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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the November 7, 1989 election. The Pamphlet includes:
1. a Sample Ballot (i.e., a copy of the ballot you see at your polling place or the one you receive when you vote absentee);
2. the location of your polling place (see label on the back cover);
3. applications for absentee ballot and permanent absentee voter status;
4. rights of voters;
5. information for disabled voters;
6. statements from the candidates who are running for office;
7. information about each proposition, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the proposition, and the legal text;
8. definitions of words you need to know;
9. a Voter Selection Coupon to mark your choices and use when you vote.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, Molly Woods, and Hoyt Zia
Board of Supervisors appointees: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gillham, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young
Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizen groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
Suggestions to the Committee may be sent to: Election Advisory Committee, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

A 第一步
请取持票向自动机将第二张选票插入。

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

B 第一步
请取持票向自动机将第二张选票插入。

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

C 第二步
請確認選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

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

D 第三步
請把帶錐之選舉針，由小孔垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4
AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

B 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。在封袋上，有空白格預備供投票人選用。

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo cierrd el sobre.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>LOUISE H. RENNE</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>MARY I. CALLANAN</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1989年11月7日舊金山市縣選舉
市縣提案提交選民投票
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Proposition Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Public Safety Improvement Bonds, 1989. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $59,700,000 for the acquisition, construction and reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco including earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, access for the disabled, and assessment programs for earthquake safety, asbestos removal and access for the disabled.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall an ordinance of the City and County of San Francisco be approved so as to: 1) create a San Francisco County Transportation Authority; 2) authorize the Authority to impose a transactions and use tax of one-half of one percent to aid mass transit and realize the other traffic and transportation projects/purposes set forth in the San Francisco County Transportation Expenditure Plan for a period of no more than twenty (20) years; 3) authorize the Authority to issue from time to time limited tax bonds in a total outstanding aggregate amount not to exceed $742,000,000.00 and which is payable from the revenues generated hereunder; and 4) approve the California Constitution Article XIII B Appropriations Limit of $160,000,000.00?</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors, without a vote of the people, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, provided that the aggregate principal amount of the tax-exempt debt issued by the nonprofit corporation to pay for the equipment not exceed $18 million, with that amount to be increased by two percent each year?</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the salary of members of the Board of Supervisors be increased to $41,122 per year, and shall voters be asked to vote in 1991 and every two years after to change this salary, based on salaries paid to Supervisors in eight Northern California counties?</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City adjust the pensions of retired police officers and firefighters when the salaries of active police officers and firefighters, respectively, are adjusted?</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before July 1964 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a lesser amount, proportionate to the number of years the worker has been retired?</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to reinstate the salary-setting process used by the City before two recent court decisions required the City to treat &quot;flat rates&quot; in the annual salary the same as &quot;range rates&quot; and to survey certain salary premiums instead of negotiating them?</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, elecciones municipales consolidadas, 7 de noviembre de 1989
Proposiciones a ser sometidas al voto de los electores — Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco

28 SI 贊成
29 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD EN EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS, 1989.
Para contratar una deuda en bonos de $56,700,000 para la adquisición, construcción e reconstrucción de edificios que sean propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reducción de los peligros en el caso de terremoto, la eliminación del acoso, el acceso para personas incapacitadas, y los programas de asesoramiento para la seguridad en el caso de terremoto, la eliminación del acoso y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.

1989年公共安全改善公債，發 行 公 債 $56,700,000，用於購建、興建、改建舊金山市、縣所擁有的樓房；包括用於滅火、清除石塊、消除雜草等通道，固定地區安全計劃等等。

33 SI 贊成
34 NO 反對

Se aprobará una ordenanza de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco para:
1) Crear una Autoridad de Transporte del Condado de San Francisco; 2) Autorizar a la Autoridad que impone un impuesto sobre las transacciones y el uso, entre un mínimo del 8%, para ayudar al transporte masivo y realizar los otros proyectos y objetivos de transporte y tráfico expuestos en el Plan de Gastos de Transportes del Condado de San Francisco durante un período de no más de veinte (20) años; 3) Autorizar a la Autoridad para emitir, de vez en cuando, bonos de impuestos limitados en una cantidad total de adquisición que no exceda $742,000,000.00 y que sea pagadera a partir de los ingresos generados por los mismos; y 4) aprobar el Artículo XIII D de la Constitución de California relacionado al Límite de Aprobaciones de $160,000,000.00?

應否通過舊金山市、縣法案，使1)設 立舊金山郡交通管理局;2) 授權管理處執行活動 用百分之 0.8%稅款公共交通和其他交通運輸計劃，並應按照舊金山郡交通支出計劃所定目標執行，為期不超過二十 (20)年;3) 授 權管理處按照發行有年限的公債，總額不超 過 $742,000,000.00，這些債務以所得稅款 償還;4) 通過加州憲法第 X 卷之 B 節 授 權 額 $160,000,000.00?

38 SI 贊成
39 NO 反對

¿La Junta de Supervisores tendrá la autorización, sin el voto de la población, de aprobar el financiamiento del alquiler de equipo mediante una empresa sin fines de lucro, siempre y cuando la cantidad principal total de la deuda exenta de impuestos emitida por la empresa sin fines de lucro para pagar los equipos no exceda los $18 millones, con siendo aumentada esta cantidad en un dos por ciento cada año?

應否在未經市民投票之前授權市參議員通 過通過非牟利公司來租用器材，但該法案由非 牟利公司發行用作租用器材的，免稅債券總 預計不超過 $18,000,000.00，每年可以依此 增加百分之二?

41 SI 贊成
42 NO 反對

¿El sueldo de los miembros de la Junta de Supervisores se aumentará a $41,122 por año, y los electores tendrán la obligación de votar en 1991 y cada dos años a partir de éste para modificar este sueldo, basándose en los sueldos que se están pagando a los Supervisores en ocho condados del Norte de California?

市參議員的年薪應增加至 $41,122.00， 並且應在1991年及以後每兩年一次由選民 採票，根據加州八個郡的市參議員的年薪而加 以調整?

44 SI 贊成
45 NO 反對

¿La Municipalidad aumentará las jubilaciones de los oficiales de policía y de los bomberos jubilados en los sueldos de los oficiales de policía y de los bomberos activos, respectivamente, sean ajustados?

市在任警員和消防員的薪酬相應調高後，市退休警員和消防員的退休金應是否予調高?

47 SI 贊成
48 NO 反對

¿La Municipalidad aumentará el monto de la jubilación mensual de los empleados municipales que se jubilaron después de julio de 1964 por $50, y de aquellos que se jubilaron a partir de esa fecha en una cantidad menor, proporcional a la cantidad de años que el trabajador haya estado jubilado?

在1964年7月之前退休的市員，市政 府應給予增加退休補助 50，從此日期之後 退休的市員，應按他們退休的年數按比例 給予較少的補助?

50 SI 贊成
51 NO 反對

¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para reemplazar el proceso de establecimiento de los sueldos utilizados por la Municipalidad previo a las dos decisiones recientes de las cortes que regulan que la Municipalidad trate los "niveles fijos" en el sueldo anual de la misma forma que trata el "rango de salarios" de sueldos, y de observar ciertas bonificaciones en los sueldos en vez de negociarlas?

最近法院作出兩項裁決，要求市政府支付 員員年薪應對 "統一率" 和 "浮動率" 同等看 待，並應當而不是確定某些薪金，是否取消 市議會以恢復市政府原有的制定薪酬程序?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall City employees be allowed to transfer their unused accumulated sick leave to another City employee who has been determined to be catastrophically ill and who has used all of his or her vacation allowance, sick leave and compensatory time off?</td>
<td>YES 53</td>
<td>NO 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall City employees be allowed to transfer their vested vacation credits to another City employee who has been determined to be catastrophically ill and who has used all of his or her vacation allowance, sick leave and compensatory time off?</td>
<td>YES 56</td>
<td>NO 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Controller be authorized to determine how often to conduct certain audits and issue certain reports about City funds, rather than being required to conduct such audits and issue such reports at specified periods, and shall the Controller be authorized to audit and review all City department records to evaluate effectiveness and efficiency?</td>
<td>YES 59</td>
<td>NO 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall security officers now employed by certain City departments be transferred to the Sheriff, who would provide security to those departments, shall the date that the Board of Supervisors must approve deputy sheriff salaries be changed from April 1 to August 25, and shall the Charter specify duties to be performed by the Sheriff?</td>
<td>YES 62</td>
<td>NO 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the authority to appoint and remove the chief juvenile probation officer be transferred from the Superior Court to a new seven-member Juvenile Probation Commission, which will oversee the management of a new Juvenile Probation Department, including the City's juvenile detention facilities?</td>
<td>YES 65</td>
<td>NO 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall certain Public Utilities Commission deputy general managers be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Public Utilities Commission, rather than under civil service rules?</td>
<td>YES 68</td>
<td>NO 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall the power of the President of the Board of Supervisors to appoint another Supervisor to serve in the President's place on the Retirement Board be enlarged to authorize the President to appoint someone who is not a Supervisor provided that person is experienced in employee pension planning or in managing investments?</td>
<td>YES 71</td>
<td>NO 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall the City laws regulating campaign contributions to candidates for City office be repealed, and shall such contributions be governed exclusively by state laws regulating campaign contributions?</td>
<td>YES 73</td>
<td>NO 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Shall the City enter into an agreement with Spectactor Management Group, consistent with specified principles regarding the land acquisition, financing and construction of a new ballpark in the China Basin area, and shall certain zoning laws be amended to facilitate the construction of a ballpark in that area?</td>
<td>YES 76</td>
<td>NO 77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES MUNICIPALES CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1989
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

53 SI 赞成
54 NO 反对

¿Los empleados municipales tendrán el derecho de transferir su permiso por enfermedad no utilizada a otro empleado municipal que se encuentre gravemente enfermo y que haya utilizado todo su tiempo de vacaciones, permita por enfermedad y tiempo libre compensatorio?

56 SI 赞成
57 NO 反对

¿Los empleados municipales tendrán el derecho de transferir sus créditos establecidos de vacaciones a otro empleado municipal que se encuentre gravemente enfermo y que haya utilizado todo su tiempo de vacaciones, permita por enfermedad y tiempo libre compensatorio?

59 SI 赞成
60 NO 反对

¿El Contralor tendrá la autorización de determinar con qué frecuencia se deben llevar a cabo certificaciones periódicas y emitir informes de conformidad con los documentos correspondientes y emitir dichos informes en periodos específicos y cuando sea necesario para que el departamento fiscalicre y responda a los departamentos municipales para evaluar la eficacia y eficiencia?

62 SI 赞成
63 NO 反对

¿Los oficiales de seguridad que actualmente son empleados por algunos departamentos municipales podrán ser transferidos al Sheriff, que proporcionará la seguridad a dichos departamentos, y podrá cambiarse la fecha en que la junta de supervisión debe aprobar los sueldos de los asistentes al Sheriff del 1 de abril al 25 de agosto, y la Carta Constitucional podrá especificar las obligaciones del Sheriff?

65 SI 赞成
66 NO 反对

¿La autoridad de nombrar y retirar al oficial principal de libertad condicional juvenil será transferida a la Corte Suprema a una nueva Comisión de Libertad Condicional Juvenil compuesta por siete miembros, que supervisará el manejo de un nuevo Departamento de Libertad Condicional Juvenil, incluyendo las instalaciones de detención de la Municipalidad?

68 SI 赞成
69 NO 反对

¿Podrán nombrar claves administrativas generales sujetos de la Comisión de Utilidades Públicas y podrán otorgar sus puestos según lo reglamenta el Administrador General de la Comisión de Servicios Públicos, en vez de hacerlo bajo el régimen civil?

71 SI 赞成
72 NO 反对

¿Podrá aumentarse el poder del Presidente de la Junta de Supervisores de nombrar a otro Supervisor para servir en el lugar del Presidente en la Junta de Jubilación, autorizando al Presidente a nombrar a quien no sea un Supervisor siempre y cuando dicha persona tenga experiencia en la planificación de la jubilación de empleados o en el manejo de inversiones?

73 SI 赞成
74 NO 反对

¿Podrán revocarse las leyes municipales que regulan las contribuciones para las campañas de los candidatos al servicio público, y podrán regularse dichas contribuciones estrictamente por medio de las leyes estatales que regulan las contribuciones para las campañas?

76 SI 赞成
77 NO 反对

¿Podrá la Municipalidad firmar un acuerdo con el Spectator Management Group, compuesto con principios específicos con respecto a la adquisición de tierra, el financiamiento y a la construcción de un nuevo estadio de deporte en la región de China Basin, y podrán enmendar dichas leyes de adquisición para facilitar la construcción de un estadio de deporte en dicha región?

1989年11月7日舊金山市選舉 市縣提案提交選民投票
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Shall the City, with certain specified exceptions, charge a 0.75 percent tax on income from residential rental units, with the revenues to be used for homeless shelters and certain low and moderate income housing programs?</td>
<td>YES 79</td>
<td>NO 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Shall the City law that limits the types of buildings eligible for condominium conversion and limits to 200 the annual number of conversions be amended to create a parallel procedure that makes all residential rental buildings eligible for conversion and allows an additional 500 units to be converted through 1993, after which the 500 unit limit would expire?</td>
<td>YES 83</td>
<td>NO 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Shall the ordinance establishing Domestic Partnerships be adopted?</td>
<td>YES 86</td>
<td>NO 87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PROPOSITION T HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN FROM THE BALLOT*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support the continuance and expansion of community-based AIDS research and services, to recognize the efforts of volunteers and health professionals providing such research and services and to urge the state and federal governments to increase funding for such research and services?</td>
<td>YES 93</td>
<td>NO 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for the Board of Supervisors to explore proposals to improve Candlestick Park at private expense instead of any proposal to construct a downtown baseball stadium?</td>
<td>YES 96</td>
<td>NO 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to conduct municipal elections by mail, provided that the Registrar finds that it would maximize voter convenience, the Controller finds it would save the City money and the Chief of Police finds that it can be done with sufficient safeguards against fraud?</td>
<td>YES 100</td>
<td>NO 101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES MUNICIPALES CONSOLIDADAS, 7 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1989
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

79 SI 贏成
80 NO 反對

¿Podrá la Municipalidad, con ciertas excepciones especificadas, cobrar un impuesto del 0.75 por ciento sobre ingresos de las unidades de alquiler residencial, utilizando las entradas para refugio destinados a las personas sin hogar y ciertos programas habitacionales para personas con ingresos bajos o moderados?

83 SI 贏成
84 NO 反對

¿Podrá enmendar la ley municipal que limita los tipos de edificios que cumplen los requisitos de ser convertidos en condominios y que limite a 250 la cantidad anual de conversiones, para crear un procedimiento paralelo que haga que todos los edificios de alquiler residencial que cumplan con los requisitos de ser convertidos en condominios y que permita convertir unas 500 unidades adicionales hasta el año 1993, después de lo cual se vencería este límite de 500 unidades?

86 SI 贏成
87 NO 反對

¿Podrá adoptarse la ordenanza que establece las Compañías de Casa?

PROPOSICIÓN T FUE ELIMINADA DE LA BALOTA — T ha sido eliminado.

93 SI 贏成
94 NO 反對

¿Podrá considerarse como póliza de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, apoyar la continuidad y la expansión de las investigaciones y servicios basados en la comunidad para el SIDA, de reconocer los esfuerzos de voluntarios y profesionales de la salud que brindan dicha investigación y servicios y de estimular a los gobiernos estatales y federales a aumentar los fondos destinados a dichas investigaciones y servicios?

96 SI 贏成
97 NO 反對

¿Será considerada como póliza de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que la Junta de Supervisores estudie las propuestas de mejorar Candlestick Park como gasto del sector privado en vez de cualquier propuesta de construir un estadio de béisbol en el centro de la ciudad?

100 SI 贏成
101 NO 反對

¿Será considerada como póliza de las personas de la Ciudad y el Condado de San Francisco conducir elecciones municipales por correo, siempre y cuando el Registrador encuentre que esto maximice la conveniencia de los electores, y si el Registrador encuentra que esto podría ahorrar dinero a la Municipalidad y al Jefe de Policía encuentra que esto se pueda realizar con suficientes resguardos contra fraude?

1989年11月7日舊金山市縣選舉 市縣提案提交選民投票
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

SALES TAX BONDS (PROPOSITION B) — The money to pay back these bonds comes from sales taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell sales tax bonds.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITION C) — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the City government. A Charter amendment changes one of these basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the Charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

CLASS (PROPOSITION G) — A number of jobs that are grouped together.

REVOLVING FUNDS (PROPOSITION J) — A fund similar to a petty cash fund.

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

REPEAL (PROPOSITION O) — Repeal means cancel, abolish, nullify.

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

CONVERSION/CONVERTED (PROPOSITION R) — A rental building that has been changed so that each unit is owned.

STOCK COOPERATIVES (PROPOSITION R) — A form of ownership where a corporation is formed to own a building, with each of the shares having the right to occupy one part of the building.

COMMUNITY APARTMENTS (PROPOSITION R) — A form of ownership where two or more persons own an apartment building, with each of the owners having the right to occupy one of the building’s apartments.

REFERENDUM (PROPOSITION S) — If a legislative body passes a law you don’t agree with, you can put that law on the ballot for people to vote on if you get enough signatures on a petition asking that the new law be placed on the ballot. This is called a referendum.

CHARTER (PROPOSITION T) — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the City government.

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

ABSENTEE BALLOTS (PROPOSITION W) — If you do not wish to go to your polling place to vote, you may vote by mail or by going to the Registrar’s Office in City Hall in person. This is called absentee voting.

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

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

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now," "The Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters' rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.

Suggestions to the Committee may be sent to: Ballot Simplification Committee, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that absentee
ballots be mailed to them or they may vote in person at City Hall
from October 10 through November 7 during normal working
hours (see “Your Rights as a Voter” section of this pamphlet). In
addition, voters with specified disabilities enumerated below may
apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future
elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee
Voters.

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

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

ELECTION DAY:

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO BE A PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

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

Disabilities that qualify for permanent absentee status include circulatory problems and mobility impairment,
as well as more severe disabilities.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the form below and return it to the Registrar of Voters.

Each time you move or re-register to vote, you must apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all
other cases you do not need to re-apply.

I hereby apply for a permanent absentee ballot by reason of ________________________________

(Briefly state the nature of your disability in general terms)

Name _______________________________________

Address _______________________________________

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

Date ______________ Signature _____________________

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

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens over 18 years old who are registered to vote in San Francisco before October 11, 1989.

Q — I moved before October 10; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after October 10; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between October 11 and November 7, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — City Attorney and Treasurer.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, November 7, 1989. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

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

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

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

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

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to my polling place on election day?
A — Yes; you can vote before November 7 by:
   • going to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall from October 10 through November 7, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday; or
   • mailing in a request for an absentee ballot. You may send in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. The application must be received by the Registrar of Voters before November 1, 1989.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This note should include:
   • your home address
   • the address to which you want the ballot mailed
   • your printed name and your signature.
   Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than October 31, 1989.

OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

CITY ATTORNEY
The term of office for the City Attorney is four years. The City Attorney is currently paid $109,174 each year.
The City Attorney represents the City and County in all civil legal actions. The City Attorney serves as legal advisor to the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, all City departments, and all City commissions. The City Attorney prepares or approves the form of all city laws, contracts, bonds and any other legal documents the city is concerned with. The City Attorney appoints deputy city attorneys to assist with this work.

TREASURER
The term of office for the Treasurer is four years. The Treasurer is currently paid $95,706 each year.
The Treasurer receives, deposits, invests, and pays out money which belongs to the City and County. The Treasurer has custody of all City and County funds, and makes payments as authorized by the Controller.
Candidate for City Attorney

LOUISE H. RENNE

My address is 3725 Jackson Street
My occupation is City Attorney
My qualifications for office are: Over the past three years, I have worked as City Attorney to provide quality legal counsel in an even-handed manner.

Our office has improved its expertise in municipal finance, housing code enforcement and toxic regulation. We have given a high priority to the enforcement of civil rights and juvenile justice. The lawyers of the City Attorney’s office now represent the diversity of the city itself.

In the years ahead, San Francisco will undoubtedly face complex legal issues. An experienced lawyer is essential to meeting that challenge. I would appreciate the opportunity to continue to serve as your City Attorney.

Louise H. Renne

The Sponsors for Louise Renne are:
Art Agnos, 42 Graystone Terrace, Mayor of San Francisco.
Rosa Agnost, 2131 Funston Ave., Artist and Community Activities Volunteer.
Richard L. Barkhurst, 2542 Washington St., Banker.
Hallie Beacham, 3845 Jackson St., Physician.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Self-Employed Businessman.
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrac St., Planning Commissioner.
Harry G. Brit, 1392 Page St. #4, President, Board of Supervisors.
Jeff Brown, 850 40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco.
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator.
Catherine J. Dodd, 494 Roosevelt Way, Health Administrator.
James D. Jefferson, 702 Broderick St., Businessman.
Geraldine M. Johnson, 825 Masonic Ave. #3, Labor Organizer.
Willie B. Kennedy, 1410 30th Ave. #5, City and County Supervisor.
Bill Maher, 1245 Willard St., Supervisor.
Victor G. Makras, 1800 Pacific Ave. #601, Real Estate Broker.
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerro St., Labor Officer.
Sandy Ouye Mort, 360 Precita Ave., Health Policy Administrator.
Juanita G. Raven, 120 Fernwood Dr., Teacher.
Leslie Tang Schilling, 1058 Chestnut St., Property Manager.
Douglas Shorestynn, 1000 Mason St., State Real Estate Investor.
John A. Suto, 3598 Jackson St., Lawyer.
Roselyne C. Swig, 3710 Washington St., President and Founder, Roselyne C. Swig Artsource.
Dorothy Vukich, 177 San Aseo Ave., Consultant.
Nancy G. Walker, 355 Green St., Member, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Court #1409, Supervisor.
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilnritus Ave., Methodist Minister.

Candidate for City Treasurer

MARY I. CALLANAN

My address is 1661 Dolores Street
My occupation is Treasurer of the City and County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are:
Accomplishment: During my nine years as Treasurer, our city has earned an average of $100,000,000 per year, representing an average yield of 11%, without risk, while helping to maintain city services.
Goal: As Treasurer I will maintain a superior return through productive and socially responsible investment management, consistent with maximum safety and prudence.
Education: Bachelor’s degree in Accounting and Master’s degree in Business Administration, University of San Francisco.
Experience: Twenty-five years of dedicated professional accounting and management service to taxpayers, including Treasurer, Chief Accountant SF Airport, and positions with District Attorney and Controller’s Budget Office and Real Estate Department.

Mary I. Callanan

The Sponsors for Mary Callanan are:
Art Agnos, 42 Graystone Terrace, Mayor of San Francisco.
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco.
Dianne Feinstein, 30 Presidio Terrace, Former Mayor of San Francisco.
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Lt. Governor of California.
Nancy Pelosi, 2640 Broadway St., Congresswoman.
John L. Burton, 712 Vermont St., Assemblyman.
John K. Altshuler, 118 17th Ave., Attorney.
Jerry L. Berg, 55 Twin Peaks Blvd., Attorney.
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Business Investor.
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrac St., Planning Commissioner.
Thomas J. Cahill, 246 17th Ave., Chief of Police Retired.
Edward F. Callanan, Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Staff Services Mgr./Commissioner.
Carlota Texidor del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator.
Donald Disier, 120 Alpine Terrace, Attorney.
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant.
David D. Pont, 125 Robinhood Dr., Chief Assistant Controller.
Louis J. Giraudo, 35 San Buenaventura Way, Businessperson/Attorney.
Anne Salto Howden, 191 Upper Terrace, Retired.
David Jenkins, 456 Belvedere St., Labor Consultant.
Carol F. Marshall, 111 Meadowbrook Dr., Executive Secretary.
John J. Moylan, 2983 24th Ave., Labor Leader.
Connie O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Lieutenant, S.F. Sheriff’s Dept.
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Drive, TV Store Owner.
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired Treasurer of San Francisco.
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name ____________________________________________

Address ___________________________________ Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required) __________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) ________________________

Signature _________________________________________
Public Buildings Safety Improvement Bonds

PROPOSITION A

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1989. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $59,700,000 for the acquisition, construction and reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco including earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, access for the disabled, and assessment programs for earthquake safety, asbestos removal and access for the disabled.

YES 28
NO 29

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City buildings may not survive a strong earthquake. Also, many City buildings contain asbestos. Many City buildings are not accessible to disabled persons.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $59,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would be used to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings, including making some of them better able to survive earthquakes, removing or reducing the danger of asbestos in buildings, and making buildings more accessible to the disabled. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligations bonds in the amount of $59,700,000 to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

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

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$59,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>43,879,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$103,579,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $5,178,975 which amount is equivalent to one and thirty-seven hundredths cents ($0.0137) in the current tax rate.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On July 24, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION “A”

Proposition “A” will provide $59.7 million to improve public safety by strengthening many important public buildings so they can withstand a major earthquake. Public safety will be improved in two ways: the strengthening of fire stations will reduce disruptions of essential emergency services after an earthquake and strengthening of other major public facilities will reduce life hazards to people inside or near these buildings during a major shake.

Many of the City’s buildings, including fire stations, were built long before earthquake resistant construction was required. The City has identified the buildings most in need of strengthening. These are the buildings most likely to suffer major damage in the next big earthquake. Vital emergency services would be disrupted, falling debris could cause significant injuries. Proposition A would make many of these buildings earthquake resistant. That is why we ask you to Vote Yes on A.

Proposition A will fund safety improvements to many fire stations, and several other buildings used for large public gatherings, including the Main Library (future Asian Arts Museum), the Palace of the Legion of Honor, and the California Academy of Sciences. The structures providing utilities to Laguna Honda Hospital will be strengthened. In addition we will remove whatever asbestos may exist in the buildings being worked on as well as provide handicapped access where these buildings are presently not readily accessible to the mobility impaired.

Proposition A stands for a safer more accessible city. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This bond issue is for the protection of our citizens, for the protection of our important public buildings, and for the protection of the investment which you, the City’s taxpayers have made in these public buildings and their contents. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Joseph Alioto
George Christopher
Dianne Feinstein
William J. (Jerry) Hume, Chairman
California Academy of Science
Bruce A. Bolt, Professor of Seismology
Philip P. Choy
Keith G. Eickman, President, Recreation & Parks Commission
H. Welton Flynn
Aileen C. Hernandez
Gladys Hu, President, Self-Help for the Elderly
Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council
Leonard E. Kingsly
Rolland C. Lowe, M.D.
John L. Molinari
Gina Moscone
Rodel E. Rodis, President,
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr.
Leslie Tang Schilling
Thelma Shelley
Yori Wada, Regent, University of California

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Passage of Proposition A is vital if unreinforced masonry fire stations are to remain operational after a big earthquake. It will also provide Laguna Honda Hospital needed funds to strengthen its Central Services Building.

It is equally critical to strengthen the Fine Arts Museum and the Academy of Sciences to assure safety to people and the treasures inside if a major quake hits the city.

We strongly urge your vote for Proposition A.

American Institute of Architects,
San Francisco Chapter

Our museums house irreplaceable art and artifacts and attract audiences from all ages and walks of life. These museums must be given added earthquake protection to ensure the safety of the public and preservation of the collections. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Asian Art Museum
Rand Castle, Director
Commissioner:
Alice Lowe, Chairman
Foundation Trustee:
Mrs. Brayton Wilbur, Jr., Chairman
California Academy of Science:
Roy Eisenhardt, Executive Director
Fine Arts Museums:
Alexandra Phillips, President of the Board
Harry S. Parker, Director
Maria Acosta-Colon
Haïkuro Aita-awa
Ruth Asawa
Rob Baker, Gateway to Indian America
Roberta Borgenovo
Thad Brown
Vyolet L. Chu
Ramon C. Cortines, Superintendent of SFUSD
David de la Torre
Jed Emerson
Mrs. John V. Erickson, Chair, Museum Society
Florence Fang
Gail B. Goldman
Richard I. Guggenheim, Commissioner, Recreation and Parks
James W. Haas

Monica H. Halloran
Paul D. Holzman
John H. Jacobs
Claire N. Isaacs, Director of Cultural Affairs,
San Francisco Arts Commission

Harry W. Kim
Robert F. LaRocca, President, San Francisco Arts Commission
Jong M. Lee, President, Korean American Chamber of Commerce
Jack L. Low, President, Chinese American Citizens Alliance —
San Francisco Lodge
Michael S. McGill
Andrew Nash
George L. Newkirk
Walter S. Newman
James Roman Noyes
Rai Y. Okamoto, Architect
Charles Hall Page
Diane Postosky, Executive Director, Environmental Traveling Companions
Alma Robinson
Toby Rosenblatt
Marjorie W. Seller
Douglas Shoreinstein
Barbara W. Sklar
Roselyne C. Swig, Commissioner, Public Library
Alfred S. Wilsey
Harvey Wong, President, Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association
Yolanda Garfias Woo

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge a “yes” vote on Proposition “A”. Proposition “A” is a 59.7 million dollar Bond Issue to improve the earthquake preparedness of city owned buildings. A number of the city buildings, including many fire stations, were built long before earthquake resistant construction was required. The city has identified the most vulnerable buildings. These buildings are likely to suffer major damage in the next big earthquake and will hinder the Fire Department’s ability to provide help when most needed. We urge all citizens to vote “Yes” on Proposition “A” — it means protection for your city, your home and your family.

James D. Jefferson, President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bretz, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Frederick F. Postel, Chief of Department

Laguna Honda Hospital provides care for over 1,000 elderly San Franciscans. We must maintain services to provide for their care. The Fire Department provides emergency response for all San Franciscans. We must make it possible for them to be able to do so. We must protect the people that visit our cultural facilities and the valuable contents of these facilities.

Through Proposition A, we will be able to provide seismic reinforcement, asbestos removal, and other safety related work to preserve these buildings.

Donald Birrer — General Manager Public Utilities Commission (Retired)
L. Jack Block — Past Grand Jurors Assn.
John Blumlein — President, Health Commission
Alexander Bonatti — Vice President San Francisco Chapter AIA
Rev. Amos C. Brown — Pastor, Third Baptist Church
John Burton — Assemblyman, 16th A.D.
Keith P. Calden, Fire Chief (Retired)
Edward A. Chow, M.D. — Health Commissioner

Richard Evans — Director of Public Works
Naomi T. Gray — Health Commissioner
Richard Guggenheim — Recreation Parks Commissioner
Thomas H. Jenkin — Director Office of Emergency Service
Walter L. Johnson — Secretary & Treasurer San Francisco Labor Council
Jeffrey Lee — Director of Public Works (Retired)
Phillip Lee, M.D. — Director, Institute for Health Planning U.C.S.F.
Milton Marks — Senator 3rd District
Robert McDonnell — Secretary & Treasurer Laborers 261
William F. Murray — Chief Emeritus Fire Department
Rudolf Nothenberg — Chief Administrative Officer
Edward Phipps — Fire Chief (Retired)
S. Myron Tatarsian — Director of Public Works (Retired)
Rosabelle Tobriner — Health Commissioner
Patricia Underwood — Health Commissioner
Anthony Wagner — Executive Administrator, Laguna Honda Hospital
David Werdergar, M.D. — Director Health Department

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition A

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

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON NOVEMBER 7, 1989, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING 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: PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION, ASBESTOS ABATEMENT, PROVIDING ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED, AND ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS FOR EARTHQUAKE SAFETY, ASBESTOS REMOVAL, AND ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED, ALL RELATED TO PUBLIC SAFETY TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT TO VARIOUS BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; FINDING THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COSTS OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF THE ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of November, 1989, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of San Francisco of the following municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1989, $59,700,000, to pay for the cost of public safety improvements to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled, and assessment programs for earthquake safety, asbestos removal, and access for the disabled, all related to public safety to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including the acquisition, construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to various buildings owned by 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 resolution and in the amount specified:

Public Safety Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 429-89, $59,700,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified 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 not to exceed the principal amounts specified.

