. This actually encourages low income families to move to San Francisco, thus presenting a tremendous welfare burden to our taxpayers.

There are far better solutions to housing needy families than building 2,500 more public housing apartments.

VOTE NO ON "H"—the blank check for more socialized housing which will cost you, the taxpayer.

Proposition H is opposed by:

The San Francisco Real Estate Board
Apartment House Associations Consolidated
Associated Home Builders, Inc. (San Francisco, California)

This argument is sponsored by the San Francisco Real Estate Board.

DANIEL W. KLEIN,
Corporate Secretary and Executive
Vice President

21 SAMPLE BALLOT

GENERAL ELEC

<div></div> <div>1</div>		<div></div> <div>2</div>	<div></div> <div>3</div>	<div></div> <div>4</div>	<div></div> <div>5</div>	<div></div> <div>6</div>	<div></div> <div>7</div>	<div></div> <div>8</div>	<div></div> <div>9</div>	<div></div> <div>10</div>	<div></div> <div>11</div>	<div></div> <div>12</div>	<div></div> <div>13</div>	<div></div> <div>14</div>	<div></div> <div>15</div>	<div></div> <div>16</div>	<div></div> <div>17</div>	<div></div> <div>18</div>
<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>FOR 1 AGAINST</div><div>THE STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL, AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1964. \$150,000,000 issue; to acquire and develop lands for recreational purposes.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>FOR 2 AGAINST</div><div>BONDS TO PROVIDE STATE COLLEGE, JUNIOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES, AND TO PROVIDE FUNDS TO MEET THE BUILDING NEEDS OF THE STATE, INCLUDING FACILITIES TO CARE FOR MENTALLY RETARDED AND MENTALLY ILL AND NARCOTICS CONTROL, CORRECTIONAL AND FOREST FIRE FIGHTING FACILITIES. (\$380,000,000 issue.)</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>FOR 3 AGAINST</div><div>THE STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AID BOND LAW OF 1964. \$260,000,000 issue; for construction or improvement of public schools.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 4 NO</div><div>VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTION: RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT. Prohibits exemption unless veteran was California resident at time of entry into service or effective date of this amendment; eligible survivor not to lose exemption because of amendment.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 5 NO</div><div>VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTION FOR WIDOWS. Increases from \$5,000 to \$10,000 amount of property widow of veteran may own and still receive exemption.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 6 NO</div><div>TAXATION: RETALIATORY TAX ON OUT OF STATE INSURERS. Revises provisions authorizing retaliatory taxation on out of state insurers. Authorizes imposition of burdens imposed on California insurers elsewhere.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 7 NO</div><div>PUBLIC RETIREMENT FUNDS. Legislature may authorize investment of any public pension or retirement fund, except Teachers Retirement Fund, in corporate stock or obligations.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 8 NO</div><div>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES: ELECTION IN COUNTIES OVER 700,000 POPULATION. Makes procedure for election when only incumbent files the same as in counties of 5,000,000 people.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 9 NO</div><div>COUNTY SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES. Provides that all counties, except as provided by Legislature, shall be subject to general laws relating to supervisorial district boundary adjustments.</div></div>										
<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES A NO</div><div>Log Cabin Ranch Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of \$1,300,000 for improvements and additions at Log Cabin Ranch, La Honda, California.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES B NO</div><div>School Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of \$31,465,000 for the acquisition, construction and completion of new schools and improvements to existing schools.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES C NO</div><div>Fire Department Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of \$4,890,000 for additions and improvements to the plant of the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES D NO</div><div>Recreation and Park Bonds, 1964. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the amount of \$9,450,000 for additions to and improvements of the recreation and park system of the City and County of San Francisco.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES E NO</div><div>Amends Section 153: Provides employees with right to indefinite leave of absence when employed as full time salaried officer or employee of employee union.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES F NO</div><div>Adds Section 95.1: Authorizes Board of Supervisors to determine the monetary limits, not to exceed \$5,000, within which public works or improvements may be done by contract, written order, or directly by the city and county.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES G NO</div><div>Amends Section 10: Fixes salary of Board of Supervisors. Repeals obsolete language.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES H NO</div><div>Shall the Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco develop, construct, and acquire within the City and County of San Francisco, with Federal financial assistance and/or State public body financial assistance, a low-rent housing project or projects of not to exceed in the aggregate twenty-five hundred (2500) dwelling units for living accommodations for persons of low income, including dwelling units designed specifically for eligible elderly persons of low income?</div></div>											
<div>PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS</div> <div>Vote for ONE Party</div>				<div>11</div> <div>12</div> <div>UNITED STATES SENATOR</div> <div>VOTE FOR ONE</div>	<div>13</div> <div>14</div> <div>REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS</div> <div>6th District</div> <div>VOTE FOR ONE</div>	<div>15</div> <div>16</div> <div>MEMBER OF THE ASSEMBLY</div> <div>21st District</div> <div>VOTE FOR ONE</div>	<div>17</div> <div>18</div> <div>ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT</div>	<div>19</div> <div>20</div> <div>PRESIDING JUSTICE OF APPEAL</div> <div>First Appellate Division Two</div>										
<div><div></div><div>3-A</div><div>BARRY M. GOLDWATER for President</div><div>WILLIAM E. MILLER for Vice President</div><div>REPUBLICAN</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>8-A</div><div>LYNDON B. JOHNSON for President</div><div>HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for Vice President</div><div>DEMOCRATIC</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>11-A</div><div>Pierre Salinger</div><div>Democratic</div><div>United States Senator</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>12-A</div><div>George Murphy</div><div>Republican</div><div>Business Executive</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>13-A</div><div>William S. Mailliard</div><div>Republican</div><div>United States Congressman</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>14-A</div><div>Thomas P. O'Toole</div><div>Democratic</div><div>Accountant</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>15-A</div><div>Milton Marks</div><div>Republican</div><div>Incumbent Assemblyman</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>16-A</div><div>John J. Davids</div><div>Democratic</div><div>Insurance</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>17-A</div><div>YES</div><div>Shall Paul Peek be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>18-A</div><div>NO</div><div>Shall Daniel R. Shoem be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>19-A</div><div>YES</div><div>Shall Daniel R. Shoem be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>20-A</div><div>NO</div><div>Shall Daniel R. Shoem be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</div></div>							