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

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 certified, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said law.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, November 7, 1989, 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 specified or set forth, in an official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of the precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than October 31, 1989.

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

"PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1989. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $59,700,000 for the acquisition, construction and reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco including earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, access for the disabled, and assessment programs for earthquake safety, asbestos removal and access for the disabled."

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

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

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 12 per centum per annum, payable semiannually, provided, that interest for the first year after the date of any said bond shall be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective

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

unless extended by a vote of the people.

4.3 Appropriations Limits. The monies collected by this initiative ordinance shall be exempt from the appropriations limits established by Article XIII B, Section 1 of the Constitution of the State of California for a period of four years from the date of enactment of this initiative ordinance, or such longer time as may be permitted by law in effect at the end of such four year period.

4.4 Severability Clause. If any part of this initiative ordinance is held invalid by a court of law, or the application thereof to any person of circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other parts of the initiative or applications which can be given effect without the invalid part of application thereof and to this end the sections of this initiative are separable.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE Robert A. Kenealey
City Attorney Deputy City Attorney
PROPOSITION B
Shall an ordinance of the City and County of San Francisco be approved so as to: 1) create a San Francisco County Transportation Authority; 2) authorize the Authority to impose a transactions and use tax of one-half of one percent to aid mass transit and realize the other traffic and transportation projects/purposes set forth in the San Francisco County Transportation Expenditure Plan for a period of no more than twenty (20) years; 3) authorize the Authority to issue from time to time limited tax bonds in a total outstanding aggregate amount not to exceed $742,000,000.00 and which is payable from the revenues generated hereunder; and 4) approve the California Constitution Article XIII B Appropriations Limit of $160,000,000.00?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a 6.5 percent sales tax in San Francisco. State law allows a county to charge an additional one-half percent sales tax to fund new transportation and traffic projects when other funds are not available.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B is an ordinance that would increase the sales tax in San Francisco by one-half percent for twenty years. The money would be used to pay for transportation projects, including mass transit, streets and traffic safety and repair, transportation programs for the elderly and disabled, and other programs. Proposition B also would create a San Francisco County Transportation Authority, made up of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors, to oversee the collection of the tax and its use. The Authority could spend up to $160,000,000 per year for these purposes and could issue not more than $742,000,000 in tax bonds, to be paid by the one-half percent sales tax.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the sales tax by one-half percent for twenty years to fund certain transportation projects when other funds are not available. You also want to form a San Francisco County Transportation Authority with a spending limit of $160,000,000 per year and with the power to issue up to $742,000,000 in bonds.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to increase the sales tax in San Francisco.

Controller’s Statement on “B”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:
"Should the proposed ordinance be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, revenues and expenditures are estimated to increase by approximately $41 million in 1990-91, increasing thereafter with the rate of inflation for a period of 20 years."

How Supervisors Voted on “B”
On July 24, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Terence Hallinan and Thomas Hsieh

TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR PROPOSITION B IS ON PAGE 33
ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

San Francisco transportation system is our lifeline. Our economy and our quality of life depend on it. Proposition B is a comprehensive solution to San Francisco’s transportation crisis.

Maintaining, improving and expanding it — that’s what Proposition B is about. The Plan meets the needs of today and the promise of tomorrow ...

- Expanded neighborhood MUNI Service.
- New MUNI buses and light rail cars to replace worn-out vehicles.
- Repaved city streets.
- Doubling van and taxi service for senior citizens, the disabled and AIDS patients.
- Historic streetcar service extension along Fisherman’s Wharf.
- MUNI Metro extension along the Embarcadero.
- Modern traffic signals throughout the city to improve traffic flow.
- A waterfront boulevard on the Embarcadero.
- Street tree planting.

These improvements — and many others — are only possible with Proposition B.

It is an ambitious plan, but Proposition B makes good financial sense.

Our investment in transportation improvement under Proposition B will generate matching state funding, which goes to Counties that have voted to improve their transportation systems. Without Proposition B, San Francisco will lose tens of millions of dollars in state funding to other Bay Area counties which have already passed transportation improvement plans.

Proposition B will also generate revenue from commuters and tourists to help pay for the streets and transit they use.

People who often disagree: business, environmentalists, labor, neighborhood advocates, the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, came together to develop this program to improve our streets and public transit network.

We can’t afford to let our streets and public transit system decline. San Franciscans deserve and need a quality transportation system — for today and for tomorrow.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

“AVENUE OF THE PIRATES”

Forget silly promises about “tree planting” and the ALREADY PLANNED “historic streetcar . . . extension . . .”

Our graffiti-covered buses — left unguarded by MUNI’s incompetent management — and LRV’s worn-out before their time by MUNI’s maintenance scandals trumpet the real truth.

Special interest campaign fund sources are pushing Proposition B:

- TOURIST-TRAP DEVELOPERS — That “waterfront boulevard on the Embarcadero” should be renamed “AVENUE OF THE PIRATES” for the greedy millionaire tourist-trap corporations that are demanding deluxe “repaved city streets” — and trees — in front of their own business establishments . . . at taxpayers’ expense. The proposed “AVENUE OF THE PIRATES” will kill all revival chances for the historic Port of San Francisco.

- MISSION BAY DEVELOPMENT — Santa Fe Pacific Corporation — “On CreditWatch with negative implications” (Standard & Poor’s 8/14/89 Credit Review) — ran its debt rating down from A+ in 1987 to BB- in 1989 . . . Largely because of the corporate “PIRATE” raiders’ 1988 $30-per-share “dividend.”

Santa Fe Pacific . . . with credit as solid as its earthquake, liquidation-prone Mission Bay Development Project bay landfill site — has long term debts of $3,249,700,000 and last March was “found guilty of conspiring with five other railroads” to illegally halt construction of ETSI’s slurry pipeline . . . Federal court damages: $750,100,000 (S&P’s 6/6/89 Stock Reports). Now the Reichmanns want San Francisco taxpayers to pay Santa Fe’s MUNI bill!!!

Vote AGAINST the “AVENUE OF THE PIRATES”.

Vote NO on Proposition B,

No on Proposition B Committee
Dr. Terence Faulkner, J.D.
Past County Chairman
San Francisco Republican Party
Patrick Fitzgerald
Past Secretary
San Francisco Democratic Party

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

"B" IS "BAD NEWS FOR SAN FRANCISCO"

The proposal to raise San Francisco's already highly regressive sales tax another half of one percent is an outrage.

This sales tax increase will serve the interests of the developers of the Mission Bay Project — the foreign development firm of Olympia and York and their foreign owners the billionaire Reichman brothers. It is also a good deal for Santa Fe and Southern Pacific Railroad stockholders.

None of these business entities will get the special assessment district slapped on their developments to rightfully charge them for causing additional burdens on Muni and other City services. Not with our special interest-run Board of Supervisors!

Instead, YOU and the PEOPLE OF SAN FRANCISCO will be left holding the sack!!! YOU should be honored to pay for special interest developers making hundreds of millions of dollars!

Raising the sales tax will also allow the extension of the Embarcadero Freeway, cutting into storage and trucking areas vital to any attempt to revive the once-great Port of San Francisco. Instead, the area of the historic port will be turned into a special interest-run tourist trap.

Thank the San Francisco Board of Supervisors for this "ROSEMARY'S BABY" SALES TAX INCREASE PROPOSAL!!!

Vote NO on Proposition B — Kill the Sales Tax increase. Also vote NO on Proposition D — Halt the Board of Supervisors' outrageous pay increase. Vote YES on Proposition T — Establish a two term limit for the Board of Supervisors.

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors has for too long acted like a local "HOUSE OF LORDS"

NO ON PROPOSITION B COMMITTEE
Terence Faulkner
Chairman and Treasurer of
No On Proposition B Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

It isn't surprising that some opponents of Proposition B must rely on name-calling and outlandish fabrications. Proposition B makes undeniably good sense.

Proposition B will benefit all San Franciscans:
San Franciscans who ride MUNI will get new buses and streetcars, expanded neighborhood service, and graffiti prevention.
San Franciscans who drive will get repaved streets, better-timed traffic signals, and better traffic management.
San Franciscans who are disabled will get doubled paratransit services.
San Franciscans who make a living will get a quality transportation system, which is the lifeline of our economy.
San Franciscans who pay taxes will benefit by the City raising revenue from tourists and commuters who use our street and transit system.
Proposition B is for all of us.
Don't listen to the naysayers who would have our city's infrastructure deteriorate and decline.
Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

RAIL TRANSIT
Residents of San Francisco, the Bay Area and communities throughout California and the nation are voicing their strong desire for clean, efficient RAIL transit. The Transportation Expenditure Plan includes funding to:
- Purchase new cars to increase J, K, L, M and N-line service,
- Build the F-line streetcar along Market and The Embarcadero,
- Extend Muni Metro to Mission Bay,
- Prepare studies of Geary and Bayshore corridor rail service and provide construction funds.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Geary Streetcar Citizens Committee

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION “B” FOR A BETTER MUNI
San Francisco is being overwhelmed by traffic because our transit-first policy is starved of the money needed to keep it going. The federal and state governments have cut support for local transit. We need the local sales tax money now for a temporary period to make up for federal and state funding cuts.
The money will go to make San Francisco a more liveable place by fixing up and expanding our transit system. All the things that make San Francisco great — schools and colleges, hospitals, museums, our workplaces, sports events, shows, points of interest — will be made more accessible wherever you live in the City. Our older citizens who don’t drive, the handicapped, AIDS victims, will be able to get to hospitals and to enrich their lives by getting out and about in the special transit facilities that will be supplied.
It’s a small price to pay — for a temporary period — for all the good that will come out of it.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION “B” FOR A BETTER MUNI.
Transport Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO
Lawrence B. Martin,
International Representative
Bobbie L. Brown,
President, Local 250-A
Ray J. Antonio,
Secretary-Treasurer, Local 250-A

The Sierra Club urges you to vote YES on Proposition B. Proposition B will provide money to implement San Francisco’s transit first policy. The Sierra Club helped develop this measure and strongly supports its programs which include:
- Improved Muni service;
- Repair of City streets;
- Increased bicycle safety;
- Improvements to pedestrian facilities;
- Increased elderly and handicapped services.
Theese programs will improve the City’s environment and air quality.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

Sierra Club

The San Francisco Republican Party recommends a YES vote on Proposition B to alleviate the current impossible traffic gridlock and the overburdened Muni system.
San Francisco is the center of the Bay Area’s regional economy. As we move into the 21st century, there will be increased demands on the City’s transportation infrastructure to provide more efficient means to move goods, services, and people.
Though we are normally skeptical of increased taxes, and particularly dislike regressive sales taxes, the proposed 1/2% sales tax increase is economically efficient and represents a fair distribution of the cost of the transportation improvements between both benefitting parties — the residents of the City and non-residents. Vote YES on “B”!

James E. Gilleran, Chairman
San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Tom McConnell, Chairman Issues Committee
San Francisco County Central Committee
Kenneth Blumenthal
Carol Marshall
Curt Augustine
Christopher L. Bowman
Pablo Wong
Jun Hatoyama
J. Bingham Dean
Brian Mavrogeorge
K. Martin Keller
Robert R. Bacci

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Everyone complains about traffic, about Muni. Now San Francisco is finally doing something about it.

After ten months of meetings and public hearings, the Citizen's Advisory Committee on Transportation, composed of 55 diverse San Franciscans, is proud to recommend Proposition B to the voters.

Citizen's Advisory Committee on Transportation

James Haas, Chair
Charna Staten, Co-Chair
Ray Antonio
Gale Armstrong
George Baringer
Jack Bookter
James Bourgart
Erma Brim
Bobbie Brown
Anni Chung

Robert Glover
John Holtsclaw
Richard Hood
Harold Hoogashian
Joseph Houghteling
Agar Jaicks
Walter Johnson
Steven Krefting
Brian Larkin
Thea Lengist

Michael Louie
Richard Marshall
Meredith Michaels
Annaliese Munet
Andrew Nash
Margie O'Driscoll
Edward Phipps
David Pipel
Norman Rolfe
Paul Rosenberg

Jacqualine Sachs
Sharyn Satsafskyn
E. Robert Scrofani
Carol Ruth Silver
George Swanson
Stephen Taber
James J. Walsh, Jr.
Harold Wanasetja
Duncan Warly
Cheryl Towns

---

The San Francisco Democratic Party supports Proposition B.

Proposition B will:
- make our neighborhoods more liveable.
- improve transit access for the disabled.
- promote San Francisco's "transit first" policy.
- maintain and improve the city's transportation infrastructure.

A transportation plan that will work for San Francisco. Vote YES on B.

---

San Francisco Democratic Party County Central Committee

Elected Members
Carole Migden, Chair
Ellen Chaitlin
Catherine Dodd

Michael Hardeman
Agar Jaicks
Leslie Katz
Tony Kilroy
Steve Krefting
Ruth Picon
Alexa Smith
Arlo Hale Smith
Alicia Wang
Ex Officio Appointees
Ed McGovern
Matthew Rothschild

---

San Francisco Tomorrow urges you to vote YES on Proposition B. San Francisco's transportation facilities are deteriorating before our eyes. Additional funding is urgently needed to rebuild and improve these facilities. Proposition B provides for:
- new Muni vehicles and facilities to benefit the City's environment and neighborhood livability;
- expanding Muni Metro service;
- maintenance and improvement of the City's streets;
- increased elderly and handicapped services — an important social program.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B.

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

The community organizations which provide vital transportation services for the disabled strongly support Proposition B.

Proposition B would double the paratransit door-to-door van and taxi services on which disabled, elderly and mobility-impaired San Franciscans rely. To get to the hospital, to the doctor, to health care services.

John King
United Cerebral Palsy Association of San Francisco

George Davis, Ph.D.
Bayview Hunters Point Multipurpose Senior Services

Catherine Koechlin
S.F. Paratransit Coordinating Council

Sandra Beddow
Free Wheelers Association

Michael Comini
The Lighthouse for the Blind and the Visually Impaired

Catherine (Betty) McQuiston
San Francisco Senior Citizen

Stan Hutton
Easter Seal Society of San Francisco

Masato Inaba
U.S. Human Resources Corp.

Gladys Hu
Self Help for the Elderly

Janet Pomroy
Recreation Center for the Handicapped

Alexis Lodde
MV Transportation
Rev. Patrick Lewis C.C. Sp.,
Archdiocese of San Francisco
Richard Eijiya
Kimochi

Dr. Rose Resnick
Rose Resnick Center for the Blind and Handicapped

Ira Okun
Family Service Agency of San Francisco

San Francisco AIDS Foundation

Tom Weathered
Lucille Lockhart
Joanne Handy
S.F. Institute on Aging
JoAnn Mancuso
Delancy Street Foundation

As members of the Transportation Committee that developed this transportation improvement program, we strongly urge you to vote YES on B.

Proposition B will bring San Francisco in line with other Bay Area counties that have already passed transportation plans. A vote for Proposition B would generate millions of additional dollars of state matching funds for San Francisco’s transportation system.

Proposition B will upgrade the City’s ailing Muni fleet; pave pothole streets; improve street design and traffic safety; improve transit for the disabled and contribute to the Muni graffiti prevention program.

Vote YES on B — We All Benefit.

Rodel Rodis, President
Public Utilities Commission

Sherri Chiesa, Vice President
Public Utilities Commission

Gordon Chin
Public Utilities Commission

H. Welton Flynn
Public Utilities Commission

Arthur Toupin
Public Utilities Commission

Dean Macris, Director
City Planning

Richard Evans, Director
Public Works
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

A good transportation system is the economic lifeline of San Francisco. Working people need dependable public transportation — a reliable Muni. They need less congested streets where people live, work and shop. The San Francisco Labor Council is proud to join the long list of supporters in endorsing YES on Proposition B. Join with us and vote Yes for our transportation future.

San Francisco Labor Council
Walter L. Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer

Many seniors and disabled people are dependent on paratransit to keep health care appointments. The California Nurses Association, Region 12 supports Proposition B.

Mariann Monteleone, RN
Catherine Dodd, RN

Transportation is consistently listed as this community’s number one priority. That’s a concern shared by the business community and residents alike. Proposition B will benefit us all. It’s an investment in San Francisco’s future. Proposition B will provide much-needed funds for:
• An improved and expanded Muni
• Street repairs and new road construction
• Better and more paratransit services for the disabled.

This is an opportunity for all San Franciscans to say “yes” to solving our transportation problems. A vote for Proposition B is a vote for our city’s future.

Gerald Newfarmer
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

It is regressive and unfair to finance mass transit and other transportation projects by increasing the city’s sales tax. The proper revenue should come from an increase in the state gasoline tax as recently acted upon by the Governor and the State Legislature. I urge you to vote “NO” on Prop. B.

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

A regressive sales tax takes a larger percentage of the total income of lower-income groups than it takes from the total income of higher-income groups.
City Hall should increase support for transit but not by unfairly taxing low, moderate, and middle income residents.

Vote NO on B.

Joel Ventresca
Past President
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

Sales taxes are a regressive form of taxation. They impact the poor the hardest. We are opposed to all violence, including economic violence. If you believe in social justice, we urge you to reject this measure.

Jim Schmitt
Green Party
Rick Wall
Humanist Party
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TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION B

ORDERING SUBMISSION OF AN ORDINANCE BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 7, 1989 TO BE CONSOLIDATED WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS AN ORDINANCE ADDING ARTICLE 14 TO PART III OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROVIDING FOR THE CREATION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY FOR THE IMPOSITION OF A ONE-HALF OF ONE PERCENT TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

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

Section 1.

(a) A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of November, 1989 and is hereby consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, November 7, 1989 for the purpose of submitting the following proposition:

Shall an ordinance of the City and County of San Francisco be approved so as to: 1) create a San Francisco County Transportation Authority; 2) authorize the Authority to impose a transactions and use tax of one-half of one percent to aid mass transit and reallocate the other traffic and transportation projects/purposes set forth in the San Francisco County Transportation Expenditure Plan for a period of no more than twenty (20) years; 3) authorize the Authority to issue from time to time limited tax bonds in a total outstanding aggregate amount not to exceed $742,000,000.00 and which is payable from the revenues generated hereunder; and 4) approve the California Constitution Article XIII B appropriations limit of $160,000,000.00.

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

(c) The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, November 7, 1989, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than October 31, 1989.

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

"Shall an ordinance of the City and County of San Francisco be approved so as to: 1) create a San Francisco County Transportation Authority; 2) authorize the Authority to impose a transactions and use tax of one-half of one percent to aid mass transit and reallocate the other traffic and transportation projects/purposes set forth in the San Francisco County Transportation Expenditure Plan for a period of no more than twenty (20) years; 3) authorize the Authority to issue from time to time limited tax bonds in a total outstanding aggregate amount not to exceed $742,000,000.00 and which is payable from the revenues generated hereunder; and 4) approve the California Constitution Article XIII B appropriations limit of $160,000,000.00."

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

(e) This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given. The Transportation Expenditure Plan referenced in Section 2 of this Ordinance shall be published once in the San Francisco Examiner within 30 days of submittal of this Ordinance to the electorate.

(f) The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

Section 2. At the special election called by Section 1 of this Ordinance, an ordinance amending Part III of the Municipal Code of the City and County of San Francisco by adding Article 14 (commencing with Section 1401) is hereby submitted to the electorate as follows:

SEC. 1401. TITLE. This ordinance shall be known as the "San Francisco County Transportation Authority Ordinance" which establishes and implements a transactions and use tax.

SEC. 1402. DEFINITIONS. For purposes of this ordinance the following words shall have the meanings ascribed to them by this section.

"Authority" shall mean the San Francisco County Transportation Authority.

"District" shall mean the City and County of San Francisco.

"Plan" shall mean the Transportation Expenditure Plan approved by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco which is considered part of this Ordinance and hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

"Operative date" shall mean the first day of the first calendar quarter commencing more than 120 days after adoption of the ordinance, pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 131105(a).

"Effective date" shall mean the date of adoption of this ordinance which shall take effect at the close of the polls on the day of election at which the proposition is adopted by majority vote of the electors voting on the measure, pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 131102(e).

SEC. 1403. PURPOSE. Pursuant to Division 12.5 of the Public Utilities Code, the San Francisco Transportation Committee has recommended that the Board of Supervisors submit to the voters of the City and County of San Francisco for their approval an ordinance which would, if so approved, create the San Francisco County Transportation Authority, authorize the Authority to impose a one-half of one percent transactions and use tax for a period of twenty years to finance the transportation improvements set forth in the Transportation Expenditure Plan approved by the Board of Supervisors and to issue limited tax bonds in a total outstanding aggregate amount not to exceed $742,000,000.00. Hence, this ordinance should be interpreted so as to achieve the purposes set forth herein:

(a) to establish a San Francisco County Transportation Authority.

(b) to impose a transactions and use tax in accordance with the provisions of Part 1.6 (commencing with Section 7251) of Division 2 of the California Revenue and Taxation Code and Sections 131100 et seq. of the California Public Utilities Code, which directs the County Board of Supervisors to adopt the tax ordinance
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Prior to the operative date, the Authority shall contract with the State Board of Equalization to perform all functions incident to the administration and operation of this transactions and use tax, provided that, if the Authority shall not have contracted with the State Board of Equalization prior to the operative date, it shall nevertheless so contract and in such a case the operative date shall be the first day of the first calendar quarter following the execution of such a contract.

SEC. 1406. TRANSACTIONS TAX AND RATE OF ONE-HALF OF ONE PERCENT. For the privilege of selling tangible personal property at retail, a tax is hereby imposed upon all retailers in this District at the rate of one-half of one percent of the gross receipts of any retailer from the sale of all tangible personal property sold at retail in this District on and after the operative date. This tax shall be imposed for a maximum period of twenty (20) years.

SEC. 1407. PLACE OF SALE. For the purposes of this ordinance, all retail sales are consummated at the place of business of the retailer unless the tangible personal property sold is delivered by the retailer or his agent to an out-of-state destination or to a common carrier for delivery to an out-of-state destination. The gross receipts from such sales shall include delivery charges, when such charges are subject to the state sales and use tax, regardless of the place to which delivery is made. In the event a retailer has no permanent place of business in the state or has more than one place of business, the place or places at which the retail sales are consummated shall be determined under rules and regulations to be prescribed and adopted by the State Board of Equalization.

SEC. 1408. USE TAX AND RATE OF ONE-HALF OF ONE PERCENT. An excise tax is hereby imposed on the storage, use or other consumption in this District of tangible personal property purchases from any retailer on and after the operative date for storage, use or other consumption in this District at the rate of one-half of one percent of the sales price of the property. The sales price shall include delivery when such charges are subject to state sales or use tax regardless of the place to which delivery is made. This tax shall be imposed for a maximum period of twenty (20) years.

SEC. 1409. ADOPTION OF PROVISIONS OF STATE LAW. Except as otherwise provided in this ordinance and except insofar as they are inconsistent with the provisions of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, all of the provisions of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code (commencing with Section 6001) are hereby adopted and made a part of this ordinance as though fully set forth herein.

SEC. 1410. LIMITATIONS ON ADOPTION OF PROVISIONS OF STATE LAW AND COLLECTION OF USE TAXES. In adopting the provisions of Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, wherever the State of California is named or referred to as the taxing agency, the name of the Authority shall be substituted therefor. The substitution, however, shall not be made when the word "State" is used as part of the title of the State Controller, the State Treasurer, the State Board of Control, the State Board of Equalization, the State Treasurer, or the Constitution of the State of California; the substitution would require action to be taken by or against the Authority or any agency, officer or employees thereof other than by or against the State Board of Equalization, in performing the functions incident to the administration or operation of this ordinance; the substitution shall not be made in those sections, including, but not necessarily limited to, sections referring to the exterior boundaries of the State of California, where the result of the substitution would be to provide an exemption from this tax with respect to certain sales, storage, use or other consumption of tangible personal property which would otherwise be exempt from this tax while such sales, storage, use or other consumption remains subject to tax by the state under the said provisions of that code; the substitution shall not be made in sections 6701, 6702, (except in the last sentence thereof), 6711, 6715, 6737, 6797 or 6828 of the Revenue and Taxation Code. The name of the District shall be substituted for the word "state" in the phrase "retailer engaged in business in this state" in Section 6203 and in the definition of that phrase in Section 6203.

SEC. 1411. PERMIT NOT REQUIRED. If a seller's permit has been issued to a retailer under Section 6067 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, an additional transactor's permit shall not be required by this ordinance.

SEC. 1412. EXEMPTIONS, EXCLUSIONS AND CREDITS.

(a) There shall be excluded from the measure of the transactions tax and the use tax the amount of any sales tax or use tax imposed by the State of California or by any city, county, or county pursuant to the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law or the amount of any state-administered transactions or use tax.

(b) There are exempted from the computation of the amount of transactions tax gross receipts when they are from:

1) Sales of tangible personal property to operators of aircraft to be used or consumed principally outside of the City and County of San Francisco and directly and exclusively in the use of such aircraft as common carriers of persons or property under the authority of the laws of this state, the United States, or any foreign government.

2) Sales of property to be used outside the District which is shipped to a point outside the District, pursuant to the contract of sale, by delivery to such point by the retailer or his agent, or by delivery by the retailer to a carrier for shipment to a consignee at such point. For the purposes of this paragraph, delivery to a point outside the District shall be satisfied:

1) with respect to vehicles (other than commercial vehicles) subject to registration pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 4000) of
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Division 3 of the Vehicle Code, aircraft licensed in compliance with Section 21411 of the Public Utilities Code, and undocumented vessels registered under Chapter 2 of Division 3.5 (commencing with Section 9850) of the Vehicle Code by registration to an out-of-District address and by a declaration under penalty of perjury, signed by the buyer, stating that such address is, in fact, his principal place of residence.

ii) with respect to commercial vehicles by registration to a place of business out-of-District, and a declaration under penalty of perjury, signed by the buyer, that the vehicle will be operated from that address.

3) the sale of tangible personal property if the seller is obligated to furnish the property for a fixed price pursuant to a contract entered into prior to the operative date of this ordinance.

4) a lease of tangible personal property which is a continuing sale of such property for any period of time for which the lessor is obligated to lease the property for an amount fixed by the lease prior to the operative date of this ordinance.

5) for the purposes of subsections (3) and (4), storage, use or other consumption, or possession, or exercise of any right to power over, tangible personal property shall be deemed not to be obligated pursuant to a contract or lease for any period of time during which any party to the contract or lease has the unconditional right to terminate the contract or lease upon notice, whether or not such right is exercised.

6) Except as provided in subparagraph (7), a retailer engaged in business in the District shall not be required to collect use tax from the purchaser of tangible personal property, unless the retailer ships or delivers the property into the District or participates within the District in making the sale of the property, including, but not limited to, soliciting or receiving the order, either directly or indirectly, at a place of business of the canvasser, solicitor, subsidiary, or person in the District under the authority of the retailer.

7) "A retailer engaged in business in the District" shall also include any retailer of any of the following: vehicles subject to registration pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 4000) of Division 3 of the Vehicle Code, aircraft licensed in compliance with Section 21411 of the Public Utilities Code, or undocumented vessels registered under Chapter 2 of Division 3.5 (commencing with Section 9850) of the Vehicle Code. That retailer shall be required to collect use tax from any purchaser who registers or licenses the vehicle, vessel, or aircraft at an address in the District.

d) Any person subject to use tax under this ordinance may credit against that tax any transactions tax or reimbursement for transactions tax paid to a district or retailer imposing a transactions tax pursuant to Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code with respect to the sale to the person of the property, the storage, use or other consumption of which is subject to the use tax.

SEC. 1413. AUTHORIZATION AND LIMITATION ON ISSUANCE OF BONDS. The Authority is hereby authorized to issue from time to time limited tax bonds pursuant to the provisions of California Public Utilities Code Sections 131109 et seq., in a total outstanding aggregate amount not to exceed $742,000,000.00.

SEC. 1414. USE OF PROCEEDS. The proceeds of the taxes imposed by this ordinance shall be used solely for the projects and purposes set forth in the County Transportation Expenditure Plan and for the administration thereof. In accordance with the legislative intent expressed in California Public Utilities Code Section 131109 such proceeds shall not replace funds previously provided by property tax revenues for public transportation purposes. Each year the tax is in effect and prior to the allocation of funds by the authority, the Controller of the City and County of San Francisco shall certify to the authority that the funds will not be substituted for property tax funds which are currently utilized to fund existing local transportation programs.

SEC. 1415. APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT. For purposes of Article XXIII of the State Constitution, the appropriations limit for the Authority for fiscal year 1989-90 and each year thereafter shall be $160,000,000.00 unless that amount should be amended pursuant to applicable law.

SEC. 1416. AMENDMENTS. All amendments to Part 1 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code made subsequent to the effective date of this ordinance which relate to sales and use taxes and which are not inconsistent with Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code and all amendments to Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, and all amendments to Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, shall automatically become a part of this ordinance; provided, however, that no such amendment shall operate so as to affect the rate of tax imposed by this ordinance.

SEC. 1417. PENALTIES. Any person violating any of the provisions of this ordinance shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punishable by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars ($500.00) or by imprisonment for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 1418. SEVERABILITY. If any provision of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

APPROVED AS TO FORM

LOUISE H. RENNE
City Attorney

ANGELA KARALE
Deputy City Attorney
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURE PLAN

Adopted July 24, 1989
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
ELEMENTS OF THE PLAN

The Board of Supervisors recommends the following elements be included in a Transportation Expenditure Plan for the City and County of San Francisco.

A. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sales Tax

A 1/2% sales tax dedicated to transportation improvements specified in this plan shall be imposed. The duration of the tax shall be 20 years.

Restriction of Funds

In accordance with enabling legislation and adopted principles, sales tax revenues generated pursuant to this plan shall be used to supplement and not replace existing local revenues used for transportation purposes. Moreover, sales tax revenues shall be spent on capital projects rather than to fund operations and maintenance of existing transportation services, unless otherwise specified in the Project List. Funds for operations and maintenance shall be limited to incremental costs associated with the implementation of new transportation services as specified in this plan. Incremental costs shall be defined as solely those costs that would clearly not have otherwise been incurred absent the new service.

B. PLAN SUMMARY

The following table summarizes the 1/2% sales tax revenue allocations by project category and subcategory in constant 1990 dollars.

**SUMMARY OF SALES TAX ALLOCATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT</td>
<td>$541,000,000 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREETS &amp; TRAFFIC SAFETY</td>
<td>$271,000,000 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARATRANSPORT</td>
<td>$72,000,000 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SALES TAX REVENUE</td>
<td>$902,000,000 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. PLAN DESCRIPTION

Priority Program

The principle focus of this plan is to define a program of prioritized projects and to insure that funding is allocated across major transportation categories, i.e., Transit, Streets and Traffic Safety, Paratransit, and Transportation Systems Management (TSM), and within subcategories. Subcategories consist of lists of projects exhibiting similar characteristics, e.g., transit service enhancements and extensions. A two-tier priority program has been developed in response to these objectives. Allocations of sales tax revenues are made to each of the major transportation categories. Within each subcategory, individual projects have been given a priority rating of 1, 2, or 3 (1 being first priority).

The allocations between major categories are: Transit - 60%, Streets and Traffic Safety - 30%, Paratransit - 8%, and TSM - 2%. This reflects the city's transit first policy as well as providing funding for identified transportation needs within all major categories. Within each program subcategory, the list of projects shall be funded using sales tax revenue up to the total amount for that subcategory and according to the priority assigned. Under current revenue projections not all projects listed could be funded. In the event that sales tax revenue for the subcategory runs out, lower priority projects within the subcategory will not be funded. In the event that a surplus results after funding all projects listed in a subcategory, the remaining revenue will be available for re-allocation to other subcategories. If the major transportation category is fully funded, then the money can be shifted to an alternative category.

In this manner, implementation of top priority projects is assured. The County Transportation Authority shall periodically calculate actual sales tax revenue collections (in constant dollars) relative to the amount originally projected in the Transportation Expenditure Plan (see Technical Appendix for the City & County of San Francisco Transportation Expenditure Plan). Should actual collections exceed original projections, the surplus shall be allocated to the Transit, Streets and Traffic Safety, Paratransit, and TSM categories in the same proportions as originally outlined in the plan.

Project List

Each of the project descriptions includes the following information: description of the project, priority, restrictions on use of sales tax funds, cost of project, other funds available, shortfall to be funded by the sales tax, and the sponsoring agency. The cost of project identifies the cost to complete the project, excluding previously allocated funds.

Sales tax funds shall be used for capital improvements unless otherwise noted. The project descriptions specify which projects are eligible for incremental operations and maintenance funds.
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CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURE PLAN (Continued)

TRANSIT PROJECTS
Service Enhancement and Extensions
Priority Project
1 MUNI Metro Turnback - Construction of a turnback for Metro trains beyond the Embarcadero Station to allow more frequent and reliable Market Street subway service without recurrent delays. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. Cost: $130.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $20.5 million. Other Funds: $109.5 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 MUNI Metro Extension - Extension of MUNI Metro from the Embarcadero Turnback to the Caltrain Terminal at 4th and Townsend Streets. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. Cost: $68.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $48.0 million. Other Funds: $20.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 Mission Bay Metro Extension - Extension of Metro service from 4th & Townsend to 16th & Owens to the new Metro East facility. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. Cost: $31.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $13.0 million. Other Funds: $18.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 F-Line Streetcar - Expansion of historic streetcar service along The Embarcadero Roadway to the heart of Fisherman's Wharf and along Upper Market Street to Castro. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. Cost: $65.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $40.0 million. Other Funds: $25.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 Metro Subway Signal System - Provide faster more frequent metro subway service. Cost: $23.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $5.0 million. Other Funds: $18.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 Metro Accessibility Improvements - Improvements to the system safety for the disabled within the MUNI Metro subway. Cost: $0.5 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $0.1 million. Other Funds: $0.4 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 Presidio Facilities Redevelopment - To accommodate MUNI's expanded articulated trolley fleet. Cost: $32.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $1.5 million. Other Funds: $30.5 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 Metro East LRV Facility - Development of a new storage and maintenance facility to accommodate an expanded LRV fleet. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. Cost: $83.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $18.0 million. Other Funds: $65.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 Geneva Modifications - Restoration and rehabilitation of Geneva facilities including conversion of overhead and fixed facilities to accommodate and better maintain PCC cars. Cost: $4.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $0.1 million. Other Funds: $3.9 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 Mission Bay Trolley Rerouting/Extensions - Rerouting and extensions of MUNI routes 22, 30 and 47 to improve service to Mission Bay/Potrero Hill. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. Cost: $18.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $5.5 million. Other Funds: $12.5 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 Trolley Coach Electrification - Conversion of MUNI 9, 42, and 71 routes from diesel to trolley coach operation. Cost: $22.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $1.0 million. Other Funds: $21.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 Extension of MUNI Route 14 to Daly City BART Station - Extension of existing trolley coach service from existing terminal at Mission Street/San Jose Avenue to Daly City BART station. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. Cost: $4.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $2.0 million. Other Funds: $2.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 Ferry Terminal Expansion - Expansion of existing ferry terminal in order to accommodate additional ferry service. Cost: $1.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $0.1 million. Other Funds: $0.9 million. Sponsor - Port.

Major Transit Corridors
Priority Project
1,2 Major Transit Corridor Planning/Environmental Fund - Planning and environmental studies to determine future local and regional transit service improvements from downtown San Francisco along the Third Street/Bayshore Corridor (Priority 1), transit service improvements along the Geary Corridor between downtown and the Richmond District (Priority 1), transit service improvements along a North Beach Corridor between Market Street and the North Beach neighborhood (Priority 2), and transit service improvements on Van Ness Avenue (Priority 2). Cost: $10.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $10.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

2,3 Major Transit Corridor Capital Construction Fund - Construction fund for fixed guideway capital improvements in the Bayshore, Geary, (Priority 2) and North Beach (Priority 3) corridors. The type of transit improvements and the full cost of these projects will be determined during the Planning and Environmental Studies. The cost noted here would represent the city's contribution to construction. It is anticipated that additional federal, state, or local funds would be available. Cost: To exceed $190.0 million. Total Cost to be determined. Amount to be funded by Sales Tax: $190.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

Rehabilitation and Replacement
Priority Project
1 Vehicles - Replacement of MUNI diesel buses, trolley coaches and light rail vehicles and reconstruction of historic streetcar and cable car fleets. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. Cost: $623.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $346.0 million. Other Funds: $477.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

1 Guideways - Upgrading and rehabilitation and replacement of rail and overhead trolley wire throughout the MUNI system. Cost: $118.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $3.0 million. Other Funds: $115.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.


1 Graffiti Prevention - Security improvements at MUNI facilities to prevent graffiti and expand vehicle cleaning facilities. This cost reflects only capital improvements for a graffiti prevention program. Cost: $5.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $5.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

STREETS AND TRAFFIC SAFETY PROJECTS
Street Resurfacing and Reconstruction
Priority Project
1,2 Street Resurfacing - Repaving and reconstructing city streets to prevent the deterioration of the roadway system. The streets to be repaved are selected in accordance with the City's Pavement Management System which considers pavement condition, bus and trolley use, and automobile and truck traffic. In conjunction with street reconstruction projects, bus bulbs and/or transit safety islands shall be installed on transit preferred streets as deemed appropriate by the Department of City Planning, Department of Public Works, the Public Utilities Commission, the Board of Supervisors and any other department or commission which is required to approve the widening of streets and sidewalks. The top 44% of the streets identified (Continued on next page)
are Priority 1 projects and the remaining 56% are Priority 2 projects. Cost: $340.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $254.5 million. Other Funds: $85.5 million. Sponsor - DPW.

1. **Seismic Reinforcement - Earthquake reinforcement for bridges, ducts and walls throughout the city.** Cost: $2.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $2.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

2. **Railroad Track Removal/Repair - Removal of obsolete railroad tracks on city streets and repair of the pavement adjacent to active railroad tracks.** Cost: $6.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $5.0 million. Other Funds: $1.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

2. **Sidewalk Repair - Reconstruction of sidewalks in front of city maintained property and near city maintained street trees.** Cost: $7.5 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $7.5 million. Sponsor - DPW.

2. **Street Repair and Cleaning Equipment - Purchase of street maintenance and cleaning equipment, such as asphalt pavers, dump trucks, sweepers, and front-end loaders for city crews.** Cost: $17.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $17.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

**Traffic Signals and Street Signs**

1. **Signal Upgrading - Replacement of worn out traffic signal equipment for which replacement parts are no longer available. New or substantially upgraded traffic signals located on Transit Preferential Streets shall have transit pre-emption capabilities. The top 42% of the signal upgrades proposed are Priority 1 projects and the remaining 58% are Priority 2 projects.** Cost: $119.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $119.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

1. **Street Name Signs - Placement of street name signs throughout the city. Many streets are inadequately identified which causes confusion for motorists and transit users.** Cost: $1.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $1.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

2. **Install Raised Reflective Lane Markings - Installation of raised reflective pavement markers on city streets for better delineation of traffic lanes at night and during wet weather.** Cost: $2.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $2.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

2. **New Traffic Signals - Installation of traffic signals at selected unsignalized intersections. The locations of intersections are determined by the Traffic Engineering Bureau's priority list. Includes capital and incremental maintenance costs.** Cost: $8.5 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $8.5 million. Sponsor - DPW.

2. **Traffic Control Systems - Minor additions and modifications to the city's traffic control systems including: special warning signs, pedestrian guidance systems, pavement bars and special test installations to improve traffic safety and efficiency.** Cost: $1.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $1.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

2. **Traffic Engineering Equipment - Replacement of traffic engineering equipment such as line painting machines and traffic count devices.** Cost: $4.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $4.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

2. **Army Street Circle - Modification of southbound ramp connection from Highway 101 to eastbound Army Street to increase radius for large trucks.** Cost: $0.1 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $0.1 million. Sponsor - DPW.

2. **Potrero Avenue - Rechannelization and modification of traffic signals on Potrero Avenue between Division Street and Army Street to improve traffic and pedestrian safety and traffic efficiency.** Cost: $0.4 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $0.4 million. Sponsor - DPW.

**Major Capital Projects**

1. **Embarcadero Roadway - Creation of a waterfront boulevard along the Embarcadero and King Street from North Point Street in Fisherman's Wharf to 6th Street in Mission Bay. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs.** Cost: $101.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $35.0 million. Other Funds: $65.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

1. **19th and Holloway Safety Improvements - Safety improvements along 19th Avenue extending from Eucalyptus to Junipero Serra. This is intended to reduce conflicts between auto traffic and pedestrians boarding streetcars on the 19th Avenue median, particularly at San Francisco State (Holloway Street). Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax expenditure limited to Planning & Engineering. Cost: $30.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $45.5 million. Other Funds: $25.5 million. Sponsor - DPW/MUNI.

1. **Candlestick Park Short-Range Traffic Improvements - Traffic signal improvements near Candlestick Park to improve traffic flow and reduce impacts of Candlestick Park traffic on nearby neighborhoods.** Cost: $1.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $1.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

1. **Bernal Heights Street System Upgrading - Construction of streets in Bernal Heights where existing streets are unrepaired or below city standards to ensure adequate emergency vehicle response times for the community.** Cost: $6.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $6.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

1. **Hunters Point Industrial Connector - Industrial by-pass route east of Third Street between Innes and Carroll Avenues by way of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard to divert truck traffic off residential streets. Sales tax expenditure limited to Planning & Environmental studies. Cost: $3.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $0.3 million. Other Funds: $2.7 million. Sponsor - DPW.

1. **Undergrounding Crossover Drive through Golden Gate Park - Explore the undergrounding of Crossover Drive between Lincoln Way and Fulton Street in Golden Gate Park. Sales tax expenditure limited to Planning & Environmental studies. Cost: $100.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $2.0 million. Other Funds: $98.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

1. **Third Street Median Islands - Construction of landscaped median islands with left turn lanes along Third Street between China Basin and Jamestown Ave. to improve traffic safety and reduce congestion in this main transportation corridor.** Cost: $7.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $7.0 million. Sponsor - DPW.

**Street Trees**

1. **Planting and Maintenance of Existing Street Trees - Improved maintenance of existing trees in public rights-of-way. First $6.0 million is Priority 1 and the remaining is Priority 2. Cost: $8.5 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $8.5 million. Sponsor - DPW.**

1. **Planting and Maintenance of Additional Trees - Planting additional street trees on major thoroughfares throughout the city. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. First $5.5 million is Priority 1 and the remaining is Priority 2. Cost: $7.5 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $7.5 million. Sponsor - DPW.**

**PARATRANSIT SERVICES**

Expansion of Paratransit Door-to-Door Van and Taxi Service Levels

**Priority Project**

1. **Additional Service to Address Current and Projected Waiting List Growth and Provide Services to Persons with AIDS and Frail Elders - Increased funding for van and taxi services to expand services to meet current and projected waiting list growth for taxi, group van, and lift van services for persons with**
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disabilities, including frail seniors. Also additional services for persons with AIDS and for clients of the expanding Adult Day Health Care system. The first $72.0 million is Priority 1 and the remaining $3.0 million is Priority 2. Sales tax funding for service operation. Cost: $147.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $75.0 million. Other Funds: $72.0 million. Sponsor - MUNI.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

Ridesharing and Transit Promotion

Priority Project

1,2 Transit Preferential Streets - Includes designation of streets and lanes for exclusive transit use; sidewalk widenings at bus stops; traffic signal modifications to improve transit flow; reduction and relocation of bus stops; possible removal of unnecessary stop signs along transit and bicycle routes; and modifications to the on-street truck loading and parking zones downtown. The first $3.0 million is Priority 1 and the remaining $0.5 million is Priority 2. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. Cost: $4.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $3.5 million. Other Funds: $0.5 million. Sponsor - DCP/DPW/MUNI.

1 Sterling Street HOV Lanes on Eastbound Approach to Bay Bridge - Extend the existing lane for High Occupancy Vehicles on Second or Bryant Streets to provide travel time savings for carpools and vanpools on the eastbound approach to the Bay Bridge. Cost: $0.5 million. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $0.4 million. Other Funds: $0.1 million. Sponsor - DPW.

1 Transportation Brokerage Program - Increase staff monitoring of the Brokerage Program which requires developers and institutions to distribute ridesharing materials and transit information to employees at new office buildings or established institutions. Cost: $4.0 million. Includes operations and maintenance costs. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $3.5 million. Other Funds: $5.0 million. Sponsor - DCP.

1,2 Transportation Management Association Program - This program would assist in coordinating transit and ridesharing marketing activities for the entire downtown. The program would include an educational element, transit pass sales and carpool matching, possibly using a downtown "store" similar to Berkeley Trip. The program might ultimately be expanded to serve institutions as well. The first $4.5 million is Priority 1 and the remaining $0.5 million is Priority 2. Includes operations and maintenance costs. Cost: $5.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $5.0 million. Sponsor - DCP.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Project

1,2 Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Elderly & Handicapped Accessibility Projects - San Francisco portion of regional hiking and bicycle trails around the bay and between ridge top parks; various bicycle projects such as additional bicycle lanes, improved signage, additional bicycle racks and other facilities and educational and safety programs; and provision of drop curbs at intersections to permit ease of movement for the mobility impaired. The first $4.0 million is Priority 1 and the remaining is Priority 2. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. Cost: $6.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $4.5 million. Other Funds: $1.5 million. Sponsor - DPW.

1,2 Downtown Pedestrian Projects - Improvement of existing alleyways as pedestrian/open space areas for pedestrian convenience and aesthetic enjoyment and architectural treatments for the improvement of the pedestrian environment on designated sidewalks such as Second Street, Montgomery Street and Union Square area streets. The first $2.0 million is Priority 1 and the remaining is Priority 2. Includes capital and incremental operations and maintenance costs. Cost: $3.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $3.0 million. Sponsor - DCP/DPW.

3 Pedestrian Connections and Transit Access - Provision of grade-separated pedestrian crossings at high volume pedestrian locations and to provide access to major transit facilities. For example, Kezar Stadium to Golden Gate Park or from the proposed new main library to the Civic Center Metro/BART station. Cost: $5.0 million. Shortfall to be funded by Sales Tax: $5.0 million. Sponsor - DCP/DPW.
PROPOSITION C

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without a vote of the people, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, provided that the aggregate principal amount of the tax-exempt debt issued by the nonprofit corporation to pay for the equipment not exceed $18 million, with that amount to be increased by two percent each year?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: "Lease financing" is a way for the City to pay for equipment by leasing it until it is paid for, instead of paying for the equipment all at once. The Board of Supervisors generally may not approve the lease financing of equipment unless approved by the voters.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment that would allow the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval, to approve the lease financing of equipment from a City-sponsored nonprofit corporation created for that purpose. The nonprofit corporation would issue tax-exempt debt to pay for the equipment. The principal of the debt at no time could exceed $18 million, that amount to be increased by two percent each year.

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

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

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On July 24, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

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

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C:

- Saves the City money by allowing current and future leases for equipment to be financed at lower interest rates (currently 6%) than must now be used with private corporations (ranging 9% to 16%).
- By simply refinancing existing leases, the City could save over $500,000.
- Additional money could be saved on any future leases.
- Gives the City the option to pay cash for equipment or to finance it expeditiously at a low cost to the City.
- Allows quicker replacement of inefficient and outdated equipment, which will reduce maintenance costs, decrease downtime, and increase productivity for equipment which has outlived its economic useful life.
- Provides restrictions to insure prudent use of this financing mechanism.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

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

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition C
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would enable the Board of Supervisors to put us in debt up to $18,000,000 without voter approval. Our taxes pay off city debts. We have the right to approve the debt ahead of time.

VOTE NO ON C!

In 1976, San Francisco voters adopted a Charter amendment I authored to require voter approval of all revenue bonds and “lease financing” plans. Old-fashioned general obligation bonds, backed by the General Fund, always have required voter approval. Prior to 1976, however, City Hall kept devising more and more gimmicks to bypass the voters in financing costly city projects. That’s how Candlestick Park was built; that’s how the city bought those smelly Muni diesel buses.

The most complicated of these debt-creating gimmicks is “lease financing”. A city-sponsored non-profit corporation issues tax-exempt bonds to build or buy something, then leases the facility or equipment to the city. No matter how tricky the maneuver, the taxpayers foot the bill.

Borrowing money on public credit is serious business to taxpayers. Don’t let the supervisors take away our right to approve the creation of city debt. It’s our money, and our vote.

PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

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

(b) For the purposes of this section, “lease financing” occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease(c)); or

(3) to lease financings from a non-profit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $18 million, such amount to be increased by two percent each year following approval of this subsection.

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 13.
Did you know that you can vote before Election Day?
Vote absentee in person at City Hall (Room 158) starting October 10
or by mail — fill out the application on the back cover.
PROPOSITION D

Shall the salary of members of the Board of Supervisors be increased to $41,122 per year, and shall voters be asked to vote in 1991 and every two years after to change this salary, based on salaries paid to Supervisors in eight Northern California counties?

YES 41
NO 42

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The eleven members of the Board of Supervisors are paid $23,924 each year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is a charter amendment which would increase the salary of each member of the Board of Supervisors to $41,122 per year. This amount is the average of the salaries paid to the members of the Board to Supervisors of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Napa and Santa Cruz counties. In every odd numbered year starting in 1991, the civil service commission would survey these eight counties to determine the average salary and the voters will be asked to approve a raise to this new level at the next general election. If the voters reject the new salary, the previous salary will remain in effect until the voters approve a change.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the salaries of the members of the Board of Supervisors to $41,122 a year. You also want the Civil Service Commission to determine in each odd-numbered year beginning in 1991 what the average salary is of eight Bay Area counties, and you want to vote at the next general election to decide if you want to raise the salaries of the members of the Board of Supervisors to this new level.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the salary for the members of the Board of Supervisors to remain at $23,924.

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, the cost of government would be increased by $189,189, annually.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On July 31, the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Angela Alioto, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Willie Kennedy, Nancy Walker, and Doris Ward.
NO: Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Thomas Hsieh and Wendy Neider.

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

San Francisco is a great city that demands dedicated, hardworking and effective representation.

The Board of Supervisors administers the third largest county budget in California, $2.1 billion this year, tackling the problems of police and fire services, the homeless, AIDS, the Crack epidemic and transportation.

Our eleven-member Board serves the only combined City and County in California carrying dual responsibilities. Contra Costa County has 21 City Councils plus its Board of Supervisors, or 110 elected representatives to handle a similar size population!

The best guarantee for an independent, conscientious and responsive Board is a fair, appropriate salary.

Proposition D will establish that our Board members should be paid at a fair level and that any future Supervisor salary increases would be set by a vote of the people. And there would be no automatic raise without full citywide ballot approval.

The present salary of $23,924 per year was approved by the voters in November, 1982. But, today, that salary ranks last among the sixteen largest California counties.

Even Napa County with one-seventh the population of San Francisco pays their part-time Supervisors over $2,000 a year more than our virtually full-time Board members.

Vote Yes on Proposition D

Proposition D contains a fair formula that would only increase Supervisors pay to $41,122 — the minimal average of County Supervisors salaries in all other Bay Area counties, with no automatic cost-of-living increase!

Proposition D also mandates that every two years this formula must go to a vote of the people for evaluation.

By passing Proposition D voters will be making a wise investment in the City’s future by guaranteeing quality representation. And all at the cost of only 25 cents per San Francisco resident per year, no more than the price of a postage stamp.

For Fair Compensation and Quality Government Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

SAY "NO" TO LESS WORK FOR MORE PAY!

In their argument for "D," the Supervisors "forgot" to mention Proposition "N".

Under the Charter, one Supervisor is required to serve on the San Francisco Retirement Board.

"N" would allow Supervisors to escape responsibility for personally assuring the safety and fair distribution of City retirement funds, by letting the Board President appoint an unelected representative in their place.

If both "D" and "N" pass, Supervisors will get 70% more pay for less work!

Does that sound fair?

When did YOU get a 70% pay raise for doing less work?

SAY "NO" TO FULL-TIME PAY FOR PART-TIME WORK!

The Supervisors also don’t mention that, while the Charter prohibits the Mayor from having outside jobs, there is nothing in "D" to require Supervisors to work full time representing you!

Most Supervisors have profitable outside employment.

• Four Supervisors are attorneys — one a leading criminal defense lawyer; another an associate in a top antitrust law firm.

• One Supervisor works for a college district outside San Francisco.

• One Supervisor is an architect.

• One Supervisor serves as an officer of a large business.

• One Supervisor manages his extensive holdings as a landlord and supermarket owner.

REMEMBER: THE SAME SUPERVISORS PUSHING "D" ALSO SUPPORT "O" (Authorizing $5000 special interest campaign contributions to Supervisors).

FOR HONEST GOVERNMENT — "NO" on "D", "J", "M", "N" AND "O".

Committee For Honesty In Government
Alexa Smith, Democratic Committee Member
Thomas Spinosu, Republican Leader
Arlo Hale Smith, BART Director

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

"D" IS DISHONEST!
Disguised as a proposal to give Supervisors a "cost-of-living" pay raise, Proposition D is a deceptive measure designed to give the Supervisors a whopping 70% salary increase overnight.
And if Proposition D passes, Supervisors will be given AUTOMATIC PAY RAISES in perpetuity! That's right, AUTOMATIC PAY RAISES!
READ THE FINE PRINT!
Proposition D does more than raise the salaries of our part-time Supervisors from about $24,000 to $41,122.
Proposition D takes away our right to vote on future Supervisor salary increases, by setting their pay after 1990 at the average level paid in eight other countries where local supervisors set their own salaries without voter approval!
DON'T BE MISLED!
The Supervisors claim they're not being paid enough. But they don't tell you that they each have two aides who do most of their work, and extensive additional support staff — all of which cost us, the taxpayers, hundreds of thousands of dollars per year.

They don't tell you about their "friends" committees — special interest money they regularly collect to pay for breakfasts, lunches, dinners — anything else they can say is a "governmental" or "political" expense. They don't tell you about the free parking spaces and numerous other official and unofficial perks that go with the job.
They don't tell you that every other California county — including Los Angeles — has only five supervisors! Five supervisors doing the work that eleven supervisors do in San Francisco!

VOTE FOR REFORM!
In this election, voters have a chance to say "NO" to greediness and mismanagement at City Hall and "YES" to reform and honest government by voting:
"NO" on "D" and "O" (measure allowing special interests to contribute up to $5000 per Supervisors) and "YES" on "T" (two-term limit on Supervisors)!!

Committee For Honesty In Government

---

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D.

Proposition D is a thoughtful, conscientious proposal to guarantee San Francisco is guided by the best quality Board of Supervisors.

Proposition D does not:
- Allow automatic cost-of-living increases.
- Take the Board's pay out of the voter's hands.
- Change the Board's responsibilities in any way.

Proposition D does:
- Pay the Board of Supervisors the minimal average of the salaries in the other nine Bay Area counties.
- Prohibit future raises without a vote of the people.
- Cost each San Franciscan 25 cents a year, or no more than the price of a single postage stamp.

For Fair Compensation and Quality Government, Vote Yes on Proposition D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisor Salaries

PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

It is time that San Francisco paid Supervisors a reasonable salary. The current salary of $23,924 is ridiculously low. This is a fair and sensible measure.

San Francisco Tomorrow

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

WHAT HAVE THEY DONE FOR US LATELY?
In November 1980 we voted to shift the tax burden to large corporations. Not until 1988, when we faced a $100 million deficit, did our Supervisors vote to raise an additional $7 million from the payroll and gross receipts tax. And then only after the Mayor got an “OK” from downtown interests.

FULL-TIME JOB?
There is no limitation on supervisors’ “moonlighting” income. Let them limit or prohibit “earned income” from outside sources before we vote them a full-time salary.

LIKE OTHER COUNTIES?
Every other county has only FIVE supervisors. They can afford higher salaries.

WAIT ’TIL NEXT YEAR
Let’s see some real changes. Adequate health and welfare programs. Ethics and election reform. Until then, our supervisors can continue to serve, if only for the power and glory, at the same salary.

Robert Frank

The supervisors want a $17,000 raise. So do we! We’re not about to get one. Neither should they!

Robert Arenson
Cheryl Arenson
John Barbagelata
Martha M. Gillham

Daniel G. Gillham
Joan Saraf
Irene Patridge
Ray Allen
Alexandra Vukovich
Angela Barbagelata

When was the last time you received an increase in salary from $23,924 to $41,122 annually?
That is what the majority of supervisors are asking you to vote for. They have been given no mandate by the voters to run for office. They understand the ground rules for this position — hours and salary. They have chosen to put their hat in the ring to run for this office to become representatives of the people. No one asked them to apply for the position — it was their own idea.
So why gripe.
Vote No on Proposition D.

Marguerite Warren

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

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors is unlike any of the other 57 county boards of supervisors. San Francisco is the only consolidated city and county in the state. It is also the only county with an elected chief executive officer—a mayor, who is paid over $122,000 to direct the day to day affairs of local government on a full-time basis. The framers of our Charter deliberately established the salary for supervisors in the Charter. Changes must be approved by the voters.

Proposition D is based on the false assumption that San Francisco supervisors are like supervisors in other counties, which have no mayor and consist of five-member boards, exercising quasi-administrative as well as legislative functions. In San Francisco, however, the Charter specifically makes it official misconduct for supervisors to interfere in or exercise any administrative responsibilities. Proposition D would alter the fundamental nature of the charter provision on salaries so that our supervisors could “piggyback” on the compensation of supervisors in other counties.

Three times the voters have changed the amount paid supervisors, but by a specific dollar figure, not by rewriting the Charter with automatic biennial increases subject only to voter rejection. I authored the last salary increase in 1982, which increased pay to $23,924 and was based logically on the change in the Consumer Price Index between 1964 and 1982. If the same method were applied now, the supervisors would receive a $6,476 raise to $30,400 per year. But Proposition D hikes pay by $17,198 to $44,122, and that’s just for starters under this new and radical scheme.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

THEY ARE NOT A HOUSE OF LORDS — THEY JUST ACT LIKE IT!
Vote NO on Proposition D. The current Board of Supervisors is a national joke. They don’t need a raise. They are paid too much.
Vote YES on Proposition T — for a two-term limit on that same Board of Supervisors. A new Board could only be an improvement.

Terence Faulkner
Past County Chairman
San Francisco Republican Party

ASK YOURSELF:
What has the San Francisco Board of Supervisors done to merit another pay raise?
Answer: Nothing.

Terence Faulkner
Past County Chairman
San Francisco Republican Party

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 2.100 thereof, relating to the salary of members of the Board of Supervisors.

The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of said city and county at an election to be held on November 7, 1989, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 2.100, so that the same shall read as follows:

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

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 $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000. Effective upon the approval of this charter amendment by the qualified voters, each member of the board of supervisors shall be paid a salary of $41,122 per year, which is the average of the salaries of the members of the boards of supervisors for the counties listed hereafter as of July 31, 1989: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Napa and Santa Cruz. Not later than the first day of April of 1991 and of every odd-numbered year thereafter, the civil service commission shall survey each of the eight counties listed above and determine the average of the salaries of the members of the board of supervisors for each of these counties. The average salary as determined by the civil service commission shall then be submitted to the qualified voters of San Francisco at the next available general election for final authorization to pay the determined average salary to the members of the board of supervisors effective upon the date of authorization by the qualified voters. Should the qualified voters fail to authorize any proposed change in the salary to be paid to members of the board of supervisors, as required by this Section, then the salary being paid to members of the board of supervisors at the time the change is rejected by the qualified voters, shall remain in effect until changed by the qualified voters.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE  Theodore R. Lakey
City Attorney  Deputy City Attorney

Moved since you last voted? Then you must re-register. Phone 554-4375.
Police and Fire Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION E
Shall the City adjust the pensions of retired police officers and firefighters when the salaries of active police officers and firefighters, respectively, are adjusted?

YES 44
NO 45

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Salaries for police officers and firefighters may be changed several times each year. Pensions for retired police officers and firefighters are changed only once each year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. Under Proposition E, pensions for retired police officers and firefighters would be changed each time there is a change to the salaries of police officers and firefighters.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that pensions of retired police officers and firefighters be changed every time police officer and firefighter salaries are changed.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pensions of retired police officers and firefighters to be changed only once a year.

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on data from the Retirement System, it would increase the cost of government by an amount which cannot accurately be determined but could result in an annual cost of approximately $500,000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”
On July 24, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None
Police and Fire Retirement Benefits

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Proposition E is a fair adjustment to the method which determines the monthly retirement allowance of our former police officers and firefighters. Under the current system, adjustments to this allowance take effect on July 1, even though they may become owing much earlier in the fiscal year. Retired police officers and firefighters, many living on fixed incomes, could be forced to wait almost a full year before receiving any increases due them. Passage of Proposition E would erase the waiting period by clarifying the 1986 law.

Retirement allowance increases are tied to increases in salaries for currently-employed police officers and firefighters. The salaries of active police officers and firefighters are determined by a survey of salaries in comparable California departments. Salary increases for active personnel take effect on the same date that increases are granted in those other California departments. But increases for retirees are granted only for active salary increases which are effective as of July 1. Retirement allowance increases based on later active salary increases are deferred until the next July 1. Where active salaries are adjusted as of July 2, the retirement benefits are not adjusted for an entire year! How are our retirees supposed to keep up with inflation on a fixed income when their retirement benefits are adjusted a year late?

It is only fair that we treat the retired members of the Police and Fire departments just as we do the active members — with respect and with an equitable retirement pension. After all, they put their lives on the line every day of their careers to protect our fellow San Franciscans. Let’s do what’s right and correct the error that keeps our retirees a year behind in receiving what they deserve.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE “YES” ON “E”

Proposition “E” is a technical correction to the proposition that sets retirement allowances for retired fire fighters and police officers.