ION NOVEMBER 3, 1964

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 10 NO</div><div>STATE SCHOOL FUND. Repeals requirement that proceeds from United States land grants for school support, escheated estates, and certain other grants be kept in a perpetual fund used solely for school support.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 11 NO</div><div>PERFORMANCE OF MUNICIPAL FUNCTIONS BY COUNTY OFFICERS. Deletes requirement that city electorate approve performance of municipal functions by county officials; validates city-county agreements heretofore made.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 12 NO</div><div>PROPERTY TAXATION: RELIEF IN EVENT OF DISASTER. Legislature may authorize relief from property taxes where property in a disaster area is destroyed by act of God.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 13 NO</div><div>CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS: NAMING CORPORATIONS. Prohibits constitutional amendments which name private corporations to perform functions or have powers or duties; applicable to amendments approved at 1964 general election.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 14 NO</div><div>SALES AND RENTALS OF RESIDENTIAL REAL PROPERTY. Prohibits State, subdivision, or agency denying person's right to decline to sell or rent residential real property to any person; prohibition inapplicable to government owned or condemned property or transient lodging accommodations in public places.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 15 NO</div><div>TELEVISION PROGRAMS. Provides no charge shall be made to public for television programs transmitted to home television sets.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 16 NO</div><div>LOTTERY. Establishes statewide lottery supervised by state commission; original licensee to be a named private corporation. Commission to sell \$2.00 tickets to licensee for \$1.74; 74% of commission receipts appropriated for public education; 26% for expenses and prizes.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>PROPOSITION</div><div>YES 17 NO</div><div>RAILROAD TRAIN CREWS. Prohibits State from preventing railroads from manning trains pursuant to federal legislation or awards pursuant thereto, or collective bargaining agreements; repeals provisions concerning crews on certain kinds of trains.</div></div>	<div><div></div><div>STATE PROPOSITIONS</div></div>
--	--	---	---	--	---	---	---	---

<div><div>CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</div><div><div></div></div></div>	<div><div>DIRECTIONS FOR VOTING</div><div><div>1. Move RED HANDLE LEVER of voting machine to the RIGHT as far as it will go and LEAVE IT THERE.</div><div>2. To vote FOR or AGAINST propositions or FOR or AGAINST confirmation of member of Board of Education, or FOR or AGAINST Justices of the Supreme Court and District Court of Appeal, pull down pointers over words indicating your choice and LEAVE THEM DOWN.</div><div>3. To vote for all of the electors of a party pull down the pointer over the names of the presidential and vice-presidential candidates of that party and LEAVE IT DOWN.</div><div>4. To vote FOR candidate for United States Senator, Representative in Congress and Member of Assembly, pull down pointer over the name of your choice and LEAVE IT DOWN.</div><div>5. To vote for those electors who have pledged themselves to vote for a candidate for President and for Vice President of any party not qualified to participate in the election, write in the names and party of those presidential and vice presidential candidates in the blank space provided for that purpose in the upper left hand corner of the machine — under square slide #1.</div><div>6. To vote for a person whose name does not appear on the ballot label card, RAISE NUMBERED SLIDE AT TOP OF MACHINE corresponding to number of office on office title card, and WRITE NAME of candidate on paper under slide. DO NOT pull down pointer over name of any candidate in office group in which you intend to write in name of a candidate.</div><div>7. LEAVE THE POINTERS DOWN and move the RED HANDLE LEVER to the LEFT as far as it will go. Your vote is not registered until this is done.</div><div>8. If in doubt as to operating the voting machine, request instructions from the inspector or judge of the election board before attempting to vote.</div></div></div>	<div><div>TO EXPEDITE VOTING</div><div>MARK YOUR CHOICES</div><div>ON POLLING PLACE</div><div>CARD AND TAKE IT</div><div>TO THE POLLS</div><div>WITH YOU</div></div>	<div><div>STUDY SAMPLE</div><div>BALLOT CAREFULLY.</div><div>MARK YOUR CHOICES ON</div><div>POLLING PLACE CARD.</div><div>TAKE CARD TO POLLING</div><div>PLACE.</div><div>POLLS OPEN 7 A.M. —</div><div>CLOSE 8 P.M.</div><div>VOTE EARLY</div></div>
--	--	--	---

<div><div>20</div><div>TICE, RT</div><div>ict</div></div>	<div><div>21</div><div>JUSTICE, DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL</div><div>First Appellate District Division Two</div></div>	<div><div>22</div><div>MEMBER BOARD OF EDUCATION</div><div>Nominated by Mayor for confirmation by Electors.</div></div>	<div><div>23</div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div>24</div><div></div><div></div></div>
<div><div>21-A</div><div>YES</div><div>Shall Wakefield Taylor</div><div>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</div></div>	<div><div>22-A</div><div>NO</div><div></div><div></div></div>	<div><div>23-A</div><div>YES</div><div>Reynold H. Colvin</div></div>	<div><div>24-A</div><div>NO</div><div></div><div></div></div>	