The San Francisco Labor Council urges you to vote “YES” on Proposition “E” — it is both fair and equitable. It adjusts the retirement allowances for retirees at the same time salaries are adjusted for the active members of the fire and police departments.

Walter L. Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council

San Francisco’s finest — our police officers and firefighters — deserve fair and equitable treatment in their retirement years.

Their retirement allowance is increased whenever active duty personnel get a raise. Because of a defect in current law, however, police and fire retirees can wait as long as a year before their “raise” takes effect.

That’s wrong, and should be remedied. Please vote YES on Proposition E.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

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

Prior to 1986, retired Police Officers and Firefighters received an adjustment in their retirement allowances on July 1st of each year when the active Police Officers and Firefighters received an adjustment in their salaries. In 1986, the voters approved a charter amendment permitting adjustments in active Police Officers and Firefighters salaries after July 1st of any year. Through an oversight the change in adjusting active members salaries was not applicable to retirement allowances of retired members.

Proposition E will provide for an adjustment of retirement allowances of retired Police Officers and Firefighters on the effective date of any adjustment of the salaries of active members of the Police and Firefighters.

A YES on Proposition E will restore the system as it existed prior to 1986.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition E.

San Francisco Democratic Party
S.F. Veteran Police Officers Association
S.F. Veteran Firefighters Association
S.F. Firefighters Local 798
S.F. Police Officers Association
Milton Marks, State Senator
S.F. Retired City Employees Association

Retired police officers and firefighters were inadvertently not included in a 1986 Charter amendment which established a system for adjusting police and fire salaries after July 1 of any year. The result of this oversight is that retired police officers and firefighters may have to wait nearly one year for an adjustment in their monthly retirement allowances. Prior to 1986, adjustments in retirement allowances were made when active police officers and firefighters received their annual cost of living increase.

Proposition E restores the retirement allowance adjustment method that existed prior to 1986. This was an equitable system which allowed for retired adjustments when their active counterparts (police officers/firefighters) received a salary adjustment. These retired public safety members have devoted 25 to 40 years of their working lives to city service, often facing life endangering situations. Now on a fixed income, they do need — and were previously provided — a measure of financial protection against inflation.

A YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION E brings back the system whereby retirement allowance increases are directly tied to increases in active salaries. This system was established in 1975 and worked well until it was unintentionally changed in 1986.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Mike Keys, President
S.F. Police Officers’ Assn.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition E

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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8.558 Definition of "final compensation" - Allowances first payable prior to July 1, 1975

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, but solely with respect to the determination of the amount of each retirement allowance payable to or on account of a person who retired for service or because of disability under the provisions of section 8.544 of the charter prior to July 1, 1975, "final compensation," for time commencing on July 1, 1975, shall mean the rate of remuneration (excluding remuneration for overtime) attached on July 1, 1975, to the rank or position upon which such person's retirement allowance was determined when first effective, provided, further, that each such allowance shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1976, and on July 1 of each succeeding year 1990, and thereafter on the effective date of any legislation fixing the rates of compensation for police officers under section 8.405 of this charter by an amount equal to 50 percent of the rate of change in the salary attached to said rank multiplied by the allowance which was payable for the month immediately preceding such each July 1.

This section does not give any person retired under the provisions of said section 8.568, 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 July 1, 1975.

This section does not authorize any decrease in the amount of any allowance from the amount being paid as of June 30, 1975.

No retirement allowance to which the definition of "final compensation" as set forth in this section is applicable shall be subject to adjustment under the provisions of section 8.526 for time commencing July 1, 1975. Contributions, with interest credited thereon, made by or charged against the city and county standing to its credit on account of a person whose retirement allowance is subject to the provisions of this section and which were made by or charged against the city and county for the purposes of said section 8.526 shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

8.559-6 Adjustment of Allowances

Every retirement or death allowance payable to or on account of any member under section 8.559 shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1976, and on July 1 of each succeeding year 1990, and thereafter on the effective date of any legislation fixing the rates of compensation for police officers under section 8.405 of this charter by an amount equal to 50 percent 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, 1976, or on the date such member or beneficiary began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.

8.582 Definition of "final compensation" - Allowances first payable prior to July 1, 1975

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, but solely with respect to the determination of the amount of each retirement allowance payable to or on account of a person who retired for service or because of disability under the provisions of section 8.568 of the charter prior to July 1, 1975, "final compensation," for time commencing on July 1, 1975, shall mean the rate of remuneration (excluding remuneration for overtime) attached on July 1, 1975, to the rank or position upon which such person's retirement allowance was determined when first effective, provided, further, that each such allowance shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1976, and on July 1 of each succeeding year 1990, and thereafter on the effective date of any legislation fixing the rates of compensation for firefighters under section 8.405 of this charter by an amount equal to 50 percent of the rate of change in the salary attached to said rank multiplied by the allowance which was payable for the month immediately preceding such each July 1.
Retired City Employees Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION F
Shall the City increase the monthly retirement allowance of City workers who retired before July 1964 by $50, and of those who retired since then by a lesser amount, proportionate to the number of years the worker has been retired?  
YES 47  NO 48

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired City workers receive a pension based upon their salary at the time of retirement and the number of years worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment to give a monthly increase to all City workers who retired before July 2, 1988. Workers who retired before July 1964 would get an increase of $50 each month. Workers who retired since then would receive a smaller amount, depending on how long ago they retired.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want retired City employees to receive up to $50 more each month in pension payments.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want pension payments for retired City employees to stay the same.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2.5 million per year for the next nine years, until the year 2000, after which there would be no annual cost."

How Supervisors Voted on "F"
On July 24, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
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Retired City Employees Retirement Benefits

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

The retirement plan provisions of San Francisco currently allow an annual increase in benefits of 2% or less to retired "Miscellaneous" employees of the City and County of San Francisco. However, with continued inflation, these retired employees are falling further and further behind the real cost of living. Those employees who retired in 1964 today receive an average retirement benefit of $500.00 per month. This ballot measure will give these retirees a special one-time increase of $2.00 a month for each full year of retirement to a maximum of $50.00 a month. This modest amount will give them deserved help in their retirement years.

Please support them by voting YES on Proposition F.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will help our city retirees keep pace with inflation. It will give them a modest, though much-needed, boost in their pensions.

Proposition F is prudent and just. Please join me in voting YES on Proposition F.

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

The pensions of Miscellaneous (non Police and Fire) City employees who retired in 1964 are now 76% behind the rise in the Consumer Price Index. These retired City employees have not had a pension increase in two years. This amendment offers a modest monthly pension increase (only $2 a year) for employees who have retired within the past twenty-five years and has a cap of $50 a month.

The San Francisco Labor Council supports this overdue pension increase for Miscellaneous retired City employees.

Walter L. Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor Council

YES ON PROPOSITION F

Retired City employees paid into the Retirement Fund with assurance they would be protected in later years. The Retirement System does not FACTOR COST-OF-LIVING and continuing inflation puts many retirees at almost poverty level.

Return dignity to retirees by voting YES ON PROPOSITION F.

Bill Reed

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

Proposition F is a cost-of-living adjustment in retirement pensions of “miscellaneous” City Employees who retired years ago on pensions which proved inadequate in an inflated economy.

The term “Miscellaneous” applies to persons in various City Job Classifications.

Proposition F provides a retirement formula under which each monthly retirement allowance will include a $2.00 increase for each year in retirement with the maximum of $50.00 going to those who retired at least 25 years ago when salaries were lower. All other retirees will receive proportionately reduced benefits with those having one year in retirement receiving the $2.00 minimum.

Many retirees in the advanced group do not receive Social Security cash benefits.

As the life expectancy of retirees with the maximum benefits is very short (some are 77 to 96 years of age) the cost to the City will reduce rapidly since Proposition F applies to the presently retired. The total cost will be funded in 12 years.

Proposition F is endorsed by Civic Groups, Business and Labor Organizations and prominent Citizens. In fairness join them in VOTING YES ON NOVEMBER 7TH. Thank you.

Sponsored by the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F

Peter Economou, President
Tom McDonough, Chairman
John Simpson, Retirement Committee Chair

In cooperation with the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco and many public spirited organizations and citizens of San Francisco we urge the adoption of the Charter Amendment by the voters on Tuesday November 8, 1989 to provide that employees who retired prior to July 2, 1988 shall have their retirement allowances increased $2.00 per month for each year of credited retirement service in the retirement system, but not to exceed a maximum of $50. per month.

Pile Drivers, Divers, Carpenter, Bridge, Wharf & Dock Builders
Local #34

Ed Kelly, Financial Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Veteran Police Officer Association
Sol Weiner
BAC Local 19, Tile, Marble, Terrazzo, Shopmen Division
Ralph Gomez
Retired Firemen and Widows
Thomas F. McDonough

San Francisco Fire Fighters
James T. Ferguson
Sheet Metal Workers’ International Association Local Union 104
Robert Mammini, President/Business Manager
Tile Layers and Allied Crafts Union Local #19 Ca.
S.N. “Bud” Papadakis, Business Mgr, Secty-Treasurer
San Francisco City Employees Credit Union
Felton Williams, Chairman of the Board
Bernard Crotiny, President/CEO
San Francisco Police Officers Association
Mike Keys
United Public Employees Local 790 — SEIU
Steve Neuberger, Political Director
Carpenters Union Local 222
James O’Sullivan, Financial Secretary

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

As members of the Retirement Board, we are requested to administer retirement benefits for active and retired members of the Retirement System. We are especially conscious of the adverse effects of inflation on those persons who retired many years ago. Such persons are having an extremely difficult time handling the cumulative rise in the cost of everyday living.

In recent decades, all retirement plans have had a problem in protecting retirees from the pernicious effects of inflation. Some plans have funded COLAs, equal to or greater than the full change in the CPI; other plans, including the San Francisco Miscellaneous Plan, have not kept retirement allowances in pace with inflation, settling for only a fraction of what would be appropriate and fair.

Therefore, we urge the voters of San Francisco to vote “Yes” on Proposition “F”.

Bonnie K. Gibson, President
Samuel W. Walker, Vice President
Peter D. Ashe, Commissioner
William Breall, M.D., Commissioner
Maurice Mann, Commissioner
Bill Maher, Supervisor
Joseph D. Driscoll, Commissioner

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: The entire section is new.
8.539.2 Increasing Retirement Allowances of Miscellaneous Officers and Employees Retired prior to July 2, 1988.

Commencing on July 1, 1990, every retirement allowance payable by the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System, to or on account of any person who was retired prior to July 2, 1988 as a member of said system under sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.584, 8.586 or 8.588 of this charter, is hereby increased by the amount of $50.00 per month, provided such member had retired prior to July 2, 1964. If the member had retired after July 1, 1964, then said monthly increase shall be an amount which shall bear the same ratio to $50.00 that the number of years the member has been retired bears to twenty-five (25) years.

In computing years of retirement, the retirement system shall count completed fiscal years between the member's effective date of retirement and June 30, 1989.

This section does not give any member retired prior to July 1, 1990 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 July 1, 1990.
Prevailing Rates of Wages

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Charter be amended to reinstate the salary-setting process used by the City before two recent court decisions required the City to treat "flat rates" in the annual salary the same as "range rates" and to survey certain salary premiums instead of negotiating them?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Every year the City does a survey of salaries paid by public and private employers in the Bay Area. In the survey, the City often finds two different kinds of pay rates: "flat rates" and "range rates." A "flat rate" is a single rate of pay for all workers in a class. A "range rate" is an increasing rate of pay over time.

The salaries of most City workers are determined by applying a four-part formula to the pay rates found in the yearly surveys. The first three parts find the average of the pay rates for similar jobs. The fourth part sets a salary range starting 10 percent below and ending 10 percent above this average.

Until recently, the City treated "flat rates" and "range rates" differently. The City did not use the fourth part of the formula to increase or decrease surveyed "flat rates" by 10 percent because the City believed that this would have created a salary range which did not exist elsewhere. A recent court decision said that under the Charter as written, the City must treat "flat rates" and "range rates" the same.

On a separate point, the City traditionally has negotiated with City worker unions over wage "premiums" for special work, such as working at night. A second recent court case said that under the Charter as written, these premiums must be set by survey of premiums elsewhere, not negotiation.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the City would treat flat rates in the salary survey differently from range rates. Proposition G also would allow the City to negotiate certain premiums such as extra pay for working at night.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to treat flat rates in the salary survey differently from range rates. You also want to allow the City to negotiate certain premiums such as extra pay for working at night.

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

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However as a product of its future application it would reduce the cost of government by an indeterminate but probably substantial amount. Based on 1989-90 salary standardization data, the application of the provisions of this amendment would have reduced the cost of salary increases by approximately $8.1 million.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On July 31, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-1 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Wendy Nelder.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
This charter amendment would restore the way the City has set wages and benefits since 1976 and save the City nearly $10 million annually.

In 1976, San Francisco voters approved charter section 8.407, to ensure that wages of City employees are fair, but do not exceed the prevailing wages of workers performing similar work in the Bay area.

Two recent court cases have changed the way the City sets wages and benefits under section 8.407.

The Corrlea case changed how the City treats "flat rates" in its annual salary survey. A flat rate is a single hourly rate of pay for all workers in a class regardless of seniority. Formerly, in applying section 8.407's four-step formula, the City did not extend flat rates by 10%, because that would create an inflated pay rate for City workers. The court said that the City must add 10% to flat rates in the survey.

As a result, some classes of City workers are now earning more than any other public employees performing similar work. In some cases City workers are even making more than workers in the private sector.

These excessive salaries are exactly what section 8.407 was intended to prevent.

In a second lawsuit, a court interpreted section 8.407 as requiring that "premium" rates — pay for special tasks such as night work — be set by survey rather than by negotiation. Until now, these rates have been negotiated. Surveying these premiums would be extremely costly and impractical because information about premiums paid by other employers often is not available. This charter amendment would save these costs and allow the City to negotiate the kinds of premiums negotiated in the past.

Vote for Proposition G to restore salaries that are fair, but not excessive.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION G

Proposition "G" is misleading and would not save the taxpayers one cent.

Voters corrected the formula for city craft workers in 1976, offered by Quentin Kopp, which has been fair and upheld in several court cases. Now this mayor, who has the highest paid personal staff in the city's history, wants to change the formulas to lower wages for those workers who keep the infrastructure of San Francisco together.

This Charter amendment asks San Francisco citizens to reverse an established workable agreement, and by so doing create an unfair method of calculating wages. The craft workers agreed to a wage freeze in the 88-89 budget when the city was in need. The effect of this Charter amendment will be to freeze wages at least two more years. This money will not be a savings to the taxpayer, but spent elsewhere. Maybe for more $90,000 a year deputy mayors.

San Francisco Labor Council
Paul Dempster, President

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

John Barbegelata and Quentin Kopp were the author and sup-
porters of this charter section which was approved in 1976 by the
citizens of San Francisco. Don’t change it now.

VOTE No on G

Apparently the present Mayor and Board of Supervisors still
don’t understand what section 8.407 of the Charter says. Based on
their argument they omit that 8.407 says to reduce by 10% as well
as to extend by 10%.

VOTE No on G

The official argument for “G” by the Mayor and Board shows
that they don’t understand section 8.407. It is the intent of 8.407
that City employees only be paid the average wage in the Bay Area
even though the cost of living in San Francisco is higher. City
employees have one of the worst benefit plans in the whole state.
Don’t penalize these employees any further.

VOTE No on G

San Francisco Labor Council
Laborers’ Local 261
San Francisco Building Trades

VOTE NO ON G! This Proposition is an ill conceived method
by which city employees wages are calculated. In November 1976
the voters passed proposition D. This proposition, which became
part of the City Charter, mandated that city employees be paid the
average compensation for like work in similar job categories in the
Bay Area. This compensation was to be determined by conducting
a survey of employers in both the public and private sectors. The
responsibility for the conduct of this survey was entrusted to City
Staff. It turned out that City Staff was not complying with the
formula for certain classifications in their calculations. These class-
cifications included skilled occupations such as Carpenter,
Plumber, Electrician, Painter and Laborer. When union representa-
tives requested that these errors be remedied, City Staff refused to
do so. Faced with an intransigent refusal to comply with the City
Charter in the area of Employee Relations, the Unions were forced
to enter into a law suit in Superior Court to force compliance with
the City Charter. After a three year lawsuit, the Courts found in
favor of the employees and ordered compliance with the formulas.

In what can only be construed as a further disregard for good faith
employee relations, City Staff has convinced City officials to place
this amendment on the ballot. We urge you, the voters to repudiate
this misadventure in employee relations. VOTE NO ON PROPO-
SITION G!

Laborers 261
San Francisco Building Trades
Jerry Tillon
Bob McDonnell

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

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

8.407 Definition of Generally Prevailing Rates of Wages
Notwithstanding any provision of section 8.401 or any provision of any other section of this charter to the contrary, generally prevailing rates of salaries and wages for those employees covered by section 8.401 of the charter shall be determined by the civil service commission as set forth below.

The civil service commission shall conduct a comprehensive investigation and survey of basic pay rates and wages and salaries in other governmental jurisdictions and private employment for like work and like service, based upon job classifications as provided in section 3.661 of this charter and shall make its findings, based on facts and data collected, as to what are the generally prevailing basic pay rates for each benchmark class of employment solely in the manner hereinafter provided. A benchmark class is defined as a “key class” within an occupational grouping selected as the class for which a representative sample of data will be collected.

Basic pay rate data for public and private employment shall be collected solely from the Bay Area counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, San Francisco and Santa Clara; provided, however, that for any benchmark class of employment for which the civil service commission determines there is insufficient data from Bay Area public jurisdictions the commission shall survey major public agencies in the state employing such class, major public agencies to be defined as those employing more than 3,000 persons.

The commission shall collect basic pay rate data for like work and like service from Bay Area public jurisdictions as follows:

(a) The counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara.

(b) The ten most populous cities in these five Bay Area counties based on the latest federal decennial census.

(c) Agencies of the state and federal governments and from school districts and other special districts in the six Bay Area counties as determined by the civil service commission. The commission shall collect private basic pay rate data from recognized governmental Bay Area salary and wage surveys of private employers in the City and County of San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The data collected shall be limited to rates of pay and salaries actually being paid by private employers for like work and like service.

The term “prevailing rates of wages” for employees governed by charter section 8.401 and this section shall be defined as the rate ranges developed from the weighted average of the midpoint of the basic pay rates, excluding fringe benefits, for surveyed public employment and the median of the pay rates for private employment, to be determined as follows:

1. multiply the medians from the private and midpoints from public employments data base by the number of employees in the given classification from each data base;
2. add the products of (1);
3. divide the sums in (2) by the total number of employees surveyed for that classification; and
4. extend this figure by 10 percent to establish the maximum of the range rates and reduce this figure by 10 percent to establish the minimum. The medians and midpoints of surveyed flat rates shall not be extended or reduced.

When fixing rates of compensation the board of supervisors shall fix basic pay rates as close as reasonably possible to prevailing rates, provided, however, that the board of supervisors shall not set the maximum rate of pay for any class in excess of the maximum prevailing rate for that class; provided further, however, that no employee shall have his basic pay rate reduced to conform to prevailing rates except as provided for in section 8.406. For those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the schedules of compensation shall provide for a minima, not less than three intermediate, and maxima salary steps and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from minimum to intermediate to maximum with due regard for seniority of service.

The term “basic pay rate” as used in this section is hereby defined as applying only to the basic rate of wages, with included range scales, and does not include any other benefits of employment, including, but not limited to, fringe benefits, premiums, differentials, overtime, or working condition benefits.

It is the declared intent of the qualified electors of the city and county that the board of supervisors has no power to provide any benefits of employment except those already provided for in the charter and any addition, deletion or modification of benefits of employment shall be submitted, as a charter amendment, to the qualified electors of the city and county. The qualified electors expressly state that they understand that benefits of employment are sometimes referred to as “fringe benefits” of employment and the qualified electors expressly reserve the right to either grant or deny such benefits except those conditions of employment commonly referred to as "working conditions" and such premiums and differentials as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance. Any reference to "working conditions" shall mean those compensations which must necessarily be provided in order for the employee to perform his job description duties efficiently and safely, and shall include but not be limited to such working conditions and benefits as are typically included in the administrative provisions of the salary standardization ordinance and the salary ordinance.

The board of supervisors, in its discretion, may provide working condition benefits for employees covered under this section and Section 8.401 of this charter only in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) The civil service commission must determine, certify and recommend to the board of supervisors that the working condition benefit is equitable or necessary for the efficient and safe performance of the employee's duties as enumerated in his job description.

(b) The working condition benefit, as recommended by the civil service commission, is substantially comparable for like work and like service to that provided for the job classification and is provided to not less than 50 percent of the employees of the class in jurisdictions covered by the salary survey.
Sick Leave Transfer for Catastrophic Illness

PROPOSITION H
Shall City employees be allowed to transfer their unused accumulated sick leave to another City employee who has been determined to be catastrophically ill and who has used all of his or her vacation allowance, sick leave and compensatory time off?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee may not transfer unused sick leave to another City employee.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would allow a City employee to give unused sick leave to another City employee who is seriously ill and who has no more vacation, sick leave or time off earned for working overtime. The Board of Supervisors would adopt rules for transferring sick leave to other employees after receiving recommendations from the Health Commission, Civil Service Commission and Retirement Board,

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow a City employee to give unused sick leave to another City employee who is seriously ill and who has no more vacation, sick leave or time off earned for working overtime.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow a City employee to give unused sick leave to another City employee.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending development of specific terms and conditions by the Civil Service Commission and approval by the Board of Supervisors, cannot be determined, but may be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On July 24, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Thomas Hsieh

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
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Sick Leave Transfer for Catastrophic Illness

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This amendment offers hope and comfort for city employees facing catastrophic illness.

What could be more devastating than to suffer from a life threatening malady. To experience great physical and emotional pain each day, and to worry endlessly about medical bills, rent payments, and survival.

Imagine how frightening it must be for some people to wage this painful battle alone without friends or family support.

And yet this is the reality experienced by many San Franciscans, including some of our most dedicated city workers. The human suffering comes from a catalog of horrible medical afflictions — AIDS, Alzheimer's, cancer, and organ diseases.

Proposition H permits city employees to transfer unused sick leave time to co-workers diagnosed with catastrophic illnesses. Employees’ vested and unvested sick time are covered by the amendment. Vested benefits are already fixed costs to the city. Unvested sick time, however, may be an additional cost whenever it is used by the employee. But that cost can be offset by savings in social services, housing subsidies, and health care services.

In short, this amendment gives workers the freedom to choose how to make use of sick time earned. They may use it personally, transfer some or all to a catastrophically-ill co-worker, or lose it.

California’s Lottery Commission has a similar program in place for its employees. The plan has won much deserved praise from management, employees, and the public. Those employees who have participated in the program express considerable pride and satisfaction with being able to help out a fellow worker in crisis.

Help us to offer the same choices to our employees. Help us to extend compassion and hope to those city workers who struggle daily to stay alive.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Granted, the Supervisors are full of the best of intentions in drafting Proposition H.

Granted, it is devastating to suffer from a life-threatening illness. That does NOT mean we should sanction the dishonest practice of “transferring” sick leave from a city worker who is well to one who is not — especially when it could cost taxpayers AN ADDITIONAL $5 MILLION A YEAR, OR MAYBE MUCH, MUCH MORE!

In their zeal to do good deeds, (with the taxpayer’s money!), the Supervisors are playing a little fast and loose with the facts.

Their argument states that the huge annual costs of Proposition H “can be offset by savings in social services, housing subsidies, and health care services.” If these social services are already taking care of the “catastrophically ill”, we obviously don’t need Proposition H. If these services are inadequate, then Proposition H will cost the taxpayers additional millions. THE SUPERVISORS CAN’T HAVE IT BOTH WAYS!

The Supervisors also claim that “California’s Lottery Commission has a similar program in place for its employees”. THAT’S JUST NOT TRUE! The Lottery’s plan allows employees to transfer VACATION TIME, not sick leave. It’s one thing for a compassionate employee to forgo some vacation time to benefit a co-worker. It’s another thing altogether to transfer sick leave, which doesn’t belong to EITHER employee in the first place.

VOTE NO ON H! THIS IS SIMPLY AN UNWARRANTED GIFT OF PUBLIC FUNDS!

W.F. O’Keefe, Sr.
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

It took years of struggle to halt the spurious practice of city employees cashing in their unused sick leave upon retirement. Those payments used to cost the city untold millions. Besides, you shouldn’t be paid sick leave when you haven’t been sick!

Proposition H is a return to the bad old days of misusing sick leave and EXORBITANT city costs.

Everyone sympathizes with the plight of people suffering horrible illnesses. But many a bum idea has been motivated by good intentions.

Prop H would let city employees “transfer” their unused sick leave to a fellow employee with a “catastrophic” illness. First, Prop H never defines “catastrophic” illness. In fact, we have NO IDEA how many city workers might qualify for this new give-away. Second, and even more important, unused sick leave is not something a city employee has the RIGHT to transfer. It doesn’t BELONG to the employee in the first place.

Prop H is like the con man selling the Brooklyn Bridge to every rube he meets. You can’t give away what isn’t yours to start with!

The supervisors’ budget analyst says Prop H could cost over $5 MILLION A YEAR. Then again, it could cost much MORE than that. The scary thing is NO ONE KNOWS HOW MUCH PROP H MIGHT COST THE TAXPAYER!

Proposition H even opens up the possibility for corruption and collusion among city employees in “transferring” unused sick leave. Once sick leave can be “transferred” among employees, it becomes valuable. There might even be a black market in sick leave!

Compassion says you should consider Prop H. Common sense says you should reject it. VOTE NO ON H!

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

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is a straightforward measure that benefits only city employees diagnosed with a catastrophic illness.

It permits city employees to voluntarily transfer any unused sick time EARNED by them to a co-worker who suffers from a life-threatening illness.

There is NO cost to the City for employees who transfer their vested sick time. These are guaranteed benefits.

The transfer of unvested sick time may be a cost to the city. However, these costs may be offset by savings in social services, housing subsidies, transportation subsidies, and health care services.

California’s Lottery Commission currently has a similar program. It is workable and effective.

Vote Yes on Proposition H. It’s humane and good government.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

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

PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This and Prop. I mean essentially no cost to the city, since the workers have already earned the donated time. There’s a marginal cost, in that some of the workers might otherwise not use the time — but they’ve earned it; it’s rightfully theirs to give.

Grassroots

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

All of us have compassion for those who are catastrophically ill. But the passage of this proposition could drain the city’s treasury beyond control. The city’s budget analyst estimated if each city employee transfers one day of unused sick leave, it will cost the city four million dollars. Sick leave is not a vested benefit. When a city employee leaves or retires, his or her unused sick leave also becomes voided. I urge you to vote “NO” on Prop. H.

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

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

Section 8.364 AUTHORIZATION TO TRANSFER UNUSED SICK LEAVE

(a) Employees of the City and County of San Francisco may individually transfer their unused accumulated sick leave to another individual employee of the City and County of San Francisco who has been determined to be catastrophically ill, and who has exhausted her or his vacation allowance, sick leave and compensatory time off, provided that such determination and such transfer may be made only in compliance with the terms and conditions established by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors.

(b) Notwithstanding Sections 8.360 and 8.363 of this charter, within sixty (60) days of the effective date of this section, the Health Commission, Civil Service Commission, and Retirement Board shall conduct a joint hearing to consider and develop recommendations for submission to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors shall adopt an ordinance, as provided in subsection (a), and establish any rules necessary to administer, interpret, and regulate the provisions of this section, provided that all such rules shall be approved, amended, or rejected by resolution by the Board of Supervisors.
Vacation Credit Transfer for Catastrophic Illness

PROPOSITION I
Shall City employees be allowed to transfer their vested vacation credits to another City employee who has been determined to be catastrophically ill and who has used all of his or her vacation allowance, sick leave and compensatory time off?

YES 56  NO 57

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: A City employee may not give their earned vacation time to another City employee.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow a City employee to give earned vacation time to another City employee who is seriously ill and who has no more vacation, sick leave or time off earned for working overtime. The Board of Supervisors would adopt rules for transferring earned vacation time.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow a City employee to transfer earned vacation time to another City employee who is seriously ill and who has no more vacation, sick leave or time off earned for working overtime.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow a City employee to transfer earned vacation time to another City employee.

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, there could be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which, pending development of specific terms and conditions by the Board of Supervisors, cannot be determined, but should not be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”
On July 24, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Official Argument in Favor of Proposition I

This is a companion amendment to Proposition H. It permits city employees to transfer their unused vacation time to a co-worker who suffers from a catastrophic illness.

Because vacation time is a vested benefit, the cost to the City for carrying out Proposition I is minimal. Indeed, there may be a savings to the City in other areas, such as fewer costs for social services, housing subsidies, transportation subsidies, and medical support.

The San Francisco Health Commission will develop a definition of a catastrophic illness, and may include such maladies as AIDS, Alzheimers, cancer, and others. Transfer of vacation time may be made only in compliance with the terms and conditions established by the Board of Supervisors.

The transfer of vacation time becomes a gift from one City employee to a co-worker who faces a life threatening illness. It offers a measure of support and comfort to someone confronting bleak medical facts by helping to ease their financial burden and worries.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

Paid Argument in Favor of Proposition I

Props. H and I are *fiscally-conservative liberalism* — Hongisto’s specialty.

You can’t match his “progressive” credentials — who else has a proposition that actually *does something* for people with AIDS?

Yet it was “fiscally-conservative” Hongisto whose initiative stopped the Embarcadero Freeway demolition boondoggle.

And he’s led the opposition to the downtown stadium boondoggle; he’d rather the land and tax money be used toward our city’s many unmet necessities that other liberals just talk about.

Yes on H and I — the Hongisto Initiatives.

Grassroots

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I

Text of Proposed Charter Amendment

PROPOSITION I

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

Section 8.441 AUTHORIZATION TO TRANSFER VACATION CREDITS

(a) Employees of the City and County of San Francisco may individually transfer their vested vacation allowance credits to another individual employee of the City and County of San Francisco who has been determined to be catastrophically ill by the employee’s head of department, in accord with the definition of catastrophic illness to be provided by the Health Commission, and who has exhausted her or his vacation allowance, sick leave and compensatory time off, provided that such transfer may be made only in compliance with the terms and conditions established by the board of supervisors.

(b) The board of supervisors is hereby empowered to enact any and all ordinances necessary to administer, interpret and regulate the provisions of this section.

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

Shall the Controller be authorized to determine how often to conduct certain audits and issue certain reports about City funds, rather than being required to conduct such audits and issue such reports at specified periods, and shall the Controller be authorized to audit and review all City department records to evaluate effectiveness and efficiency?

YES 59
NO 60

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Controller is the City's auditor and chief accounting officer. Among other duties, the Charter requires the Controller to:

1. Prepare reports summarizing the state of each of the City's various funds every three months.
2. Audit all the money received by the City Treasurer every month.
3. Audit the revolving funds of the City departments every month.
4. Audit the records of all City departments and officers.
5. Audit the accounts of a department whenever the person responsible for the department's funds leaves office.
6. Decide how much of its budget each department may spend each month or quarter, and this must be done every three months.
7. Write on every City check both the title and number of the fund against which the check is drawn.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment that would change some of the Controller's duties and powers.

1. The Controller would issue reports for each of the City's various funds as often as the Controller thinks necessary, but at least covering the first six- and eight-month periods of each fiscal year.
2. State law would determine how often the Controller audits the money received by the Treasurer.
3. The Controller would audit City department revolving funds as often as the Controller thinks necessary.
4. The Controller could audit and review the records of all City departments and officers to evaluate effectiveness and efficiency.
5. The Controller would no longer be required to audit the accounts of a department when the person responsible for the department's accounts leaves office, but could do so if he or she thinks necessary or if asked.
6. The Controller would decide how much of its budget each department may spend each month or quarter. The Controller would decide how often to do this.
7. It would no longer be necessary for every City check to contain the title and number of the fund against which the check is drawn.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes in the Controller's duties and powers.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to change the duties and powers of the Controller.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On July 24, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Wendy Nelder.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Vote YES on Proposition J!
Current provisions of the charter establish detailed schedules for the submission of various reports by the Controller and specify very rigid reporting requirements. Often these reports are not timely in relation to the City’s budget process nor is the information totally useful for making financial management decisions. The Controller needs the flexibility provided by this Charter amendment to allow him/her to prepare timely, meaningful reports for the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

Vote YES on Proposition J!
Although the Controller has the power to audit the accounts of all officers and employees of the City and County, there has been no specific charge for the Controller to consider effectiveness and efficiency. This amendment corrects that omission by giving the Controller specific authority to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of all boards, commissions, officers and departments and their operations and functions.

Vote YES on Proposition J!
As chief accounting officer of the city and county, the Controller exercises supervision over the accounts of all officers, commissions, boards and employees of the city and county. This amendment provides needed flexibility in the reporting and auditing powers and duties of the Controller so that he/she may continue to provide timely and meaningful financial reports to city managers, policy makers, the public and the investment community.

Vote YES on Proposition J!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Is it reform to repeal San Francisco’s $500 limit on campaign contributions? Or to permit Supervisors to collect $5,000 each from special interest PAC’s?

Is it reform to eliminate monthly audits of City Departments? Or to permit patronage hiring at MUNI?

Is it reform to give Supervisors a 70% pay raise without requiring them to work fulltime? And to let Supervisors work less at the same time?

DON’T BE SWINDLED!
The Supervisors are trying to con us into letting them have a 70% pay raise, $5000 contributions, less work, no monthly audits of City Departments, and patronage hiring at MUNI.

THAT’S WHY THEY’RE SUPPORTING “D,” “J,” “M,” “N,” AND “O”!
WHAT ARE THEY AFRAID OF?
That monthly audits may reveal more “Metergates,” more inci-

dents of money being “lost” at City Hall, more mismanagement of City Government?

That voters might find out they plan to do less work at 70% more salary?

That without $5000 contributions they might go the way of the Polish Communist Party? They might even lose an election?

Is that why they found a legal loophole to get “T”—two-term limit on Supervisors—thrown off the ballot?
SEND CITY HALL A MESSAGE!
Vote “NO” on special interest measures “D,” “J,” “M,” “N,” AND “O”!

Committee To Prevent Misappropriation Of Public Funds
Thomas Spinosa, Republican Leader
Alexa Smith, Democratic Committee Member
Arla Hale Smith, BART Director
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

NO MORE METERGATES!
Proposition "J" would eliminate our Charter’s requirement that the City Controller do monthly audits of the revolving accounts of all City Departments.
Experience shows San Francisco needs the protection of monthly audits.
During the past decade or so, citizens have learned that:
Millions of dollars in parking meter revenues had been stolen from City coffers.
The San Francisco Housing Authority “lost” about $1 million.
The Supervisors have given use of a $9 million City street to wealthy contributors free of charge.
 Doesn’t it seem stupid to eliminate monthly audits in the wake of mismanagement and corruption at City Hall?
"J" PUSHED BY SAME SUPERVISORS WHO WANT 70% PAY RAISE AND $5000 SPECIAL INTEREST CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS
But who’s surprised?
"J" was put on the ballot by:
The same Supervisors who raised sewer charges and parking fines sky-high.
The same Supervisors who gave use of a $9 million City street away to wealthy contributors for free.
The same Supervisors who imposed a $200 fee on small businesses.
The same Supervisors sponsoring Proposition “D” — which raises Supervisors' pay 70% to $41,122 and guarantees Supervisors future pay increases without voter approval.
The same Supervisors pushing Proposition “O” — which allows them to accept special interest PAC contributions of up to $5000.
The same Supervisors fighting Proposition “T” — two-term limit on Supervisors — tooth and nail.
Say "NO" TO SPECIAL INTEREST GOVERNMENT!
Vote “NO” on "J". Also be sure to vote “NO” on "D" and "O" and “YES” on "T".
Committee To Prevent Misappropriation of Public Funds

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Proposition J allows the Controller to
• implement legislation sponsored by Supervisor Kennedy that establishes a Performance and Efficiency Audit Office to evaluate and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of all city department operations
• provide city policy makers with more meaningful financial reports
• direct efforts towards analyzing financial problems; not simply reporting fund balances
• audit the accounts of the Treasurer as specified in State Law
• determine how often minor department revolving funds (petty cash funds) need to be post-audited. The Controller currently reviews and will continue to review every revolving fund expenditure. This practice is not changed by Proposition J.
Proposition J is a “good government” measure which adjusts some very detailed Charter provisions written in 1931 to allow the Controller flexibility to provide the City with improved auditing, financial analysis and reporting.
Better financial reporting benefits city managers, policy makers, the investment community and the public.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Controller Duties

PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Union officers representing accountants and auditors employed by the City and County we urge you vote yes on Proposition J. Too much of our time is spent producing unnecessary reports because of outdated Charter restrictions. This amendment would allow us to make better use of our skills and would provide more efficient and economical services to the City. We urge you to vote yes on J.

David Chan, President
Accountants and Auditors Chapter
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21
(San Francisco Unified School District)

Susan Maher, Executive Board
Accountants and Auditors Chapter
Professional and Technical Engineers, Local 21
(Controller's Audits Division)

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition J

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

3.302 Controller’s Reports

The controller shall annually make a complete financial report which shall be audited and distributed as provided in Section 3.303 of this charter. The controller shall also make a quarterly report not later than the 25th day of the month succeeding the last preceding quarter, showing a summary statement of revenues and expenditures for the preceding quarter and for that portion of the fiscal year ending on the last day of such preceding quarter. Such statements shall include all general and funding accounts and shall be detailed as to assets, liabilities, income, expenditures, appropriations and funds, in such manner as to show the financial condition of the city and county of each department, office, bureau or division thereof, for that portion of the fiscal year to and including the preceding quarter, and with comparative figures for the similar period in the preceding fiscal year. The controller shall at the same time prepare statements showing at the end of each quarter the cash position of the city and county (and the unencumbered balance in each fund). He shall also prepare quarterly for each of the several funds a summary of the resources available and estimated to be collectible, obligations authorized and estimated to be expendable, and surplus in such a manner as to show the estimated cash position of each fund at the end of the fiscal year. The controller shall periodically make such reports as may be necessary to show the actual or projected financial conditions of the city and county of each department, office, bureau or division thereof. Further provided that the controller shall prepare such reports for at least the first six and eight month periods of each fiscal year. He shall also prepare monthly and transmit to all department heads concerned, reports showing the allowances, expenditures, encumbrances and unencumbered balances of each revenue and expenditure appropriation. A copy of each such quarterly report and special fiscal reports as requested, shall be transmitted to the mayor, the board of supervisors, the chief administrative officer, and kept on file in the controller’s office.

3.303 Audits

The controller shall audit the accounts of all boards, officers and employees of the city and county charged in any manner with the custody, collection, or disbursement of funds. The controller shall audit monthly all accounts of money coming into the hands of the treasurer. He shall make an audit-monthly of each departmental revolving fund authorized by this charter or by the board of supervisors, the frequency of which shall be governed by state law. The controller shall have the authority to audit the operations of all boards, commissions, officers and departments to evaluate their effectiveness and efficiency. The controller shall have access to, and authority to examine all documents, records, books and other property of any board, commission, officer or department.

When requested by the mayor, the board of supervisors, the chief administrative officer, or any board or commission for its own department, he shall audit the accounts of any officer or department and on the death, resignation, removal, expiration of term or retirement of the head of any department or office, or any officer or employee charged with the receipt, collection or disbursement of money, he shall make an audit of the accounts of such department, officer or employee.

6.301 Allotments

The several items of expenditure appropriated in each annual appropriation ordinance, being based on estimated receipts, income or revenues which may not be fully realized, it shall be incumbent upon the controller to establish a schedule of allotments, monthly or quarterly as he may determine, under which the sums appropriated to the several departments shall be expended. The controller shall revise such revenue estimates monthly periodically. If such revised estimates indicate a shortage the controller shall hold in reserve an equivalent amount of the corresponding expenditure appropriations set forth in any said annual appropriation ordinance until the collection of the amount as originally estimated is assured; and, in all cases where it is provided by this charter that a specified or minimum tax shall be levied for any department, the amount of the appropriation in any annual appropriation ordinance derived from taxes shall not exceed the amount actually produced by the levy made for said department. The controller in issuing warrants or in certifying contract or purchase orders or other encumbrances, pursuant to Section 6.302 of this charter, shall consider only the allotted portions of appropriation items to be available for encumbrance or expenditure and shall not approve the incurring of liability under any allotment in excess of the amount of such allotment. In case of emergency or unusual circumstances which could not be anticipated at the time of appointment, an additional allotment for a period may be made on the recommendations of the department head and that of the chief administrative officer, board or commission and the approval of the controller. After the allotment schedule has been established or fixed, as herebefore provided, it shall be unlawful for any department or officer to expend or cause to be expended a sum greater than the amount set forth for the particular activity in the said allotment schedule so established unless an additional allotment is made, as herein provided.

6.302 Encumbrances

Accounts shall be kept by the controller showing the amount of each class of item of revenue as estimated and appropriated in the annual appropriation ordinance, and the amount collected. Accounts shall also be kept by the controller of each expense appropriation item by the board of supervisors. Every warrant on the treasury shall state specifically by title and number the appropriation item against which such warrant is drawn.

Each such revenue and expense account shall show in detail the amount of the appropriation or appropriations made therefore by the supervisors, the amount drawn thereon, the amount of encumbrance for purchase orders, contracts or other obligations theretofore certified by the controller as against it, and the unencumbered balance to the credit thereof. This balance shall be the "unencumbered balance" as this term is used in this charter.

No obligation involving the expenditure of money shall be incurred or authorized by any officer, employee, board or commission of the city and county unless the controller first certifies that there is a valid appropriation from which the expenditure may be made, and that sufficient unencumbered funds are available in the treasury to the credit of such appropriation to pay the amount of such expenditure when it becomes due and payable. Each such certification shall be immediately recorded by the controller.

Each sum so recorded shall be an encumbrance for the purpose certified until such obligation is fulfilled, cancelled or discharged, or until the ordinance or resolution is repealed by the board of supervisors.

6.305 Revolving Funds

The board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the mayor, in any proposed annual budget, may, in the approval of such budget and the annual appropriation ordinance therefore, establish departmental revolving funds to be used as petty cash funds for specific purposes and to be subject to settlement with and audit by the controller at least monthly, as provided in Section 3.303. The mayor shall recommend and the supervisors shall establish revolving funds to be used as petty cash funds for specific purposes and to be subject to settlement with and audit by the controller at least monthly, as provided in Section 3.303. The mayor shall recommend and the supervisors shall establish revolving funds designated in this charter as the special election fund and the purchaser’s revolving fund, and they shall respectively recommend and establish such revolving funds as may be necessary to facilitate the operation of each utility and institution of the city and county.


City Attorney shall send a copy of said request to the District Attorney upon its receipt.

(d) The City Attorney shall within nine days from the date of the receipt of said written request send a copy of his or her proposed opinion to the District Attorney. The District Attorney shall within four days inform the City Attorney whether he or she agrees with said advice, or state the basis for his or her disagreement with the proposed advice.

(e) No person other than the City Attorney who acts in good faith on the advice of the City Attorney shall be subject to criminal or civil penalties for so acting; provided that, the material facts are stated in the request for advice and the acts complained of were committed either in reliance on the advice or because of the failure of the City Attorney to provide advice within 14 days of the request or such later extended time. (Amended by Ord. 361-80, App. 8/5/80)

SEC. 16.515. PENALTIES. (a) Any person who knowingly or willfully violates any provision of this Article shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment in the County jail for a period of not more than six months or by both such fine and imprisonment; provided, however, that any willful or knowing failure to report contributions done with intent to mislead or deceive or any willful or knowing violation of the provisions of Section 16.508 or Section 16.509 of this Article shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $500 or three times the amount not reported or the amount received in excess of the amount allowable pursuant to Section 16.508 or Section 16.509 of this Article, whichever is greater.

(b) Any person who intentionally or negligently violates any of the reporting requirements or contribution limitations set forth in this Article shall be liable in a civil action brought by the civil prosecutor for an amount up to $500 or three times the amount not reported or the amount received in excess of the amount allowable pursuant to Section 16.508 or Section 16.509, whichever is greater. (Amended by Ord. 361-80, App. 8/5/80)

SEC. 16.516. EFFECT OF VIOLATION ON OUTCOME OF ELECTION. If a candidate is convicted of a violation of this Article at any time prior to his or her election or his or her candidacy shall be terminated immediately and he or she shall be no longer eligible for election, unless the court at the time of sentencing specifically determines that this provision shall not be applicable.

No person convicted of a misdemeanor under this Article after his or her election shall be a candidate for any other City and County office for a period of five years following the date of the conviction unless the court shall at the time of sentencing specifically determine that this provision shall not be applicable.

A plea of nolo contendere shall be deemed a conviction for purposes of this Section. (Amended by Ord. 361-80, App. 8/5/80)

SEC. 16.517. EFFECT OF VIOLATION ON CERTIFICATION OF ELECTION RESULTS. The Registrar of Voters shall not issue any certificate of nomination or election to any candidate until his or her campaign statements required in Section 16.504 have been filed. (Amended by Ord. 114-76, App. 4/2/76)

SEC. 16.518. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION. This Article shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes. No error, irregularity, informality, neglect or omission of any officer in any procedure taken under this Article which does not directly affect the jurisdiction of the Board of Supervisors or the City and County to control campaign contributions shall affect the void of this Article. (Amended by Ord. 114-76, App. 4/2/76)

SEC. 16.519. SEVERABILITY. If any provision of this Article, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the article and the applicability of such provisions to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby. (Amended by Ord. 114-76, App. 4/2/76)
PROPOSITION K

Shall security officers now employed by certain City departments be transferred to the Sheriff, who would provide security to those departments, shall the date that the Board of Supervisors must approve deputy sheriff salaries be changed from April 1 to August 25, and shall the Charter specify duties to be performed by the Sheriff?

YES 62  
NO 63  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Sheriff's duties are set out in state law. Many city departments and agencies employ their own security officers who are under the supervision of these departments. The Board of Supervisors must approve pay raises for most City workers, including Sheriff Department employees, no later than April 1 of each year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K is a Charter amendment. It would specify the duties of the Sheriff, including operating the County Jail, providing security to and serving the warrants of the courts, and training and maintaining deputy sheriffs to provide public protection during riots and emergencies. These duties of the Sheriff could not replace or conflict with the duties and powers of the Police Department.

Proposition K also would require the Sheriff to provide security to a number of City departments that now employ their own security officers. Under the Proposition, these security officers would work for and be supervised by the Sheriff. If qualified, they would become deputy sheriffs; those who are not would serve in a special classification and would have limited law-enforcement powers. Employees transferred to the Sheriff would continue to provide security to their current departments unless they asked for a change or were promoted.

Proposition K would change, from April 1 to August 25, the date the Board of Supervisors must approve pay raises for deputy sheriffs and all other security officers working for the Sheriff.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the duties of the Sheriff to be specified in the Charter. You want security officers under City departments to be transferred to the Sheriff, who would be required to provide security for those departments. You want to change, from April 1 to August 25, the date the Board of Supervisors must approve pay raises for deputy sheriffs and all other security officers working for the Sheriff.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want security officers to remain under the City departments for whom they now work. You do not want to change the date by which the Board of Supervisors must approve pay raises for deputy sheriffs.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it could increase the cost of government by approximately $73,000 in 1990-91, possibly increasing to as much as $700,000 in fiscal 1992-93, depending upon actuarial assumptions of the State of California."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 31, the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


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

Proposition K means more peace officers more efficiently managed. We urge a YES vote on Proposition K for a safer San Francisco.

Proposition K will:
- Provide additional training to the City's security forces AT NO COST TO THE CITY.
- Improve law enforcement recruitment, training, retention and procurement practices.
- Create a wider range of public safety services.
- Make substantially better use of your tax dollars.

Proposition K consolidates over 100 miscellaneous security positions under the Sheriff, and upgrades them to fully empowered, fully trained peace officers so that while they carry out their current duties they can also fight crimes and protect lives and property.

- Currently, the City employs these security personnel to protect City parks, hospitals and other facilities, but they lack the training and management to serve as an effective anti-crime force.
- Proposition K authorizes the City to send these security personnel to a State of California certified Peace Officer Standards and Training Academy, at no cost to the City. After receiving full Academy training, the guards would join the Sheriff's Department as full-fledged peace officers with the authority and training to fight crime and protect lives.

We strongly urge you to vote YES on Proposition K for a safer, more efficient San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

No Rebuttal Was Submitted On The Official Argument in Favor of Proposition K

Remember to VOTE on Election Day, Tuesday November 7, 1989.
Your polling place is open from 7:00 in the morning to 8:00 in the evening.

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

Existing provisions of the City Charter provide for the general law enforcement authority of the Chief of Police. Passage of this Charter amendment would significantly erode the Police Department's ability to deliver law enforcement services by fractionalizing public parks, buildings, and city-owned property into a series of jurisdictional territories under general supervision of the Sheriff. The Sheriff’s Department would have primary law enforcement authority within these territories while police officers would be able to enter the territory only upon need. Crime prevention patrols by police units would no longer be available in areas under primary jurisdiction of the Sheriff.

As proposed, the costs of training, certification, equipment, salaries, pensions and disability pensions would sharply escalate for decades to come. Conflicts between department heads and security personnel controlled by the Sheriff will inevitably impact service to the public.

Mayor Art Agnos joins me in strongly opposing this measure as it will result in uncertainty and confusion in the minds of citizens as to whom to call in various areas of the City where there is a need for law enforcement response.

For this reason and others such as higher costs and bureaucratic duplication, Mayor Agnos opposes this Charter amendment.

Mayor Agnos is concerned that this measure did not originate with any City department, nor did City department heads affected by this measure participate in the development of the measure. It was sponsored by the Deputy Sheriff's Association in order to expand their membership.

The creation of mini-jurisdictions with the duplication of resources, costs and the resultant bureaucracies created will be detrimental to public safety services which are now delivered in a unified and professional manner.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Frank M. Jordan
Chief of Police

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K means more law enforcement officers in San Francisco with the professional training and supervision to fight crime.

Proposition K was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because it will help the City's law enforcement agencies protect lives and property. The argument submitted against Proposition K severely misinterprets the goals and effects of Proposition K.

• Proposition K plainly states that "Nothing herein shall interfere with or supplant the duties and powers of the police department."

• Proposition K will reduce bureaucracy by consolidating management of non-police department security personnel at the libraries, parks, hospitals and other City buildings under the Sheriff, an elected law enforcement professional.

• Proposition K will help avoid jurisdictional disputes by stating plainly the duties and powers of the Sheriff's Department.

• Proposition K will provide professional training for security personnel at no cost to the City.

Proposition K will benefit all San Franciscans. We strongly urge you to vote YES on PROPOSITION K for a safer San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Sheriff Duties

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

San Francisco's libraries are a treasure, but we need your help to keep them safe.
Proposition K means a better trained, more efficiently managed security force for our libraries.
I ask all San Franciscans to vote YES on Proposition K.

---

As security officers who patrol the City's Parks, we know both how beautiful, and how potentially dangerous, our parks can be.
WE NEED YOUR HELP TO KEEP OUR CITY'S PARKS SAFE.
Right now none of the security officers in the parks have the legal peace officer authority to make arrests, or to intervene when we see a crime in progress. Our instructions when we see a crime are to "observe and report."
Proposition K would give professional training at the Peace Officers Academy, and after that the authority to make peace officer arrests and to intervene to keep citizens safe.
Please help us keep the parks safe. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION K.

SAN FRANCISCO PARK PATROL OFFICERS
Harold E. Walther, Jr.
Cheng M. Yu

---

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition K, the law enforcement consolidation amendment.
Proposition K will bring into the Sheriff's Department a number of Civil Service law enforcement security positions now scattered throughout the City. Current employees in these positions will not be transferred involuntarily from their current job assignments.

There are tremendous advantages to all San Franciscans in passing Proposition K: better coordination and accountability of San Francisco's non-Police Department peace officers; strict, state-paid training for the new Sheriff's Department employees; and a wider range of assignment opportunities for deputies who work in the county jail resulting in less deputy turnover, thereby reducing hiring and training costs for the City.
It's clearly stated that nothing in Proposition K interferes with current Police Department powers: Section (i), "Nothing herein shall interfere with or supplant the duties and powers of the Police Department."
Vote Yes on Proposition K — a good government measure benefiting all San Franciscans.
I support Proposition K 100% — please vote "Yes" on K.

Sheriff Michael Hennessey

---

Proposition K is a bargain for San Francisco!
Proposition K upgrades and consolidates the management of the City's security personnel, eliminating bureaucratic waste.
Proposition K makes better use of your tax dollars by converting security officers already on the City's payroll to full-fledged deputy sheriff peace officers with the training and authority to fight crime at City public facilities throughout San Francisco.

The city already pays for these security personnel. Proposition K will make them more effective.
We ask all San Franciscans to VOTE YES on PROPOSITION K.

Al Waters
President, S.F. Deputy Sheriffs' Association
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

OUR NEIGHBORHOODS NEED MORE LAW ENFORCEMENT PROTECTION NOW!

Proposition K will increase trained and professional law enforcement presence at City facilities and parks in neighborhoods throughout San Francisco.

Right now the City's security guards lack the training and authority to fight crime. Proposition K would upgrade these guards to full-fledged peace officers, who would have the authority to help keep San Francisco safe.

We strongly urge all our neighbors throughout San Francisco to vote YES on Proposition K.

Bernal Heights Community Foundation
Gerald Whitehead, President*

* For identification purposes only

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Existing provisions of the City Charter provide for the general law enforcement authority of the Chief of Police. Passage of this Charter amendment would significantly erode the Police Department's ability to deliver law enforcement services by fractionalizing public parks, buildings, and city-owned property into a series of jurisdictional territories under general supervision of the Sheriff.

The Sheriff's Department would have primary law enforcement authority within these territories while police officers would be able to enter the territory only upon need. Crime prevention patrols by police units would no longer be available in areas under primary jurisdiction of the Sheriff.

The public safety of San Franciscan's cannot be compromised by the establishment of jurisdictional boundaries created solely to enhance recruiting and retention problems faced by the Sheriff's Department. Presently, various city departments utilize security personnel to guard public parks and buildings. The responsibilities of these public employees are limited to performing security services and the enforcement of local ordinances related to the property they protect. Passage of this amendment would elevate the status of these employees to full peace officer status with general law enforcement authority.

As proposed, the costs of training, certification, equipment, salaries, pensions, and disability pensions would sharply escalate for decades to come. Conflicts between department heads and security personnel controlled by the Sheriff will inevitably impact service to the public.

The creation of mini-jurisdictions with the duplication of resources costs and the resultant bureaucracies created will be detrimental to public safety services which are now delivered in a unified and professional manner.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Assemblyman Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assemblyman John Burton

Proposition K will increase costs to taxpayers of San Francisco. The cost of security programs at San Francisco General Hospital would increase substantially if reorganized under the Sheriff's Department. Under present administrative direction of San Francisco General, with expert consultation from the San Francisco Police Department, the security provided meets the special needs of hospital patients, employees, volunteers and visitors in a capable and cost-effective manner. The community would pay more and receive less if Proposition K were passed.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Phillip E. Sowa
Executive Director
San Francisco General Hospital

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Plans to put armed deputy sheriffs in city parks are unnecessary and expensive. Security, when required, should be provided by the San Francisco Police Department. The additional cost of $170,000 to turn park rangers into deputy sheriffs can be better spent on recreation directors and gardeners. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Keith Eickman, President, Recreation and Park Commission*
Frances McAteer, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission*
Richard J. Guggenheim, Member, Recreation and Park Commission*
Tommy Harris, Member, Recreation and Park Commission*
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission*

Mary E. Burns, General Manager, Recreation and Park Department*
Phil Arnold, Assistant General Manager, Recreation and Park Department*
Amy Meyer, conservationist
Bette Landis
Jane Otto, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks*
LeRoy King, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU)*
Elisabeth deLosada, member, of the San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board*
* For identification purposes only

Laguna Honda Hospital would be harmed by Proposition K. Institutional Police Officers at the Hospital are an important part of the patient care team. The security needs of the hospital require a sensitive approach to our frail elderly patients, staff, volunteers, and visitors. Our institutional police are specially trained to operate successfully in this unique environment.

The Proposition would place management of hospital security in the Sheriff’s Department. The type of training and service provided by the Sheriff’s Department is oriented to the County Jail system — not the hospital. The service approach of the hospital would be significantly compromised by Proposition K. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Anthony G. Wagner
Executive Administrator
Laguna Honda Hospital

Proposition K is not good for San Francisco. Effective security at San Francisco General, Laguna Honda and Community Health Clinics requires a security force devoted to those institutions and their patient-care activities, and familiar with their special needs. The current system of specially trained institutional police, working in cooperation with the San Francisco Police Department, serves San Francisco very well. It should not be dismantled.

Please vote NO on Proposition K.

David Werdegard, M.D., M.P.H.
Director of Health
Department of Public Health
City & County of San Francisco

San Francisco’s multimillion dollar art collection is protected by civil service museum guards. The guard force is trained for the security needs of The Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco and the Asian Art Museum. Proposition K will eliminate this security force and replace it with more expensive Deputy Sheriffs who may be rotated in and out of the museums and other city facilities. This constantly changing security force will not have the training in the special needs of the museums and will not be accountable to the administration of the museums. Proposition K will result in poor management and security for the City’s priceless art collections. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Alexandra Phillips, President Fine Arts Museums
Alice Lowe, Chairman Asian Art Commission
Harry Parker, Director Fine Arts Museums
Rand Castle, Director Asian Art Museum

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

The security of public health care facilities, including San Francisco General Hospital and Laguna Honda Hospital, require patient-oriented security officers supervised by health care administrators. Proposition K would transfer the supervision of these security services to the Sheriff’s Department, thereby making it more difficult for health care administrators to assure a patient-sensitive attitude in the health care facilities. Please vote NO on Proposition K.

John Blumlein  
President, Health Commission  
Edward A. Chow, M.D.  
Chair, Joint Conference Committee  
Laguna Honda Hospital  
Rosabelle Tobriner  
Chair, Joint Conference Committee  
San Francisco General Hospital

Out of town on November 7, 1989? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
NOTE: Additions are indicated by bold face type.

3.404 Sheriff

(a) The sheriff shall be an elective officer. His salary shall be established by salary standardization procedures. He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of $50,000. He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, an attorney, one under-sheriff, one assistant sheriff and one confidential secretary.

(b) In addition to such other duties as the general laws of the State of California may authorize and require the Sheriff to perform, the Sheriff is authorized to perform and shall perform the following duties for and in behalf of the people of the City and County of San Francisco:

(1) maintain, administer, and operate the County Jail;
(2) provide for the security of the Municipal and Superior Courts, serve warrants of arrest and other criminal and civil process of the Municipal and Superior Courts, and serve other warrants of arrest and criminal process valid for service upon persons located within the City and County of San Francisco;
(3) in the manner prescribed by law, pursue, take custody of, and bring into the City and County of San Francisco fugitives from justice and other persons wanted for criminal proceedings in the Municipal and Superior Courts;
(4) transport prisoners between the County Jail and the state prison, state hospital, and such other places to which such prisoners are lawfully committed or ordered confined by the Municipal or Superior Courts;
(5) preserve the peace, maintain public order, and enforce the law within the buildings and upon the grounds of public agencies and institutions, and other public places, of and within the City and County of San Francisco, including the buildings and grounds of the Department of Public Health, the San Francisco General Hospital, the Laguna Honda Hospital, the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Social Services, the Department of Parks and Recreation, the Port of San Francisco, and such other public agencies, institutions, and places as the Sheriff and the Board of Supervisors shall agree; provided that nothing herein shall be construed to deny the authority of the San Francisco Police Department, or the authority of any other law enforcement agency, to enter at need into the buildings or upon the grounds of such public agencies, institutions, or places for the purpose of preserving the peace, maintaining public order, or enforcing the law;
(6) train and maintain a corps of Sheriff’s deputies to provide for the control and suppression of riots and other public disturbances, and to preserve the peace and maintain public order during times of emergency;
(7) enter into such agreements with the Chief of Police or the local director of any federal, state, or local law enforcement agency as necessary to provide mutual aid during times of riot public disturbance, emergency, or other need; provided that the Sheriff shall make no agreement requiring the deployment of Sheriff's deputies more than fifty miles from the nearest geographical boundary of the City and County of San Francisco, except as authorized by the Board of Supervisors; and
(8) engage in such projects for the control, suppression, and prevention of crime as may be necessary to secure and enhance the public safety, including but not limited to the following:

(A) the development, implementation, and management of a community corrections program, for the purposes of providing rehabilitation to persons sentenced to a term of confinement in the County Jail, and reducing the cost to the City and County of San Francisco for the care and custody of such persons, and
(B) the development, implementation, and management of a data processing system for criminal justice information, for the purpose of developing statistical and other information for the formulation and periodic evaluation of criminal justice policy by the people of the City and County of San Francisco, their elected representatives, and the elected and appointed heads of the various criminal justice agencies of the City and County of San Francisco.

c) Subject to the Civil Service provisions of this Charter, the Sheriff may employ Sheriff's deputies to carry out the law enforcement functions and duties specified herein; provided that such functions and duties shall be performed by the Sheriff, or by Sheriff's deputies regularly employed as peace officers pursuant to section 830.1 of the Penal Code.

d) The Sheriff shall prepare and submit to the Board of Supervisors an annual report on the scope of the Sheriff's activities pursuant to the functions and duties herein assigned to the Sheriff; provided that nothing herein shall be construed to require the Sheriff to include in such report or otherwise to disclose any information protected from disclosure by law.

e) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Charter, the Board of Supervisors is authorized to enact, and shall enact an ordinance to accomplish the following:

(1) to abolish all civil service classes whose incumbents are not empowered or not required by state law to be empowered as peace officers under section 830.1 of the Penal Code, and who now perform the functions and duties of institutional, buildings and grounds, park, or harbor security officers, and to abolish such other classes as the board of supervisors may deem appropriate to accomplish the purposes described herein except that nothing herein shall authorize the board of supervisors to reclassify security personnel employed by the war memorial or community college district;
(2) to transfer the functions and duties of such classes to the Sheriff;
(3) to convert positions in the abolished classes to positions in the various classes of Sheriff's deputies, and, as necessary, to positions in a specially created class under the control of the Sheriff and having restricted law enforcement authority;
(4) to provide for the appointment of qualified persons holding positions in the abolished classes to positions in the various classes of Sheriff's deputies, and to provide further for appointment of persons holding positions in the abolished classes and not qualified for appointment to positions in the various classes of Sheriff's deputies to positions in the specially created class provided that no person holding a position in any of the abolished classes shall, as a result of such conversion and subsequent appointment, be subject to a reduction in present salary, nor to any further probationary period except as may be required by state law, nor to loss of option to remain in present general assignment, except by request for transfer or by promotion.

(f) The wages, benefits, and other conditions of employment of appointees in the various classes of Sheriff's deputies and appointees in any other class established by ordinance pursuant to section (e)(3) above, shall be established utilizing the mechanism set forth in sections 8.401 and 8.407 of this Charter, except that the Civil Service Commission shall certify basic pay rates for Sheriff's deputy classifications on or before August 1 of any year in which a survey pursuant to sections 8.401 and 8.407 is conducted. The board of supervisors shall fix the rates of such classes not later than August 25 of that year, and the rates shall be effective September 1. In all other respects, the compensation of classes covered by this section shall be governed by Charter sections 8.401 and 8.407.

g) If any provision of this section of the Charter is found to be in conflict with any other provision of any other section of this Charter, or any enactment pursuant thereto, the provisions of this section of the Charter shall prevail.

(h) If any provision of this section of the Charter is found to be invalid, such finding shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions, and all such provisions.

(i) Nothing herein shall interfere with or supplant the duties and powers of the Police Department.

(j) The provisions herein contained shall become law on the date on which approval of this section of the Charter is certified by the Secretary of State of the State of California; provided, however, that section (e) and any ordinance enacted pursuant thereto, shall be effective not later than the first day in July of the year 1990.
PROPOSITION L
Shall the authority to appoint and remove the chief juvenile probation officer be transferred from the Superior Court to a new seven-member Juvenile Probation Commission, which will oversee the management of a new Juvenile Probation Department, including the City's juvenile detention facilities?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Superior Court hires the chief juvenile probation officer to manage the City's juvenile detention facilities and the probation division of the juvenile court. Persons hired by the chief juvenile probation officer must be approved by the juvenile probation board or committee created by state law.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L is a charter amendment that would create a seven-member commission appointed by the Mayor to manage a new City juvenile probation department, including the juvenile detention facilities. The Commission would hire the chief juvenile probation officer who would supervise the day-to-day operation of the department. Under Proposition L, persons hired by the chief juvenile probation officer would no longer be approved by a juvenile probation board or committee created by state law.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create a City juvenile probation department managed by a seven-member commission appointed by the Mayor and you want that commission to hire the chief juvenile probation officer.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to continue to have the Superior Court manage the juvenile detention and probation system.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, the creation of a juvenile probation commission could increase the cost of government by $8,400. The cost effect of departmental reforms, being dependent upon future budgetary and Civil Service considerations, cannot be determined at this time."

How Supervisors Voted on "L"
On July 24, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L.

This charter amendment will strengthen the administration of the Juvenile Probation Department by creating a public commission with clear lines of accountability directly to the mayor.

Decades of problems in our Juvenile Probation Department are due to basic structural weaknesses in our local juvenile justice system. Currently, 28 Superior Court Judges are the "boss" of the Probation Department, with unclear accountability and ambiguous roles. The judges have many responsibilities that are not directly related to judicial functions, including the administration of two institutions, social rehabilitation programs and a large and varied staff. The Chief Probation Officer, who serves at the pleasure of rotating judges, lacks the power and independence to assert creative, strong leadership.

Vote YES on Proposition L.

This charter amendment would create a seven-member commission which would have responsibility for setting policy and for administrative and fiscal management of this complex system. Long-standing policy questions of how youths who violate the law should be treated at Juvenile Hall and in the community would become matters of public debate, with decisions made by a public commission representing the interests of youth, parents, community groups, and juvenile justice advocates and personnel.

Vote YES on Proposition L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L.

San Francisco's juvenile justice system is overdue for reform. For 30 years, this system has been plagued with problems — poor conditions in the Juvenile Hall, ineffective rehabilitative programs, and one management crisis after another. All parties involved in this system agree that there is a need for a basic structural change that would improve accountability and bring San Francisco into compliance with national standards for the care and treatment of youth.

The current system is insulated from public scrutiny. The responsibilities of the various branches of city government for running the system often overlap and contradict each other. The proposed charter amendment would open to public debate many important issues about how youth are treated within the juvenile justice system. This amendment would streamline the system, clarifying lines of authority.

Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth has worked on juvenile justice issues for 15 years. Our Board of Directors, composed of community representatives and experts in youth law, are confident that Proposition L is the most significant step San Francisco could take to reform an outdated juvenile justice system.

Improve youth services: Vote YES on Proposition L.

Sharon Meadows
Peter Bull
Art Tapia
Greg Day
Jean Jacobs
Board of Directors, Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Proposition L is a much-needed reorganization of the justice system. PropL mandates citizen input on juvenile justice programs, provides for a better system for troubled youth and a cost effective way to make our City safer. Vote YES ON PROP L!

Jose Medina,  
Police Commissioner

Terence Hallinan  
Michael Hardeman  
Leslie Katz  
Tony Kilroy  
Steve Kreisling  
Ruth Picon  
Alexa Smith  
Arlo Hale Smith  
Alicia Wang  
Ex Officio Appointees  
Anne Daley  
Ed McGovern  
Jim Morales  
Matthew Rothschild  
Alfredo Rodriguez  
Arnold Townsend

A Juvenile Probation Department will ensure better accountability and provide a much needed public forum for resolving problems in our juvenile justice system. It will improve services to San Francisco's most needy youth.  
VOTE YES ON PROP L.

San Francisco Democratic Party  
County Central Committee  
Elected Members  
Carole Migden, Chair  
Adrian Bermudes, Jr.  
Kimiko Burton  
Lulu Carter  
Ellen Chaitin  
Greg Day  
Catherine Dodd  
Bob Geary

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition L

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

PART TWENTY-THREE:
JUVENILE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT
3.699 Establishment

There is hereby established a department of juvenile probation which shall consist of a juvenile probation commission, a chief juvenile probation officer and such assistants, deputies and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department.

3.699-1 Juvenile Probation Commission - Composition

A juvenile probation commission is hereby created, which shall consist of 7 members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. Two of the members shall be appointed from lists of eligibles submitted to the Mayor by the Superior Court.

The term of each commissioner shall be 4 years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon, on the 15th day of January in the year 1990; provided that the respective terms of office of those first appointed shall be as follows: two for four years, two for three years, two for two years and one for one year. These initial terms shall be determined at the initial meeting of the commission by drawing lots. Vacancies occurring on said commission either during or at the expiration of the terms of each said member shall be filled by the mayor in the same fashion as the appointment of the vacating member. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $25 per meeting but not to exceed $100 per month.

Any person may serve concurrently as a member of the Juvenile justice commission created by state law and as a member of the Juvenile probation commission herein created. The commission shall be broadly representative of the general public of San Francisco, including racial, ethnic, gender, age (including youth), socio-economic and sexual orientation groups in the City and County.

3.699-2 Juvenile Probation Commission - Powers, Duties

The juvenile probation commission shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the department of juvenile probation. The juvenile probation commission may appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter. The juvenile probation commission shall have the power to create new positions within the department of juvenile probation and, notwithstanding section 8.300 of the charter, shall have the power to declare new management or executive positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter, subject to the approval of the board of supervisors. The juvenile probation commission shall also have the power to declare existing executive or management positions within the department to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter, subject to approval of the board of supervisors, and to determine whether persons with civil service status serving in existing positions declared exempt shall continue to have civil service status in those positions. However, in no event shall the juvenile probation commission declare more than 6 management or executive positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter.

3.699-3 Chief Juvenile Probation Officer

The juvenile probation commission shall appoint a chief juvenile probation officer, who shall hold office at its pleasure. The chief juvenile probation officer shall be the department head within the meaning of charter section 3.501.

The chief juvenile probation officer and his or her assistants and deputies shall have the powers conferred upon chief juvenile probation officers, assistants and deputies by the laws of the State of California; and they shall perform all of the duties prescribed by such laws, and such additional duties as may be prescribed by ordinances of the board of supervisors.

4.105 Probation Boards

The adult probation committee and the juvenile probation board or committee shall continue to exercise their respective powers and duties as fixed by state law, except as in this charter otherwise provided.

The superior court judges of the city and county presiding in the department or departments for the hearing and disposition of criminal cases and proceedings shall, by order entered in the minutes of the court in the criminal department or departments thereof, appoint the adult probation officer.

A majority of the superior court judges of the city and county shall, by order entered in the minutes of the court in the department of the proceeding judge, appoint the chief probation officer of the juvenile court, such appointment to be based on specified professional qualifications to be established and published by a majority of the judges of the superior court.

The chief probation officer of the juvenile court may be removed only by a vote of a majority of the judges of the juvenile court. The chief probation officer, prior to his removal, may request a hearing before a committee of five judges appointed by the presiding judge.

The adult probation officer shall appoint such assistants, deputies and employees as may be allowed or provided by the board of supervisors, subject to confirmation by the adult probation board or committee created by state law.

The chief probation officer of the juvenile court shall appoint such assistants, deputies and employees as may be allowed or provided by the board of supervisors, subject to confirmation by the juvenile probation board or committee created by state law.

The salaries of the adult probation officer, the chief probation officer of the juvenile court, their and his or her assistants, deputies and employees shall be fixed by the board of supervisors in the same manner as for other officials and employees of the city and county.

The adult probation officer, the chief probation officer of the juvenile court and their or his or her assistants and deputies shall have the powers conferred upon adult probation officers, probation officers of the juvenile court, and their assistants and deputies by the laws of the State of California; and they shall perform all of the duties prescribed by such laws, and such additional duties as may be prescribed by ordinances of the board of supervisors.

The civil service provisions of this charter shall apply to and govern the assistants, deputies and employees of the adult probation officer and of the chief probation officer of the juvenile court. For purposes of this charter the adult probation officer shall be the appointing officer as to his assistants, deputies, and employees, subject to confirmation as aforesaid, and the chief probation officer of the juvenile court shall be the appointing officer as to his assistants, deputies and employees, subject to confirmation as aforesaid.

The pension and retirement provisions of this charter shall apply to and govern the adult probation officer, the chief probation officer of the juvenile court, their assistants, deputies and employees.
PROPOSITION M

Shall certain Public Utilities Commission deputy general managers be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Public Utilities Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

YES 68
NO 69

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Public Utilities Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the departments and bureaus under the Commission. Deputy general managers for the Municipal Railway, Water Department and Hetch Hetchy Water and Power are hired for and fired from those positions under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a charter amendment. Under Proposition M, deputy general managers would no longer be hired for and fired from those positions under the civil service system. Instead, deputy general managers would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Public Utilities Commission. Proposition M would not affect current deputy general managers.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want deputy general managers for the Municipal Railway, the Water Department and Hetch Hetchy Water and Power to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Public Utilities Commission and to be exempt from civil service hiring rules.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want deputy general managers for the Municipal Railway, the Water Department and Hetch Hetchy Water and Power to continue to be hired for and fired from those positions under the civil service system.

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "M"
On July 24, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Wendy Nelder.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

This Charter amendment will not add any positions, change salaries, or increase costs.

Many major city department heads such as Airport, Police, Fire, Health, and Public Works are permitted to appoint their deputies at their discretion. The general manager of Public Utilities does not have this authority with respect to the deputies in the utilities under his or her control, the San Francisco Municipal Railway, Water and Hetch Hetchy. Currently the Municipal Railway has four deputy general managers, and the Water department and Hetch Hetchy each have one deputy general manager. All of these positions are appointed from a list generated from a Civil Service exam.

The deputy general manager positions are critically important. The success of large government departments depends on the senior management team’s ability to work together. Building a successful senior management team is difficult under the traditional Civil Service exam process because the process does not consider the ability of the individuals to work as a team.

By making these positions discretionary appointments the general manager of Public Utilities will have greater ability to build a successful team and hold the deputies responsible for critical public services. Employees currently in the positions will not be affected by this Charter amendment.

This measure allows the General Manager of the Public Utilities Commission, a department comprising over 5,000 employees, the flexibility of appointing top level management for greater efficiency and teamwork at no extra cost to the City.

Vote Yes on Proposition M

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The Supervisors claim patronage appointments at MUNI — which “M” will bring us — will improve efficiency.

They tell us “I” — which eliminates monthly audits of City departments — will get rid of “rigid reporting requirements.”

They also say the 50% salary increase “D” will bring them is “fair.”

They suggest eliminating Supervisors’ oversight of retirement funds — which “N” will do — somehow benefits the City.

They say that “O” — which allows $5000 PAC contributions to Supervisors’ campaigns — will simplify campaign laws.

These same people also said that the sewer project wouldn’t increase our water bills!

And that there was no City deficit in 1987!

DO YOU BELIEVE THEM?

If, so, we’ve got a bridge to sell you!

IF NOT, ASK YOURSELF WHY?

Why do they think we’d give them a 70% pay raise? Or authorize $5000 campaign contributions?

Why did they find a legal loophole to get “T” (two-term limit for Supervisors) thrown off the ballot?

Did they do these things to benefit us?

Or do they just think we’re stupid?

SHOW THEM YOU’RE NOT DUMB!

SHOW THEM YOU’RE TIRED OF “BUSINESS AS USUAL” AT CITY HALL.

Vote “NO” on special interest measures “D,” “I,” “M,” “N,” and “O”!

Committee To Close Legal Loopholes

Thomas Spinosa, Republican Leader
Alexa Smith, Democratic Committee Member
Arlo Hale Smith, BART Director

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

"M" MEANS "MORE MISMANAGEMENT AT MUNI"!

Proposition M is a cynical proposal by the Supervisors to turn a number of positions at MUNI and the Water and Power Departments into patronage jobs.

MUNI already has an abysmal record in the areas of cleanliness, safety, and fiscal management.

MUNI buses and streetcars are regularly covered with garbage and graffiti. In contrast, Golden Gate Transit and BART keep their cars almost spotless.

MUNI regularly has serious, even fatal, accidents, while BART has never had a single passenger death.

MUNI recovers only about 33% of its operating costs at the farebox. BART recovers 50% at the farebox and San Diego’s trolley line has an operating ratio of over 90%!

Exempting positions from civil service, like Proposition “M” proposes, allows the politicians to hire their friends!

The politicians have already made a fine mess at City Hall: They have imposed a $200 fee on small business, raised sewer service charges through the ceiling, increased parking fines without providing transportation solutions, and given away City property to their contributors.

Why let them hire their friends at MUNI?

"M" PUSHED BY SAME SUPERVISORS WHO WANT 70% PAY RAISE AND $5000 SPECIAL INTEREST CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

"M" is sponsored by:

The same Supervisors sponsoring Proposition “D” — to give themselves a 70% pay raise, and guaranteed future salary increases without voter approval.

The same Supervisors pushing Proposition “O” — to allow special interest PAC’s to contribute up to $5000 to their campaigns.

The same Supervisors who oppose Proposition “T” — the two-term limit on Supervisors.

JUST SAY “NO” TO SPECIAL INTEREST GOVERNMENT!

Vote "NO" on "M". Also be sure to vote "NO" on "D" and "O" and "YES" on "T".

Committee To Close Legal Loopholes

---

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Unfortunately, the frivolous argument against Proposition M is cast in a manner which denies you, the tax paying public, with a serious statement of facts.

Proposition M is proposed with the clear intention of improving the management of three (3) critical city departments — Water, Hetch Hetchy, and Municipal Railway — nothing more, nothing less.

The argument against Proposition M focuses on negatives regarding Municipal Railway, rather than the positives which could be achieved through the passage of Proposition M.

Do you want:

• Sound, professional, government management?
• More bang for your tax buck?
• Accountability to you the taxpayer?

If so — vote for Proposition M, which means “Improved Government Management.”

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

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

Why you should say no to City Hall on Prop M

The City Charter mandates that all municipal jobs except department head positions are supposed to be filled only after competitive civil service exams have been offered to all qualified candidates. Now, elected officials are asking you to extend political appointments to the high-level professional and technical ranks in the Public Utilities Commission, with annual salaries of nearly $90,000.

We say vote no on Prop M. Tell City Hall that politics has no place in municipal employment. Fair and open competition for deputy director positions in the Muni, Water Department and Hetch Hetchy would result in competent civil service employees who answer first to the needs of the citizenry, not to the politicians or department heads who appointed them.

We know that voters have rejected similar initiatives but City Hall continues to fill positions by political appointment rather than open competition. Right now, all of the deputy directors in the PUC operating departments are so-called “temporary”: in other words, appointed in the absence of a civil service exam. The Civil Service Commission looks the other way and conveniently ignores its obligation to give exams because the departments like it that way. In other words, the fox is guarding the hen house.

This practice is not limited to deputy director and other high ranking jobs; it permeates the whole system. If the Commission doesn’t offer exams, then the department heads get to hand-pick employees of their choosing, with no regard to fairness or even, in many cases, competence. What City Hall is really asking you to do is to legalize the current practice that continues despite the will of San Francisco voters.

Vote no — tell City Hall that politics has no place in municipal employment.

San Francisco Labor Council
Paul Dempster, President

Proposition M would add six new political patronage jobs at the Public Utilities Commission. It is insidious and should be rejected.

The supervisors claim that the deputy general managers for Muni, Hetch Hetchy, and the Water Department need to be “team players”, and thus should be exempt from the Civil Service system. “Team player” sounds like a code word for knuckling under to orders from their boss!

The Civil Service system is designed to protect city employees from just such political pressure. The Civil Service test is designed to prevent incompetent or unqualified applicants from obtaining city jobs. A test may not be perfect, but it’s better than no standard at all. Proposition M goes back to the days of “who do you know” and “will you follow orders”.

FOR OUR CITY’S SAKE, PLEASE VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

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

WHY YOU SHOULD SAY NO TO CITY HALL ON PROP M:

The City Charter mandates that all municipal jobs except department head positions are supposed to be filled only after competitive civil service exams have been offered to all qualified candidates. Now, elected officials are asking you to extend political appointments to the high-level professional and technical ranks in the Public Utilities Commission, with annual salaries of $89,000.

We say vote no on Prop M. Tell City Hall that politics has no place in municipal employment. Fair and open competition in the PUC would result in competent civil service employees who answer first to the needs of the citizenry, not to the politicians or department heads who appointed them.

As career civil service employees we know that even though voters have rejected similar initiatives, City Hall continues to fill positions by political appointment rather than open competition. Right now, many of the PUC deputy directors are so-called "temporary"; in other words, appointed in the absence of a civil service exam. The Civil Service Commission, in charge of preventing this Charter violation, ignores its obligation to give exams because the departments like it that way. In other words the fox is guarding the hen house.

This practice is not limited to deputy director and other high ranking jobs; it permeates the whole system. If the Commission doesn’t offer exams, then the department heads get to hand-pick employees of their choosing, with no regard to fairness or even in many cases, competence. What City Hall is really asking you is to legalize the current practice that continues despite the will of San Francisco voters.

Vote no — tell City Hall that politics has no place in municipal employment.

Dee Lemmon, President
Nancy Gin, Vice-President
International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION M

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

3.593 Manager of Utilities and Other Executives

The Public Utilities Commission shall appoint a manager of utilities who shall be the chief executive of the commission and shall, subject to the approval of the commission, have the management of all utilities, bureaus and operations under its jurisdiction. He shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall appoint or remove the heads of departments and bureaus under the commission, and shall appoint or remove deputy general managers for the San Francisco Municipal Railway, the San Francisco Water Department and Hetch Hetchy Water and Power, exclusive of the civil service provisions of this charter, provided, however, that incumbent deputy general managers as of the date of enactment of this amendment shall not be displaced or affected thereby. The manager of utilities and the heads of departments and bureaus, and the deputy general managers shall each possess the necessary executive, administrative and technical qualifications for their respective offices. The manager shall have full power to administer the affairs of the commission as chief executive officer and may, with the consent of the commission, act as the head of any department or bureau created by this charter or by the commission. The salaries of the manager, deputy general managers and heads of separate utilities and bureaus shall not exceed prevailing salaries paid those holding similar positions in comparable private employment.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
FUSES TO SELL THE UNIT AS AGREED OR DEMANDS A HIGHER PRICE, YOU SHOULD IMMEDIATELY CONTACT THE APPROVING AGENCY AND THE CITY ATTORNEY.

I/We, the undersigned, as tenant(s) of unit at San Francisco, California, at the time of filing of the Tenant Initiated Conversion Application of such property, do certify my/our consent to the filing of the Tenant Initiated Conversion Application for the building. I/We have seen and have received a copy of the Tenant Initiated Conversion Application which lists the maximum sales prices for all tenant occupied units in this building and other information on the Tenant Initiated Conversion Application to be filed with the City of San Francisco.

The list indicates that the maximum sales price for my/our unit is to be $... I/We understand that if the offer to purchase the unit is made more than one year after the date of filing of the Tenant Initiated Conversion Application the unit’s sale price may increase according to any change reflected in the Consumer Price Index from the date of filing to the date the offer to purchase the unit is made to you by the owner.

I/We further understand that this Consent to Conversion Form will be filed with the City for the purpose of establishing the percentage of tenants who agree to the conversion pursuant to this article.

I/We declare, under penalty of perjury, that all of my/our statements above are true and correct. (Signed and Separately Dated by Intending to Purchase Tenant(s) and Owner.)

Sec. 1411. Prohibition Against Other Tax and Fee Requirements; Prohibition Against Additional Resale Controls.

(a) No fee may be imposed, either directly or indirectly, by the City on a Tenant Initiated Conversion except the imposition of reasonable processing fees by the San Francisco Department of Public Works.

(b) No tax may be imposed, either directly or indirectly, by the City on a Tenant Initiated Conversion except such taxes as are imposed on similar multi-resident structures in the City.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (a) of Section 1406, the City shall not impose, either directly or indirectly, any restrictions on the price, terms or conditions of sale or resale of any unit in a Tenant Initiated Conversion except to incorporate the terms and conditions agreed to by the parties in the Tenant Initiated Conversion Application as authorized by this Article. Nothing in this Section shall restrict the City, any other government agency, or any other person from making any voluntary loans or other forms of voluntary financial assistance to purchasers of units for which a Tenant Initiated Conversions Application has been approved with any terms agreeable to all parties.

Sec. 1412. Applicability of Other Laws. Any provision of any ordinance of the City or any provision of the Administrative Code, and any appendix or any rules or regulations thereto, inconsistent with the provisions of this Article, to the extent of such inconsistency and no further, shall not apply to the extent necessary to effect the provisions of this Article. Any general or specific plan of the City inconsistent with this Article shall be amended to the extent necessary to be consistent with this Article, and until such amendment, shall be deemed consistent with this Article. The conversion of rental units to home ownership under this Article 11 shall be specifically deemed to comply with the Master Plan.

Sec. 1413. Limitations. If the Board of Supervisors finds based upon competent factual data obtained from municipal, state, federal or other independent sources of data that the ratio of non-owner occupied residential units to owner occupied residential units within the City of San Francisco has fallen below the average of such ratio for the State of California, the Board of Supervisors is empowered, at its discretion and in order to achieve the objectives of this Article, to cease accepting new Tenant Initiated Conversion Applications until the ratio of non-owner occupied residential units within the City exceeds the average such ratio for the State of California.

Sec. 1414. Provisions Severable. If any provision of this Article or its application to any person or circumstance is declared or found invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, this invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this Article which can be given effect without the invalid provision of application, and to this end the provisions of this Article are declared to be severable. This Article shall be liberally construed to achieve its purposes and to preserve its validity.

Section 2. Part 11, Chapter XII of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Subdivision Code) is hereby amended by amending Section 1332 to read as follows:

Section 1332. Hearings on Conversions; Master Plan.

(a) The City Planning Commission shall hold and may hold a hearing in the case of Conversions of 5 or more units which include one or more residential units, except that as to Tenant Initiated Conversions regulated by Article 11, the Commission shall be required to hold a hearing only if a request is made as provided in that Article. The City Planning Department shall give notice of such hearings as provided in Section 1313 (b).

(b) Whenever a property is to be subdivided, the Department of City Planning shall report on the question of consistency of the subdivision with the Master Plan.

(c) The Director shall disapprove the proposed subdivision when the Department of City Planning finds that the proposed subdivision is not consistent with the Master Plan, subject to any decision on appeal by the Board of Supervisors.

(d) When the Department of City Planning finds, subject to any decision on appeal by the Board of Supervisors, or when the Board of Supervisors finds, that a proposed subdivision will be consistent with the Master Plan only upon compliance with certain conditions, the director shall incorporate said conditions in his or her conditional approval of the proposed subdivision.
PROPOSITION N
Shall the power of the President of the Board of Supervisors to appoint another Supervisor to serve in the President’s place on the Retirement Board be enlarged to authorize the President to appoint someone who is not a Supervisor provided that person is experienced in employee pension planning or in managing investments?

YES 71
NO 72

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City operates a retirement system that gives benefits to its retired workers. The system is run by the retirement board. The President of the Board of Supervisors may serve as a member of the retirement board or may appoint another member of the Board of Supervisors to serve.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a Charter amendment that would allow the president of the Board of Supervisors to appoint to the retirement board a person who is not a member of the Board of Supervisors but is experienced in employee pension planning or in managing investments.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the president of the Board of Supervisors to appoint to the retirement board a person who is not a member of the Board of Supervisors but is experienced in employee pension planning or in managing investments.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the president of the Board of Supervisors to appoint to the retirement board anyone who is not a member of the Board of Supervisors.

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “N”
On July 24, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition N on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Wendy Nelder.

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

As it is now, the President of the Board of Supervisors appoints a member of the Board of Supervisors to be a trustee on the Retirement Board. This charter amendment would permit the President of the Board instead to appoint a trustee who is not a Supervisor.

The Retirement Board administers the retirement plans for City employees and supervises the investment of pension assets of almost $4 billion. Proper administration of these benefit plans and funds is of vital importance to the City and its employees.

Retirement Board trustees must be able to devote a large amount of their time over several years to Board activities. This Charter Amendment would allow the President of the Board of Supervisors to appoint to the Retirement Board a person who has the time and the qualifications to devote him or herself to this work.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is an end-run on accountability to the voters. VOTE NO ON N.

The supervisors admit that the Retirement Board "is of vital importance to the city and its employees."

Isn't it important enough for a member of the Board of Supervisors to attend two Retirement Board meetings a month?

Aren't these the same supervisors who want a 70% pay hike because they claim to work so hard at their jobs? Yet, Proposition N would eliminate a most critical responsibility.

Don't voters deserve to select their representation on a Retirement Board controlling $3,800,000,000 in city assets?

The answer to these questions is yes, yes, and yes.

The answer to Proposition N is NO, NO, NO!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
Senator Quenin Kopp, Chairman

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

Proposition N erodes voter participation in key city government decisions. It should be rejected.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N!

Until last year, the President of the Board of Supervisors had always served as a member of the City Retirement Board. It was one of the special duties of that high office.

In 1988, the voters approved a Charter amendment authored by Supervisor Nancy Walker to enable the Board President to appoint another supervisor to serve on the Retirement Board. I opposed that measure, but one could argue it had the virtue of ensuring that an elected representative of the people would serve on one of the most powerful and influential bodies in City Hall.

Now, a year later, Supervisor Walker is back with another Charter amendment that would let the Board President appoint anyone to the City Retirement Board. Thus, Proposition N would eliminate the requirement that an elected official sit on the Retirement Board.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N!

The City Retirement Board controls an investment portfolio valued at $3,800,000,000. It sends monthly pension checks to 14,000 city retirees, and has another 23,000 active city employees as members. Shouldn’t we demand accountability to the voters from at least one trustee of this immense system?

Sure, Proposition N says that the Board President should choose someone “experienced in pension planning and investment portfolio management”. But Proposition N establishes no screening process to guarantee that these qualifications are met. (The mayor’s appointees to the Retirement Board are reviewed by representatives of the San Francisco Medical Society, the Bar Association, the Real Estate Board, and other professional groups.) Proposition N is unnecessary and undemocratic.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Senator Quentin Kopp, Chairman

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

This measure does not say that a Board member CANNOT be appointed to the Retirement Board — simply that the Board president may make a judgement as to which San Franciscan is the MOST QUALIFIED to serve as the Board’s designee.

Serving on the Retirement Board is a huge commitment. It involves twice-monthly meetings that often run for half a day or more. With committee work, constituent work and other responsibilities, Supervisors often have conflicts between their work and their Retirement Board duties.

Additionally, the job of managing a $4 billion portfolio is not a simple one. It requires great financial expertise, highly specialized training, and a great deal of flexible time that can be devoted to studying Retirement Board issues.

The business of government is to effectively serve the people. Proposition N works to achieve that end.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition N
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition N

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

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

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of one member the president of the board of supervisors, or his or her appointee, who may but need not be a member of the board of supervisors, to be appointed by the president of the board of supervisors; three members to be appointed by the mayor, and three members elected from the active members, who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system. The members appointed by the mayor shall either hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management; and shall be appointed by the mayor from among three persons whose names shall have been submitted by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine. If the appointee of the president of the board of supervisors is not a member of the board of supervisors, he or she shall be experienced in employee pension planning or investment portfolio management. The term of office of the six members, other than the member president of the board of supervisors or his or her appointee, shall be five years. The term of office for the member president of the board of supervisors or his or her appointee shall be for one year, or, in the case of the president, until the member he or she is no longer serving on the board of supervisors, if the departure from the board occurs prior to the termination of the one year term. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager.

DID YOUR POLLING PLACE CHANGE?
Check the label on the back cover for the address of your polling place.
Campaign Contributions

PROPOSITION O

Shall the City laws regulating campaign contributions to candidates for City office be repealed, and shall such contributions be governed exclusively by state laws regulating campaign contributions?

YES 73
NO 74

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco has a law that limits how much a contributor may give to a candidate for City office. In 1986 San Francisco voters approved Proposition F, which changed this limit from $1000 to $500 per election. Only the voters may repeal Proposition F. In 1988, California voters approved Proposition 73, which limits contributions to a candidate by large political committees to $5000 per fiscal year, by small political committees to $2500 per fiscal year and by all other contributors to $1000 per fiscal year. Under Proposition 73, where a city law sets lower contribution limits, the city law applies.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O is an ordinance that would repeal the City laws limiting the amount of campaign contributions to candidates for City office. Instead, only state law would limit these contributions.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to repeal the San Francisco laws that limit the amount of campaign contributions to candidates for City office.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the City laws that limit campaign contributions to candidates for City office.

Controller’s Statement on "O"

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

"Should the proposed ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "O"

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


NO: Supervisors Harry Britt, Willie Kennedy, and Nancy Walker.

THE LAWS THAT PROPOSITION O WOULD REPEAL ARE ON PAGE

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

California voters passed Proposition 73 last year in an effort to require uniformity throughout the state in campaign contributions, expenditures and reporting procedures. Because San Francisco already had guidelines, limitations and procedures for reporting expenditures and contributions, we now have two sets of rules which conflict and which local and state officials are so far unable to interpret with consistency. The confusion puts San Francisco office holders and candidates at serious risk of violation of state law.

Although the effects and results of Proposition 73 are now the subject of legal action and debate in the California courts, throughout the state communities are trying to comply with it. Approval of Proposition O would ensure that state guidelines would be used to govern the campaign contribution process in San Francisco. Proposition O would guarantee that officeholders and candidates for public office in San Francisco would raise and spend campaign contributions under the same guidelines approved by the voters for candidates in all California communities.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION O!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O*

Talk about misleading advertising! You would never guess from reading the Board of Supervisors’ argument that Proposition O will raise our local campaign contribution limit from $500 to $5,000 for the biggest contributors.

The supervisors say Proposition O is needed to clear up the “confusion...” [for] San Francisco officeholders and candidates” about state and local election law. Hogwash.

Proposition O is not about rules and regulations, it’s about money. Proposition O would throw open the gates to big special interest money flooding San Francisco elections, only three years after we voters adopted our own local limit on political contributions.

I authored both city laws that Proposition O would repeal. I also co-sponsored the state law. As the author of all three laws in question, I strongly urge you to vote NO on O!

In 1986, San Francisco voters restored our original $500 campaign contribution limit by passing Proposition F. The reason for the $500 limit is simple: a lower contribution limit means less campaign spending and less influence by campaign contributors over our elected officials. Proposition O would increase that sensible limit by 900%.

State law has much larger contribution limits because it was drafted with state-level and statewide races in mind. In fact, my co-authors and I explicitly wrote state law so as not to eliminate any local campaign ordinance with lower contribution limits. Yet, that is precisely what Proposition O would do to San Francisco’s scrupulously drawn lower limit. It’s senseless.

Please vote NO on O!

Senator Quentin L. Kopp

* Rebuttal right assigned to Senator Kopp by sponsor of official argument against Proposition Q.

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

"O" IS OBSCENE!
Proposition O is perhaps the most obscene and blatant special interest measure to be placed on the ballot in years.
Masqueraded as legislation to "simplify" campaign reporting laws, Proposition O is actually designed to repeal the $500 campaign contribution limit adopted by San Francisco voters in 1986 as Proposition F!
THE TEXT DOESN'T TELL THE STORY!
Proposition O just says that state election campaign contribution limits are to apply to San Francisco elections.
What the text doesn't tell you is that, in elections for Governor, Attorney General and other state offices, SPECIAL INTEREST POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES are allowed to give each candidate they support as much as $5000! That's 10 times the amount allowed by Proposition F!
BIG BUCKS BUY BIG INFLUENCE AT CITY HALL!
The United States Supreme Court has recognized that large campaign contributions have a corrupting effect on elected officials.

Here's one case in point:
Between 1982 and 1987, Rockefeller-backed Embarcadero Center developers gave $112,810 in contributions to the Supervisors.
In 1987, these developers asked the Supervisors to give them exclusive use of a City street worth $9 million FOR FREE!
Did the Rockefellers get their free street?
YOU BET THEY DID!
The Supervisors voted 10-1 to give the street away without collecting any money for the City — even rent!
And they refused to rescind the deal even after the voters voted to cancel it by approving Proposition T in November 1987!
VOTE FOR REFORM!
In this election, voters have a chance to say "NO" to greediness and mismanagement at City Hall and "YES" to reform and government by voting:
"NO" on "D" (Supervisor pay raises) and "O" and "YES" on "T" (two-term limit on Supervisors)!!!

Committee For Genuine Campaign Reform

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION O

The arguments against Proposition O are confusing the issue, just as the passage of Proposition 73 confused the guidelines by which San Francisco candidates and officeholders run for office. San Francisco already had limits and reporting procedures before the State intervened. The new California laws conflicting with our rules only serve to put San Francisco candidates at risk breaking the law through confusion. The two sets of rules are in conflict!
Proposition O will allow San Francisco candidates and officeholders to seek office under the same guidelines that every other community uses.
Let's remove the conflict and confusion, and make certain that San Francisco candidates and officeholders use one consistent set of laws to raise and spend campaign contributions. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION O!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
Campaign Contributions

PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Grassroots supports repealing all political spending/donation limits and disclosure requirements.

The Constitution says:
"NO LAW ... ABRIDGING FREEDOM OF SPEECH"

Government has no business limiting how much individuals spend or donate to express their views, or requiring them to fill out forms and figure out technicalities as pre-condition for exercising that right.

Limits require disclosure. We think privacy is necessary to protect people from retaliation — the "secret ballot" principle applies year round, not just on Election Day. Unenforceable laws should be repealed. So should unconstitutional ones. Vote Yes.

Grassroots

Campaign contribution limits hurt small- and medium-budget campaigns more than they hurt big-budget campaigns.
You're free to spend as much of your own money on your campaign as you wish. So if you're wealthy, you have an unlimited campaign budget even without contributions.

For example, what Nancy Pelosi spent of her own money was more than Britt's entire campaign budget, clearly making the difference in their close Congressional race.

Limiting campaign contributions while personal spending is unlimited, is unfair; it gives wealthy candidates an even bigger advantage!
Repeal all limits on free speech!

Grassroots

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION O

The maximum amount that anyone can give to a local candidate is $500. We San Francisco voters adopted that limit in June 1986.
Proposition O would raise the limit to $5,000 for the biggest contributors. That's a 900% increase!
We support lower contribution limits, less campaign spending, and less special interest influence over our elections and elected officials.
Proposition O helps the fat cats, and hurts average San Franciscans.
PLease Vote No on Proposition O.

Robert Arenson
Cheryl Arenson
John Barbagelata
Martha M. Gillham
Daniel G. Gillham
Joan Saraf
Irene Patridge
Frank P. Aiello
Ray Allen

"You're invited to dinner. Bring $1000. Bring a friend. With $1000. And come again next year."

Eight of your Supervisors want you to repeal the contribution limits you established three years ago, so that they can raise more campaign contributions from "fat cats".

How many of your friends and neighbors would accept these dinner invitations?

Wouldn't it be better if a person could run for Supervisor with small contributions from a lot of people — voters and taxpayers — who believe that person is honest, dedicated, and competent?

Wouldn't it be easier to challenge an incumbent supervisor if that supervisor had limited access to funds from corporate political action committees? Wouldn't that be fairer? Wouldn't we get better representation?

Let's at least retain the present limitations. This is a move in the WRONG direction.

Robert Frank

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

ORDERING SUBMISSION OF AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING THAT CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO SHALL BE GOVERNED EXCLUSIVELY BY STATE LAW, REPEALING ARTICLE XII OF THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE (SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION CONTROL ORDINANCE) AND AMENDING PROPOSITION F, ADOPTED BY SAN FRANCISCO VOTERS ON JUNE 3, 1986, BY REPEALING SECTION 5 THEREOF, RELATING TO LIMITS ON CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

The Board of Supervisors hereby orders submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held thereon on November 7, 1989, an ordinance providing that contributions to candidates for public office of the City and County of San Francisco shall be governed exclusively by state law, repealing Article XII of the San Francisco Administrative Code (San Francisco Municipal Election Campaign Contribution Control Ordinance) and amending Proposition F, adopted by San Francisco voters on June 3, 1986, by repealing Section 5 thereof relating to limits on campaign contributions, to read as follows:

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

Section 1. Notwithstanding any other ordinance of the City and County of San Francisco, contributions to candidates for public office of the City and County of San Francisco shall be governed exclusively by state laws regulating campaign contributions, including but not limited to those laws regulating the amounts that persons may contribute and that candidates may solicit or accept and regulating the disclosure of campaign contributions.

Section 2. Article XII of the San Francisco Administrative Code (San Francisco Municipal Election Campaign Contribution Control Ordinance) is hereby repealed.

Section 3. Proposition F, adopted by the voters of the City and County of San Francisco on June 3, 1986, is hereby amended by repealing Section 5 thereof, relating to limits on campaign contributions.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

LOUISE H. RENNE
Randy Riddle
City Attorney
Deputy City Attorney

TEXT OF SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE
THAT PROPOSITION O WOULD REPEAL

If you vote "yes" on Proposition O, you want to delete the following campaign contribution law passed by the Board of Supervisors in 1973.

MUNICIPAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION CONTROL

SEC. 16.501. PURPOSE AND INTENT. Huge sums of money often are necessary to finance American election campaigns. Inherent to the high cost of election campaigning is the problem of improper influence, real or potential, exercised by campaign contributors over elected officials. It is the purpose and intent of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco in enacting this Article to place realistic and enforceable limits on the amount individuals may contribute to political campaigns in municipal elections, and to provide for full and fair enforcement of all the provisions of this Article. This Article is enacted in accordance with the terms of Sections 5 and 7 of Article XI of the Constitution of the State of California and Section 1.101 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

(Approved by Ord. 114-76, App. 4/276)

SEC. 16.502. CITATION. This Article may be cited as the San Francisco Municipal Election Campaign Contribution Control Ordinance. (Amended by Ord. 114-76, App. 4/276)

SEC. 16.503. DEFINITIONS. Whenever in this Article the following words or phrases are used, they shall mean:

(a) "Candidate" shall mean any individual listed on the ballot for nomination for or election to any City and County office or who otherwise has an affirmative right to seek nomination or election to such office.

(b) "Charitable Organization" shall mean an entity exempt from taxation pursuant to Title 26, Section 501 of the United States Code.

(c) "Committee" shall mean any person acting, or any combination of two or more persons acting jointly, in behalf of or in opposition to a candidate or to the qualification for the ballot or adoption of one or more measures.

(d) "Contribution" shall be defined as set forth in Government Code of the State of California (commencing at Section 81000); provided, however, that such contribution shall include loans of any kind or nature.

(e) "Election" shall mean any primary, general or special municipal election held in the City and County of San Francisco, including an initiative, referendum or recall election.

(f) "Enforcement authority" shall mean the District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco for criminal enforcement and the City Attorney for civil enforcement. Nothing in this Article shall be construed as limiting the authority of any law enforcement agency or prosecuting attorney to enforce the provisions of this Article under any circumstances where such law enforcement agency or prosecuting attorney otherwise has lawful authority to do so.

(g) "Measure" shall mean any City and County Charter amendment or other proposition submitted to a popular vote at an election, whether by initiative, referendum or recall procedure or otherwise, or circulated for purposes of submission to a popular vote at any election, whether or not the proposition qualifies for the ballot.

(h) "Person" shall mean any individual, partnership, corporation, association, firm, committee, club or other organization or group of persons, however organized. (Amended by Ord. 361-80, App. 8/5/80)

SEC. 16.504. ADOPTION OF GENERAL LAW — EXCEPTIONS. Except as otherwise provided in this Article, the provisions of Title 9 of Government Code of the State of California (commencing at Section 81000), including the penal provisions thereof, shall be applicable to any election held in the City and County of San Francisco. (Amended by Ord. 114-76, App. 4/276)

SEC. 16.505. CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION TRUST ACCOUNT — ESTABLISHMENT. Each campaign treasurer shall establish a campaign contribution trust account for the candidate or committee at an office of a bank located in the City and County of San Francisco, the account number and branch identification of which shall be filed with the Registrar of Voters within 10 days of the establishment thereof. (Amended by Ord. 114-76, App. 4/276)

SEC. 16.506. CAMPAIGN STATEMENTS — PUBLIC INSPECTION AND COPYMAKING. Campaign statements are to be open for public inspection and reproduction at the office of the Registrar of Voters during regular business hours and from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on the Saturday preceding an election. (Amended by Ord. 114-76, App. 4/276)

SEC. 16.507. CAMPAIGN STATEMENTS — RETENTION. Every campaign statement required to be filed in accordance with Section 16.504 shall be preserved by the Registrar of Voters for at least four years from the date upon which it was required to be filed under the terms of this Article. (Amended by Ord. 114-76, App. 4/276)

SEC. 16.508. CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS — LIMITATIONS.* (a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurer shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person with respect to a single election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed $500, provided, however, that for elections to be held after January 1, 1981 the amount shall not exceed $750, provided, however, that for elections to be held after January 1, 1983, the amount shall not exceed $1,000.

(b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this Section, each campaign trea-
surer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this Section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County.

(c) This Section shall not apply to any in-kind contribution of television or radio airtime to any candidate or committee granted to said candidate or committee pursuant to the "Fairness Doctrine" articulated in Cullman Broadcasting, 40 FCC 576 (1963). (Amended by Ord. 79-83, App. 2/18/83)

*See also Appendix P of Charter, 6/3/86; $500 limit.

SEC. 16.509. MUNICIPAL RUN-OFF ELECTION. All provisions of this Article, unless specified otherwise herein, shall be applicable in any municipal run-off election for any City and County office held pursuant to Section 9.103 of the Charter. In addition, the following provisions shall be applicable in any such municipal run-off election:

(a) No person other than a candidate shall make, and no campaign treasurers shall solicit or accept, any contribution which will cause the total amount contributed by such person in the municipal run-off election in support of or opposition to such candidate, including contributions to political committees supporting or opposing such candidate, to exceed, in addition to the contribution limit contained in Section 16.508, $250.

(b) If any person is found guilty of violating the terms of this Section, each campaign treasurer who received part or all of the contribution or contributions which constitute the violation shall pay promptly, from available campaign funds, if any, the amount received from such person in excess of the amount permitted by this Section to the City and County Treasurer for deposit in the General Fund of the City and County. (Amended by Ord. 81-83, App. 2/25/83)

SEC. 16.510. SOLICITATION OR ACCEPTANCE OF CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS—LIMITATIONS. No intended candidate for any public office of the City and County, and no committee acting on behalf of a candidate shall solicit or accept, or cause to be solicited or accepted, any contribution unless and until said candidate shall have filed a declaration of intention to become a candidate for a specific City and County office with the Registrar of Voters on a form to be prescribed by said Registrar of Voters; provided, however, that in any election in which members of the Board of Supervisors are elected by votes cast in a district, the office of a member of the Board of Supervisors shall be deemed to be a specific office of the City and County.

No person shall file a declaration of intention to become a candidate for more than one elective office of said City and County. For the purposes of this Section a committee acting on behalf of a candidate need not be controlled by or acting under the authorization of the candidate.

Except as provided below, any contributions solicited or accepted under this Section shall be expended only on behalf of the candidacy of the office specified in said declaration of intention to become a candidate. Contributions solicited or accepted under this Section for one individual shall not be expended for the candidacy of any other individual or in support of or opposition to any measure. If an individual ceases to be a candidate or fails to qualify under the provisions of the Charter for any office for which contributions have been solicited or accepted, then all unexpended contributions shall be returned on a pro rata basis to those persons who have made said contributions.

Unexpended contributions held by a candidate or committee after the date of the election in which said candidate or measure appeared on the ballot may be returned on a pro rata basis to those persons who have made said contributions, donated to a charitable organization, or as contributions to a candidate or a committee acting on behalf of a candidate, transferred to any legally constituted committee established by or on behalf of the candidate, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code of the State of California (commencing at Section 81000). (Amended by Ord. 80-83, App. 2/18/83)

SEC. 16.512. DUTIES OF REGISTRAR OF VOTERS. In addition to other duties required of him or her under general law and the terms of this Article, the Registrar of Voters shall:

(a) Prepare and publish written instructions explaining the duties of persons, candidates and committees under this Article.

(b) Determine whether required statements and declarations have been filed with him or her office and, if so, whether they conform on their face with the requirements of this Article.

(c) Notify promptly all persons, candidates and committees known to him or her who have failed to file a statement in the form and at the time required by Section 16.504 hereof.

(d) Report apparent violations of this Article to the District Attorney.

(e) Compile and maintain a current list of all statements or parts of statements filed with him or her office pertaining to each candidate and each measure.

(f) Cooperate with the District Attorney in the performance of the duties of the District Attorney as they are related to this Article.

(g) Enforce or cause to be enforced the provisions of this Article.

(h) Prepare and publish adequate procedures to notify all persons, candidates and committees in advance relative to filing dates and forms required by Section 16.504 hereof. (Amended by Ord. 99-76, App. 7/17/76)

SEC. 16.513. DUTIES OF ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY. In addition to the other duties required of him or her under the provisions of this Article, the enforcement authority for civil enforcement shall review such campaign statements filed with the Registrar of Voters as the Registrar shall refer to him or her for legal compliance with the provisions of this Article. (Amended by Ord. 361-80, App. 8/5/80)

SEC. 16.514. DISTRICT ATTORNEY—COMPLAINTS, LEGAL ACTION, INVESTIGATORY POWERS, CITY ATTORNEY ADVICE. (a) Any person who believes that a violation of any portion of this Article has occurred, may file a complaint with the District Attorney. If the District Attorney determines that there is reason to believe a violation of this Article has occurred, he or she shall make an investigation. Whenever the District Attorney has reason to believe a willful violation of this Article has occurred or is about to occur, he or she may institute such legal action at such time as he or she deems necessary to prevent further violations.

(b) The District Attorney shall have such investigatory powers as are necessary for the performance of the duties prescribed in this Article and may demand, and be furnished, records of campaign contributions and expenses at any time.

(c) Any person may request the City Attorney for advice with respect to any provision of this Article. The City Attorney shall within 14 days of the receipt of said written request provide the advice in writing or advise the person who made the request that no opinion will be issued. The

(Continued on page 70)
Downtown Ballpark

PROPOSITION P

Shall the City enter into an agreement with Spectator Management Group, consistent with specified principles regarding the land acquisition, financing and construction of a new ballpark in the China Basin area, and shall certain zoning laws be amended to facilitate the construction of a ballpark in that area?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Mayor and Spectator Management Group have signed a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") to build and finance a baseball ballpark in the China Basin area. The San Francisco Giants baseball team would play their home games at this ballpark.

The proposed site for the ballpark is currently zoned for heavy industrial use with a height limit of 40 feet. The City Planning Code also requires that one parking space be provided on-site for every fifteen seats in a sports stadium.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition P calls for the City and Spectator to sign an agreement based on certain principles of the MOU. This agreement will cover the development, financing, land acquisition, sharing of revenue and ownership of the ballpark and land. Proposition P also would amend the City Planning Code to: (1) change the zoning so that a ballpark containing no more than 48,000 seats could be built under certain conditions; (2) change the building height limit from 40 feet to 150 feet; and (3) require a minimum of 1,200 parking spaces on-site instead of current sports stadium code requirements of one parking place for every fifteen seats.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City and Spectator to sign an agreement to build and finance a ballpark in the China Basin area. You also want to make certain changes to the City’s zoning laws so that a ballpark could be built there.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City and Spectator to sign an agreement to build and finance a ballpark in the China Basin area, and you do not want to make changes in the City’s zoning laws so that a ballpark could be built there.

Controller’s Statement on “P”

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

“Should the proposed Ordinance be approved and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by indeterminate amounts averaging in excess of $3 million per year for at least ten years and as much as $10 million for construction costs. Thereafter there could either be no effect on the cost of government or an increase in net revenues of presently indeterminate annual amounts dependent upon levels of attendance and operating costs of the stadium facility. At the end of a forty-year lease term there could be an increase in revenues to the City and County in presently indeterminate amounts.”

How “P” Got on the Ballot

On August 9, the Registrar of Voters received a letter from the Mayor requesting that Proposition P be placed on the ballot. The City Charter allows the Mayor to place a proposed ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

San Francisco is a diverse family-sized City. Our diversity is a combination of our residents, our neighborhoods, our lifestyles and the civic and public amenities that make-up what a City is all about.

The City has put together a smart deal using a private developer to construct and guarantee financing for a new ballpark. We have invested in a public-private partnership with limited financial resources and we will receive a return on our investment over the life of the agreement. That means we will be receiving funds from the ballpark’s profits to fund programs for homeless, AIDS, crack cocaine, affordable housing and jobs for our youth.

Our negotiations have resulted in a financial arrangement which leaves the city with no bond debt and no tax increases. In fact, the city will maintain ownership of the land; receive 20% of the profits for 40 years in return for investing $2 million per year for 10 years; be paid 7 1/2% interest on a $1 million per year loan for 10 years at the end of the term subject to the renegotiation of the management contract.

Baseball is one of the last affordable, family-oriented types of entertainment left in this town.

This Ballpark will be easily accessible by public transportation which will be significantly improved in the China Basin area. A truly mass transit oriented Ballpark. And given that the financial side of our deal is a good one, San Franciscans ought to ask themselves, why not?

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

The $115 million China Basin Stadium proposal may be a smart deal for Bob Lurie and the out-of-town developer, but it’s a bad deal for San Francisco taxpayers.

The deal commits San Francisco to some $60 million in direct payments, loans, land costs, parking garage, site preparation, toxic removal and cost overruns. Further, the City gave away the right to collect property and admission/ticket tax. The most profitable elements — advertising and concessions — go to the developer, who also gets to set ticket prices.

It insults the intelligence of voters to suggest that possible stadium revenues will fund programs for the homeless, AIDS, crack cocaine, affordable housing and jobs for youth. Is the mayor depending on something as risky as a baseball stadium to solve these important problems? Even the City Planner says that baseball stadiums do not make money.

City resources devoted directly to these problems would have a real effect TODAY.

Why should we commit millions of scarce dollars toward financing a second cold and windy stadium just four miles from Candlestick?

And why put a stadium right in the middle of an already congested area, guaranteeing total gridlock?

Why? Because Lurie and the developer both stand to make millions at the expense of San Francisco’s future. Planning priorities shouldn’t be based on the threats of a single man.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION P.

Jack Morrison, Former Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Co-Chairs, San Franciscans for Planning Priorities

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

You are asked to contribute millions in limited City resources to meet the demands of a multi-millionaire who won’t contribute a dime to build a stadium for his own team.

COSTS TO YOU AT MINIMUM: $10 million for cost overruns; $7 million for relocation of port facilities; $7 – 15 million for a parking garage for luxury box owners and Giants employees; unknown millions for toxic cleanup and site preparation paid for by sale of MUNI property valued at over $20 million; 11 acres leased to the developer at $1 per year for an arena.

The developer will pay NO property taxes.

Imagine a stadium named after the highest bidder, such as “EXXON Stadium”.

To pay for this, ticket, parking and concession prices will go up. Baseball will not be affordable to average fans.

This is not a downtown stadium. It is a neighborhood stadium bordered by existing and planned residential communities. Full environmental impacts will not be known before you vote...

We DO know that the stadium will be a 150’ wall obscuring the Bay. An “environmentally sensitive” stadium is a contradiction.

China Basin IS cold and windy. Parking will be half that available at Candlestick, yet Planning Department predicts only 20% of fans will take public transit. Traffic jams, competition for scarce parking, uncomfortable weather, high prices, and a stadium with 15,000 FEWER seats than Candlestick is a formula for REDUCED attendance!

Traffic congestion costs businesses millions as employees and shipments are trapped in gridlock, and customers go elsewhere.

In a city cutting firefighters, MUNI and libraries because of tight budgets, it’s outrageous to build a SECOND cold, windy stadium four miles from Candlestick.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION P.

Jack Morrison, Former Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Co-Chairs, San Franciscans for Planning Priorities

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION P

The opponents of the new ballpark are not being fair.

First, they claim that the Giants aren’t contributing “a dime to build a stadium.” That’s unfair.

The Giants will pay 10 times more rent than they pay now. The City will share in the profits by receiving 20% of the income.

Second, they point to other “costs” to the City without acknowledging that the ballpark will be constructed and financed with no city bond debt, no tax increase, and no loss of city funds.

Third, the opponents say the City will receive “no property taxes.”

They fail to point out that even after the ballpark has been constructed by private developers the City will hold the deed to the land and eventually title to the ballpark itself.

And the new ballpark will generate millions in new revenues from fans who will not only attend games but eat and shop downtown. Something that Candlestick’s location does not encourage.

Leading environmentalists agree that this ballpark will bring less auto traffic into our neighborhoods than Candlestick which has very limited public transit access.

Muni Metro will be extended and bus services expanded making the new ballpark the most transit oriented ballpark possible.

The new ballpark deal is a smart one. It protects the City’s taxpayers while generating funds for needed services. It improves public transit while reducing auto traffic from baseball fans. It adds beauty and economic vitality to a blighted part of the City.

Submitted by the Mayor and Board of Supervisors
Downtown Ballpark

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

The San Francisco League of Conservation Voters is pleased to support the building of a new ballpark at China Basin. That site will be far better served by mass transit than Candlestick Park. In addition to existing bus lines that currently run from Market Street, a new Muni Metro line is being built, providing service to the ballpark along the Embarcadero and allowing for convenient transfer for BART users. South Bay fans will be able to come to games by using peninsula Caltrain. Under current plans, the Caltrain station would be no more than two blocks from the ballpark site. We will continue to work with the Mayor and city leaders on plans to extend peninsula train service directly to the ballpark with continuing service to a downtown station.

In Toronto, 65% of all game attendees come to the city's new ballpark via public transit. San Francisco’s Transit First policy states that the city must do all in its power to assure that mass transit alternatives are implemented and operational when any new building takes place. We are convinced the City stands ready to fully implement this policy, and to guarantee that 65% or more of those attending ballgames will come by means other than private cars. Currently over 85% of all attendees come to games at Candlestick by private automobile. In following Toronto’s lead and implementing the City’s Transit First policy, building the new stadium should actually decrease traffic congestion and air pollution, by lessening the number of cars on Bay Area freeways and roads during game times. Please join with us in supporting the new ballpark. Vote Yes on Proposition P.

San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Jeffrey Henne, President

The following officers and members of the Latino Democratic Club of San Francisco urge you to vote Yes on Proposition P. The downtown ballpark will provide affordable family entertainment. Let’s keep the Giants in San Francisco.

Richard Sevilla

Ruth Picon
San Ruiz
Ricardo Hernandez
James Morales
Marcelo Rodriguez
Supervisor Jim Gonzales

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION P!

San Francisco can win twice over with a China Basin ballpark. We can have an improved world-class football stadium at Candlestick and baseball at a China Basin ballpark.

San Francisco works best when we make the solutions fit the needs we have as a diverse city of strong neighborhoods.

The China Basin ballpark plan is a good fit for our city and for our city’s communities.

Hunter’s Point-Bayview will benefit from the Candlestick improvements and new summertime events that can be added when the Giants play at China Basin.

Proposal P means more jobs, an economic boost to our neighborhoods, and great entertainment in our city.

This new ballpark will also bring more minority jobs because our city’s new Minority Business Enterprise and Women’s Business Enterprise goals are part of the agreement.

Hon. Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Supervisor Doris Ward
Assemblyman John Burton

The new China Basin ballpark meets the high standards San Franciscans want in our City.

It will fit well in the City’s environmental planning, with a stronger transit-first link.

Under the new plans, China Basin won’t be turned into a desert of car lots. Air pollution will be reduced compared to the level caused by Candlestick traffic.

The China Basin ballpark size also will fit into the human scale of our City, with design features that make it a good neighbor in a new neighborhood that will be an important part of our city’s future.

Baseball is a great sport that brings us all together to root for the home team. It’s fun and it’s affordable, for families and kids as well.

This plan has the support of the League of Conservation Voters. I urge you to vote YES on Proposition P for a San Francisco-style ballpark that will serve us all well.

Terence Tyrone Hallinan
Member Board of Supervisors

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

From its raucous beginnings, San Francisco has grown into a World Class City. Now, we must make sure the City continues to build its World Class reputation, not shrink back from it. I urge you to vote Yes on Proposition P.

A downtown ballpark will be part of what makes San Francisco a proud city in the years ahead. How can we remain a World Class City without the Giants? Big league cities need big league teams playing in big league ballparks.

Proposition P is a good deal for San Francisco. With a relatively small investment, we can build a new ballpark that will bring millions of dollars of revenue into the City.

Yes, we do have other immediate social problems to address, but we cannot neglect the future to pay for the present. We can and must do both.

I urge you to vote for San Francisco to remain a World Class City. Vote Yes on Proposition P.

Supervisor Angela Alioto

San Francisco deserves a world-class baseball park; a ballpark that will generate social and economic benefits for the City and will keep the Giants in San Francisco. Vote YES on Proposition P.

- **Proposition P is a smart deal.** The City’s financial commitment is minimal, especially when compared to the economic benefits a ballpark brings. While other cities, such as Oakland, Sacramento, and Denver, are offering huge sums of money to entice a major league sports franchise, we have the Giants now.

- **A modern, comfortable facility is necessary.** The new ballpark will have good sight lines, ample restrooms, accessible concessions, better weather, and, with the help of modern engineering technology, reduced wind.

- **The ballpark makes transportation sense.** It will be centrally located and served by every major public transit system in the Bay Area, including Muni Metro’s Embarcadero extension, Muni busses, BART, CalTrain, and ferries. It will also be easily accessible from US 101 and I-280. This public transit ballpark will make Giants baseball even more accessible to seniors, to the disabled, to kids — to all of us.

Major league baseball is one of the City’s last forms of affordable entertainment for individuals and families. Like the opera, symphony, ballet, parks, museums, and 49er football, Giants baseball is a part of San Francisco’s rich cultural fabric. So let’s build our field of dreams!

Like the Golden Gate Bridge and the cable cars, the San Francisco Giants are a unique, irreplaceable civic treasure, something we cannot afford to lose. Say Hey, Say Yes to a new San Francisco Ballpark! Vote YES on Proposition P.

San Francisco Ballpark Alliance

Barbara Bagot, President

The San Francisco Democratic Central Committee overwhelmingly supports Proposition P.

Our diverse membership of businesspeople, lawyers, renters, homeowners, women, men, gay men, lesbians, Blacks, Latinos and Asian Americans recognize this financially “smart” deal and we endorse it.

We applaud the efforts to make this a public transit oriented ballpark.


Norman Ishimoto Ed McGovern Jim Morales Beverly Prior Matthew Rothschild Alfredo Rodriguez Arnold Townsend

Proposition P is a great opportunity for San Francisco. We can create a spectacular public facility, anchoring a revitalized waterfront area, in a business arrangement where the taxpayer wins. Indeed, the business terms for this facility are among the best ever negotiated anywhere in the country!

To improve San Francisco — and keep the Giants — Vote YES on Proposition P.

Gerald Newfanger, President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

As members of the lesbian and gay community, we strongly support Mayor Agnos' China Basin ballpark proposal.

This ballpark keeps our city's human scale as a transit-first ballpark, with wise financial safeguards for taxpayers, and a good fit for the China Basin area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harry Britt</th>
<th>Paul Herman</th>
<th>Jack McGowan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roberta Achienberg</td>
<td>Ray Chalker</td>
<td>Rich Worthington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleve Jones</td>
<td>Tom Annunzio</td>
<td>Tony Trevizo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Melboised</td>
<td>James Foster</td>
<td>Allan Havron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Belote</td>
<td>Ron Braithwaite</td>
<td>Carla Soderling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Bretz</td>
<td>Robert Barnes</td>
<td>Wendy Gershaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Cameron</td>
<td>Todd Dickinson</td>
<td>William Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam David</td>
<td>Dennis Collins</td>
<td>Raymond King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Hamel</td>
<td>Leonard Graff</td>
<td>William Iretton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwenn Craig</td>
<td>Rick Pacurar</td>
<td>James Haron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Krefting</td>
<td>Diana Van Gorder</td>
<td>Wayne Ollila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Maggiani</td>
<td>Catherine Dodd</td>
<td>Clint Royce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rikki Streicher</td>
<td>Pamela Swan</td>
<td>Richard Macri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Neely</td>
<td>Carole Migden</td>
<td>Henry Repetto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Genera</td>
<td>Don Knauson</td>
<td>Ray Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Allman</td>
<td>Jean Harris</td>
<td>Roy Hoffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana Bermudes</td>
<td>Melinda Paras</td>
<td>Martin Thomason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tod Hill</td>
<td>Sharyn Satalsky</td>
<td>Steven Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Newstat</td>
<td>Tony Travers</td>
<td>Myron Crews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Dockendorf</td>
<td>Brett Dean</td>
<td>Adria Ann McMurray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Housh</td>
<td>Matthew Rothschild</td>
<td>Tom Harlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Huberwan</td>
<td>Trent Orr</td>
<td>Mark Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Friday</td>
<td>Tim Taylor</td>
<td>Ric Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Grubb</td>
<td>Michael Fiumara</td>
<td>David Nembhard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Shafer</td>
<td>Gerald Whitehead</td>
<td>Wally Dennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Bush</td>
<td>Carmen Vasquez</td>
<td>Chuck Demmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Coulter</td>
<td>Russell Kassman</td>
<td>Danny Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Day</td>
<td>Kris Perry</td>
<td>Frank Rivera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hargrove</td>
<td>John Donofrio</td>
<td>Thomas Sherick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Doan</td>
<td>Mitch Vogel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edgar Calderwood</td>
<td>Gerald Naberbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walter Christom</td>
<td>Rocky Rockwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur White</td>
<td>Grady Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lila Byrd</td>
<td>Daniel Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ronald Ernst</td>
<td>Gary Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Alman</td>
<td>Michael Faveretto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Maloof</td>
<td>Delmar Neal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rick Kiner</td>
<td>James Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rob Mallin</td>
<td>Lonnie Albin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Perry</td>
<td>John Stockard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ballpark also insures that San Francisco will continue to be a city with room for all of our interests. We are proud to support our city's diversity.

Vote for One Another. Vote Yes on Proposition P.

---

This ballpark gives us an opportunity to implement further the City's Transit First policy.

Toronto, where 65% of the fans come to their new stadium by public transit, has shown that a downtown ballpark is viable without building significant additional parking. We can do at least as well in San Francisco.

At Candlestick, over 85% of the patrons arrive in cars. At China Basin we will work to produce a dramatically higher reliance on public transit in order to protect neighborhood integrity, prevent traffic tie-ups and reduce air pollution.

Our new ballpark will be served by a new Muni Metro service already approved for the waterfront. We are working to bring about the proposed extension of the peninsula rail service to provide fans from the peninsula with frequent schedules serving the ballpark and Market Street.

We are committed to making our new ballpark the most transit efficient in the nation.

Mayor Art Agnos
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION P

The San Francisco Republican Party recommends a YES on Proposition P.

For the first time since his election, the Mayor has demonstrated, with his support of "P", that he has given some thought to the economic future of the City.

Republicans are delighted and are happy to offer assistance on other fronts if the Mayor begins to provide leadership for the City's future economic prosperity.

It was Republican Mayor George Christopher's vision of San Francisco as a world class city that brought the Giants here originally and we believe that it is important to keep that vision. Vote YES on P!

James E. Gilleran, Chairman
San Francisco Republican County Central Committee

Affordable housing is important to all San Franciscans. It certainly is to us.
We believe that housing and the new China Basin ballpark are compatible and fit well together.
Boston's Fenway Park, Chicago's Wrigley field and a downtown ballpark in Honolulu all demonstrate that housing and ballparks work well next to each other. In fact, the housing around these ballparks has tended to remain more affordable over time.
The China Basin ballpark gives San Francisco an opportunity to support a business deal that makes both financial and housing sense. We urge you to VOTE YES ON P.

Tom McConnell, Chairman
Issues Committee
San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Curt Augustine
Robert R. Bacci
Kenneth Blumenthal
J. Bingham Dean
Sam T. Harper
Jun Hauyama
K. Martin Keller
Carol Marshall
Brian Mavrogeorge
Bruce M. O'Neill
Pablo Wong

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION P

Those of us who live and work in the vicinity of the proposed stadium urge your No vote on Proposition P because this oversized structure — equivalent to a 15 story office building with many times the occupants of the Bank of America building — is as incompatible in our neighborhood as it would be in yours.
Imagine trying to drive to or from your home, only to find your driveway and street blocked with double-parked cars, left by fans who could not get into the 1500 spaces that the City is obligated to build, or by those not eager to take uncertain public transit when games will be over at 10:30 or later at night. Would you welcome tailgaters and their beer drinkers celebrating in the street and sidewalk in front of your home, leaving their trash for you to clean up?
A new stadium should not be built at South Beach-China Basin, for the same reasons that it should not be imposed on the Marina, the Sunset, the Richmond District, Noe Valley, or the Mission. Please don't inflict on your neighbors what you would not want for yourself. Let's fix Candlestick, Vote No on P.

Richard H. Moss
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION P

San Franciscans for Planning Priorities is a broad coalition of neighbors, neighborhood groups, environmental groups and business people united in our opposition to the China Basin Stadium. We believe the Mayor is WRONG when he says the stadium is good for the whole City.

Joel Blum, Pace Studios, Inc.
Joel Ventresca
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Francis J. Clauss
Potrero Boosters & Merchants Assn.
Andrew Nash
President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Jack Morrison
Chair, San Franciscans for Planning Priorities
Susan Kosakowsky Burdick
Principal, The Burdick Group
Bruce A. Burdick
South Park Improvement Assoc.
Peter Moylan
San Francisco Tomorrow
Robert Bradford
Potrero Boosters & Merchants Assoc.
Toby Levy
South Park Improvement Association
Susan Angus
John Barzis
Former San Francisco Supervisor
Toby Levine
James W. Haas
Zach Cowan
Ruth Gravanis

Last year City Hall cut $70 million in direct public services for neighborhoods, but this year City Hall wants to set aside $75 million in direct public subsidies for an unnecessary downtown stadium.

Who will benefit?

Spectator owner multi-billionaire ($4.5 billion), tycoon, and Chicagoan Jay Pritzker, the head of the 10th wealthiest family in the United States, who controls one of the largest conglomerates in the world which includes 158 Hyatt Hotels and 60 corporations.

Giants owner multi-millionaire ($400 million), corporate raider, and speculator Robert Lurie, one of the wealthiest men in the United States, who controls a huge industrial and real estate empire.

Public funds should not be used to increase the wealth of affluent individuals.

Vote NO on P.

Joel Ventresca
Immediate Past President
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

The proposed costly stadium is fiscally irresponsible. The stadium would blight and destroy the emerging neighborhoods south of Market and the Mission Bay Project. Conscientious San Franciscans Vote NO on Proposition P.

Eureka Valley Trails and Art Network

The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 57 community associations across the City, asks you to join your neighbors in voting against Proposition P.

A ballpark at China Basin would disrupt the lives of San Franciscans living south of Market. It would paralyze traffic and aggravate parking problems. The bulky, 150-foot structure would wall off the waterfront from everyone’s enjoyment.

Besides bad environmental planning, Proposition P is fiscally irresponsible. Proposition P asks us to pay millions for a second ballpark when we already have Candlestick. Proposition P takes away money needed to provide police and fire protection, to keep libraries open, for health and social services, after-school programs, and other activities that benefit residents and their families.

VOTE NO on Proposition P!

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION P

Here's how the Examiner (7/28/89) reports the expected transit impact:

"TRAFFIC HORROR ENVISIONED ON WEEKDAYS — PLANNERS FORESEE HUGE SNARL WITH AVERAGE CROWD.

"Even with a new garage, more freeway ramps, extended Muni lines, train access and perhaps ferryboats, a capacity crowd heading for a weekday game could turn the area around San Francisco's proposed new stadium into a major-league Traffic Hell."

"The potential for a sellout of a day game is high if a team is in the pennant race..."

"No contingency plans were evident...beyond the promise to promote the use of public transportation..."

At Candlestick, big crowds aren't big problems.
There's over ten times as much on-site parking, and the south-of-town freeway location means most fans can avoid downtown entirely.

San Franciscans To Improve Candlestick

Here's what Art Agnos (and many others) said the last time we voted on a downtown stadium:

"A 7th and Townsend stadium is an ill-conceived, unneeded, unwanted, traffic-gridlocking, dollar-devouring white elephant that would not work, not help the Giants, is not downtown and affords practically no parking.

"In the real world we would all eventually pay for not only the stadium itself, but also for the extra multi-millions of dollars needed for new freeway exits, relocating the SP depot, adding new Muni facilities and shoring up subgrade land with a high water table."

(Voter Pamphlet 11/87)

San Franciscans To Improve Candlestick

FISCAL IMPACT TO GIANTS:
It's a secret.
They're not obligated to provide one cent towards costs for China Basin, or to tell us how much they expect to profit from it.
Bob Lurie inherited hundreds of millions.
He paid $8,000,000 for the Giants; they're now worth ten times that.

He's already making a profit at Candlestick; we're not told how much.
Taxpayers of modest means shouldn't have to subsidize him. He doesn't need it. And the city can't afford it.

Grassroots

Because weekday afternoon ballgames downtown would produce catastrophic traffic and parking crises, some people assume day games would only occur on weekends.

That rumor is false. The Giants would still have to play approximately one weekday afternoon each week they're in town.
Chronicle sports columnist Art Rosenbaum reports (8/15/89):
"To avoid clogged traffic at China Basin, it has been stated the only day games would be on Saturday and Sunday.
"That can't be, according to baseball's agreement with the players' association. Some getaway days (final game of a series)

must be played early to meet travel obligations."

Also, since West Coast night games are too late for national prime-time, any game big enough for national TV couldn't be played at night, either.
Up to 45,000 fans, roughly 80% in cars, driving endless blocks, looking for parking.
But at Candlestick: no problem!

San Franciscans To Improve Candlestick
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION P

FISCAL IMPACT TO PUBLIC (TAXPAYER):
$20,000,000 “investment” (not to be repaid);
$10,000,000 “loan” (repaid only if contract extended after 40 years);
$10,000,000 cost overruns (virtually guaranteed);
$10,000,000 parking garage construction;
$30,000,000 land value (North Beach Muni barn site, traded for China Basin land);
$10,000,000-$30,000,000 cost of replacement Muni barn land ($10,000,000-$15,000,000 if bought; $30,000,000 land value if City College’s West Campus — “Balboa Reservoir” — is taken);
$80,000,000-$110,000,000 TOTAL DIRECT CITY COSTS
INDIRECT COSTS:
Use of now-illegal taxfree bonds estimated to cost federal revenues $1,000,000/year; $30,000,000 over bond lifetime;

FISCAL IMPACT, CANDLESTICK ALTERNATIVE:
We think pro sports should be self-supporting.
Taxpayers have enough other burdens.
Improving Candlestick is inherently so much cheaper, it doesn’t require public subsidies.
It’s much cheaper to make multiple use of one facility, than to have two single-purpose stadiums.
Candlestick’s land, foundation and structure are already paid for.
There’s room to grow, and a “buffer zone” to minimize environmental impact.
Developing around Candlestick could finance stadium and trans-

City will pay much more for traffic/crowd control downtown than at Candlestick; amount unknown.
City will pay rather than collect property taxes on China Basin; amount unknown (estimated $1,000,000-plus/year);
City must pay full cost of design changes requested by City; amount unknown.
City may pay additional site preparation costs and will pay an unknown (but very large) amount to re-design transit access.

RETURN ON CITY INVESTMENT:
Essentially zero, since the $2,000,000-or-so/year expected is not significantly different from what we get now — Candlestick produces almost that much in parking revenues alone!

Grassroots

Here’s how the Examiner’s Rob Morse reports it (7/26/89):
“... the economics of the stadium game always come down to welfare for the rich.
“You just have to accept the fact that The City is giving Bob Lurie a $115 million welfare Cadillac that seats 45,000.
“I accept it, because I will be one of the fans riding in this welfare Cadillac...
“Just as it is worth paying welfare to poor people so they don’t starve, it is worth paying welfare to rich people so they will provide us with peanuts, popcorn and a ball team.”
We understand why Morse thinks it’s “welfare for the rich”, but we can’t understand why we “just have to accept the fact”. Especially on Election Day.

Grassroots

Peace-and-Freedom/6CD Club
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION P

Your NO vote on Proposition P is not a vote against the Giants. Combined with a YES vote on Proposition V, it asks Mayor Agnos to begin serious negotiations to keep the Giants at Candlestick.

The Giants should stay at Candlestick, where improvements costing $30 million are already being made. A creative plan has been proposed for additional improvements that would make Candlestick a world-class stadium at no cost to taxpayers. Let’s work together rather than using strong-arm tactics on one another.

A ballpark at China Basin would cause immense traffic gridlock and parking problems for residents and commuters who work in the City as well as ballpark spectators, increase automobile pollution, reduce open space, blight nearby neighborhoods, and adversely impact the development of the last prime open area for housing in San Francisco at Mission Bay.

Proposition P would make taxpayers liable for many costs hidden in the mayor’s memorandum of understanding with Spectactor. These include acquiring the waterfront parcel and giving it free to the developer, toxic cleanup and other land preparation, ballpark infrastructure, traffic and transit improvements, construction overruns, direct loans and payments to Spectactor, a 1500-space parking garage (with 1200 spaces free to luxury box holders and others), etc. The total will be more than $100 million.

It would be far cheaper to buy the Giant’s franchise and keep them at Candlestick.

Vote NO on Proposition P.

Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association

VOTE NO on P
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors

SFT has spent many years working on long-range planning for the City, including China Basin.

Using land for a baseball stadium and an arena is a planning disaster for the Port, open space, housing, and Mission Bay.

The stadium would form a 150 foot wall blocking the Bay. It would cause horrendous parking and traffic problems. The City would pay millions for toxic cleanup to prepare the site AT NO COST TO THE DEVELOPER.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION P.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Proposition P is a giveaway to the rich at the expense of San Francisco’s poor and working people. It could cost us over $100 million. Building a stadium instead of housing will raise rents citywide. We need AIDS funding, affordable housing, childcare, expanded healthcare and mass transit, senior and youth programs, and jobs — not another stadium.

Stephanie Hedgecote
Gloria La Riva
for the All-Peoples Congress

- A downtown stadium will cause gridlock!
- A city study shows 11 downtown intersections will be paralyzed before & after games.
- Another study shows the Bay Bridge will be backed up and the freeway jammed.

Don’t do this to our city! Vote no on Proposition P.

Senior Richard Hongisto
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION P

WHY IS THE NEW MUNI BARN SITE SECRET?
To get China Basin, the city will trade North Beach land now used for parking buses.

So where will the buses park?
As of ballot argument deadline, Mayor Agnos' plan is still secret. There are two known alternatives.

One is to buy land. City Hall can use "eminent domain", but they'd have to pay market value. This would probably be $10-$15 million. Since this is part of the price we're paying, it's clear why they wouldn't want us to know until after the election.

But the more likely alternative is City College's West Cam-
pus ("Balboa Reservoir").

This land once held classrooms, a library and other campus facilities, torn down by the city when it took the land for a reservoir — which has never been used except for parking.

The Supervisors now support returning that land to City College, and the state has agreed to fund re-building. But the Mayor is blocking it. He won't say why.

Until after the election.

Grassroots

WHY NO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT?
Any big project has to file an EIR before approval. How can the voters approve a project without even a preliminary draft of an EIR?

The wide-open design will mean noise- and light-pollution — especially if "EXXON FIELD", in gigantic, brightly-lit letters, ends up as the dominant South-of-Market visual landmark.

Traffic and parking will be bad enough weekends and evenings; weekday afternoons will be disastrous. Downtown air quality will

worsen either way.

With the west wind, how much fan trash will blow into the bay?

What would an earthquake do, given the squishy landfill they're building on? If the "Greenhouse Effect" raises sea levels, will "EXXON FIELD" become "EXXON SWAMP"?

What else don't we know?

Grassroots

"THE EMERGING CONSENSUS IS: NO"
Here's how the Examiner (8/11/89) reports South-of-Market opposition:

"SOUTH PARK FEARS STADIUM IS TOO CLOSE TO HOME"

"... it has become an area of intense vitality, dense with small businesses, an economically and ethnically mixed neighborhood that works.

"Whether the community can accommodate... the proposed China Basin ballpark is Topic A in South Park...

"The emerging consensus — in the cafes and professional offices and homeless hotels... — is no.

"'Once you bring 45,000 strangers through your neighborhood, it makes you a lot more vulnerable to anything,' architect Toby Levy said.

"South Park is mobilizing to fend off the ballpark... just two blocks south... Residents fear... traffic, parking, lighting and noise problems will overwhelm and ruin the good and vital thing they are building."

Grassroots

Abandoning Candlestick also implies abandoning Bayview/ Hunters Point.

Moving the Giants downtown would remove a major incentive to build the long-overdue Muni lighttrail on the Bayshore corridor parallel to Third Street.

City planners already are too unconcerned about the neighbor-
hoods, and the downtown stadium will make them even more unconcerned.

Moving the Giants downtown means moving them from a neigh-
borhood where they are wanted and beneficial, to one where they are a major nuisance.

This tax money should instead be spent improving transit access to Candlestick — benefiting the entire southeast quarter of the city and beyond.

Espanola Jackson
STIC
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LURIE'S SUBTERFUGE

Lurie inherited $400,000,000 from his late father and now wants to inherit another $115,000,000 from our taxpayers for an unneeded toy. Let him do what the Los Angeles Dodgers did — they built and paid for their stadium with their own money!

The Giants moved to San Francisco because Candlestick provided 10,000 parking spaces. Who would walk 8–10 blocks at night at China Basin to their car?

China Basin is just 4 miles from Candlestick. Weather tests by the City, Bechtel Corporation, and the 49ers proved that China Basin weather is the same as Candlestick.

Official reports show that our hospitals, streets, fire, police and other facilities need $1,000,000,000 in repairs. Should Lurie's unreasonable demands have priority?

If Candlestick is used only 10 times a year for football, it will fast disintegrate by non-use. Why must we have two stadiums?

Candlestick has a debt of $14,000,000 due to recent expansion. Baseball parking pays $1,500,000 per year on this debt. If we submit to Lurie's demands, our taxpayers will have to bear this additional loss.

Lurie paid $8,000,000 to buy the Giants. Today, the quoted price is $80,000,000. But Lurie will not put up a single dime for the stadium he demands.

Crowds of over 50,000 fans have been attending Candlestick despite Lurie's consistent criticism in order to get a new stadium at taxpayers' expense.

Two years ago, Prop. W was on the ballot for a new stadium at 7th and Townsend. This proposal was so false the Superior Court ordered a public correction. Now, Lurie is doing the same!

Over 60% of the fans come from the Peninsula. Why compete them to enter the mid-city and cause more gridlock?

VOTE NO on P!

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

AN OPEN LETTER TO MAYOR AGNOS:

Please reconsider your attitude toward people who disagree with you.

Here's how the Chronicle (8/15/89) reports it:

"ANGRY AGNOS BLASTS BALLPARK FOES"

"A fiery Art Agnos last night came out with both fists swinging... Speaking before the... Toklas... Club, an admittedly 'emotional' Agnos lit into ballpark opponents..."

Don't we have a right to decide how our money is spent? If not, why are we voting on it?

"Turning his voice up another notch, Agnos noted that he has stood with the gay community on a series of issues."

Did you do so because it was right? Or in exchange for gay support for the stadium?

Democracy is like baseball, Art. You win some and you lose some. Would you have it any other way?

Grassroots

WILL THE GREENHOUSE EFFECT TURN "EXXON FIELD" INTO "EXXON SWAMP"?

Many scientists warn that the rapidly-rising amount of carbon dioxide (CO2) in the atmosphere, resulting from ever-increasing burning of fossil fuels, will raise world temperatures an unknown amount; CO2 holds heat more than other air does.

Temperatures could increase enough to melt enough polar ice to raise sea levels and submerge many coastal flats. Nobody knows how quickly this will happen, but the rate will certainly increase since CO2 levels are still increasing. Many scientists predict substantial increases in temperatures and sea levels within 30-60 years.

China Basin will be among the first to go.

It's at water's edge, already close to sea level.

Worse yet, it's landfill!

The earth underneath is not bedrock; it's mud.

As sea level rises, China Basin will become soggier and softer, long before it's submerged.

Candlestick's designers neglected to plan adequately. Is history repeating itself?

Grassroots
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION P

Below is reprinted from the 1987 San Francisco Voters Hand- 
book the argument, which Mayor Art Agnos signed, against Prop- 
osition W which proposed to locate a baseball stadium four blocks 
away from the location proposed by Proposition P:

"A 7th and Townsend stadium is an ill conceived, unneeded, 
unwanted, underfunded, traffic gridlocking, dollar devouring 
white elephant that would NOT work, NOT help the Giants, is NOT 
downtown and affords practically no parking. In the REAL world 
we would ALL eventually pay for not only the stadium itself, but 
also for the extra multi millions of dollars needed for new freeway 
exits, relocating the SP depot, adding new Muni facilities, and

shoring up subgrade land with a high water table.
Vote No!
Concerned Taxpayers of San Francisco
Art Agnos. . . ."
We still agree with Art Agnos’ 1987 argument against the 
baseball stadium.
Vote No on Proposition P!

Giants Fans Against Proposition P
Stephen L. Taber
Rick Holman

• THE NEW STADIUM IS A $30 MILLION DOLLAR BOON-
DOGGLE.
• DON’T LET PRIVATE INTERESTS PICK OUR MUNICI-
PAL POCKETS.
• WE DON’T NEED TO SPEND OVER $60 MILLION DOL-
LARS ON ANOTHER STADIUM.
We need that money too badly for far more important things such

as AIDS, HOUSING, INFRASTRUCTURE REPAIR, HELP FOR 
THE HOMELESS and other pressing demands to serve city resi-
dents.
SAVE OUR CITY! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION P.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Mayor Agnos has forgotten the promise that got him elected —
that Mission Bay would provide families “with space to make a 
home”. The proposed downtown 48,000 seat stadium would:
• Cause traffic grid lock
• Cost the City over $75 million
• provide only 1,200 parking spaces — for VIPs only
• Leave the City with no control over ticket prices
• Commit the city to continued use and maintenance of Candle-

stick Park
• Provide huge profits for out-of-town developers
We weren’t fooled or blackmailed before, so don’t be fooled now. A No vote on Proposition P is a yes vote on real city issues — not a vote against baseball in San Francisco.

South Park Improvement Association

MEDIA BLITZ
After a two week MEDIA BLITZ for China Basin the pro China 
Basin Chronicle (8/8/89) released a poll that showed Candlestick 
(as is) in a practical dead heat with China Basin leading by 1%. 
Although the polls stated 4% error margin, the headlines falsely 
IMPLIED that fans prefer China Basin. These are media manipu-
lations of public opinion. If the media would print the proposed 

Candlestick improvements the polls would lean very heavily to 
Candlestick.
Lurie unquestionably has the press supporting his new toy, and 
Agnos and Lurie don’t care what the public really wants.

Philip McDonald
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HSIEH HEY FOR FISCAL CONSERVATISM!

Most of the Supervisors, like the Mayor, are big spenders, especially when spending other people’s money. Predictably, all but the fiscal-responsibility faction backed the statement supporting the downtown stadium.

The Chronicle (8/22/89) reports:

"Supervisor Tom Hsieh, who voted against submitting the statement to the voters, chastised his colleagues for being overconfident by assuming that the venture would be profitable. "The people in our city ought to be told what the liabilities are," he said. ‘Optimistic language is always a no-no from a responsible government.’"

"Hsieh was joined by Supervisors Richard Hongisto and Bill Maher in voting in dissent."

You don’t have to be “conservative” to appreciate “fiscal conservatism” — especially in these days of underfunded social services.

Grassroots

“I WOULDN’T ADVISE ANYBODY TO BUILD A STADIUM LIKE THAT.” — Dusty Baker, Giants’ outfield/hitting coach

Baker was talking about how the China Basin stadium will face the wrong direction, meaning the sun will get in all fielders’ eyes rather than just the rightfielders’, as at properly designed stadiums.

The Examiner (7/26/89) reports:

“PARK WOULD SIT AT ODD ANGLE”

“A few Giants players are wondering whether an unorthodox site plan for the proposed China Basin stadium will cause a sun problem equal to the dreaded winds of Candlestick Park.

“The batter . . . will face southeast instead of east-northeast as suggested by official Major League rules . . .”

Grassroots

Why are there no gays in major-league baseball?

Actually, there are. But pressure is so strong, they dare not let their gayness be known until after they retire, if even then.

Gays are accepted in pro tennis, popular music, government, business — even in most churches. Why not baseball?

Baseball was one of the last all-white institutions (management remains virtually all-white). Now baseball is one of the last places where gays aren’t accepted.

It’s unjust, that gay taxpayers be compelled to “donate” to an industry that excludes them.

Grassroots

The Chronicle poll (6/9/89) asked: “How many times do you expect to go . . . see the Giants play baseball this season?”

60% of San Franciscans said “Never” — about half the men, almost three-fourths of the women.

It’s not that they’d prefer downtown; the same poll showed San Franciscans preferring Candlestick by 48%/31%.

The Examiner (7/28/89) reports only 37% of San Francisco women favor a new stadium (San Francisco State poll).

Women working fulltime average around $15,000/year.

Major-league ballplayers average around $400,000/year.

Giants’ owner Lurie’s inheritance of roughly $400,000,000 “earns” him something like $40,000,000/year.

The only women who will get any significant piece of the profit will be the strippers in the luxury boxes.

Grassroots
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The China Basin proposal involved lengthy secret negotiations between the Mayor, the Giants and the proposed developer. No stadium opponents, skeptics, neutral observers or reporters were allowed in.

Why the secrecy?

Approving propositions based on secret negotiations allows and even encourages corruption.

We have no way of confirming that we really know what we're approving.

Grassroots

WILL FANS CALL IT THE “POLAR GROUNDS”?

China Basin is almost as windy as Candlestick.

But the new stadium’s design is much more wide-open to bay winds. It’s only 50% enclosed, the entire outfield — at water’s edge — having only a short fence.

Architect Crosby will test the design in a wind-tunnel — after Election Day — but hasn’t said what happens if it fails that test.

The only planned weather protection: “white fabric windscreens to match the sails on yachts berthed in the adjacent marina” (Chronicle 5/25/89).

He’d do better to worry less about color-coordination and more about whether they’ll work.

Grassroots

Here’s what Chronicle columnist Jon Carroll thinks (8/23/89):

“...The level of hypocrisy around this ballpark issue is downright insulting.

“The latest scam... changing of the Candlestick lease... to suit... Bob Lurie...

“There was a clause... that essentially kept the Giants in Candlestick until 1994... to prevent... Lurie from leaving early and... depriving the city of more than $1,000,000/annum in stadium revenues.

“Which side would Art Agnos... be on? Would he... press for the rules to be changed... to make a wealthy real-estate magnate happy?

“Kids, can you say ‘power corrupts’?

“. . .the tackiest kind of pressure politics... the mayor... pressuring the people who elected him...”

“It’s unseemly... and clumsy: Agnos piously denying that he had any intention of squeezing the voters;...

“There are citizens with legitimate concerns... being treated as pond scum as... the Mayor rushes to do Bob’s bidding...”

Grassroots

Can you imagine “EXXON FIELD”?

This stadium is supposed to be world-famous and good for San Francisco’s image.

But its name is up for bids.

Spectator can sell the name to whoever they want; we won’t find out until after the election.

This is how Sacramento’s new facility got named “ARCO ARENA”.

“EXXON FIELD” suggests “oil field” and “Ebbets Field”.

“Exxon Park” emphasizes real outdoor weather.

“COORS COLISEUM” could include a refreshments concession. Or “SPUDS MCKENZIE STADIUM” for the youth market. “BankAmeripark” and “WHEATIES BOWL” (“Ballpark of Champions”) are catchy enough to be world famous.

But good advertising for some corporation isn’t necessarily good image for San Francisco.

If our “major-league” image depends on this stadium, how can we approve it without knowing what image we’ll end up with?

Grassroots
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION P

The Chronicle (8/1/89) reports South-of-Market opposition: "GIANTS NEW NEIGHBORS: THE PEOPLE WHO WILL BE SQUEEZED OR UPROOTED BY A NEW STADIUM"

"... Jim Pluth ... proprietor of a small computer firm ... rents a unit ... two blocks from the stadium site ... Pluth represents what seemed to be the area's future ... Already some tenants are saying if the ballpark comes, they'll go.

"... he thinks the ballpark will hit local traffic like a neutron bomb ..."

"Worse yet, ... 80 times a year, residents will have to share their sidewalks with hordes of half-bagged Giants fans retreating from the ballyard.

"'It could make this area really unpleasant ..., Pluth says."

While many would want to move, others would have to:

"Since 1976 ... filmmaker Rock Ross ... has rented working space ... directly on the site of the new ballpark ...

"Naturally, the ... deal makes him cranky. In his opinion, Lurie is blackmailing the city.

"But the unkindest cut of all is that Agnos ... didn't even return their phone calls .. ."

Grassroots

FISCAL IMPACT TO SPECTACOR (SMG):

It's a secret.

Spectator plans to make a profit, but we're not allowed to know how much.

But we know that Spectator puts up virtually no investment. Instead, they'll use city funds, funds borrowed against future ticket sales, and receipts from sale of luxury boxes and advertising (including the stadium's name, worth millions/year).

Yet, after debts and expenses are paid and the Giants get their part, Spectator gets 80% of profits.

San Francisco gets only 20%!

Since the city's 20% is estimated around $2,000,000/year, Spectator's 80% must be approximately $8,000,000/year. Over 40 years, Spectator's profit would be over $300,000,000!

Not bad, for virtually no investment.

No wonder it's "confidential"!!

Grassroots

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION P

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

Section 1. It shall be the Policy of the People that the City shall enter into an agreement with Spectator Management Group, the nation's leading sports facilities management firm, to construct and finance a new ballpark at Mission Basin, consistent with the following principles:

That the ballpark be developed privately with a limited level of public financial involvement and with the risks of financing, constructing and operating the ballpark borne principally by Spectator Management Group;

That tax free bonds, the advance sale of luxury boxes and only those other forms of financing to finance construction will be used which would leave the City with no public bond debt or obligation;

That the City receive 20% of the profits from the ballpark each year for 40 years in payment for its investment of $2 million per year for 10 years;

That the City will own the ballpark after 40 years and retain sole title and ownership of the land at all times;

That Spectator guarantees an absolute limit on the City's responsibility for possible construction cost overruns;

That the San Francisco Giants sign a minimum 30-year lease to guarantee revenue shared by Spectator and the City;

That the City be paid 7.5% interest on its construction loan to Spectator of $1 million per year for 10 years at the end of the 40-year term subject to the extension of the management contract with Spectator;

That the City acquire the property for the ballpark by utilizing surplus City property.

Section 2.

Part II, Chapter II of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by adding Section 249.8 to read as follows:

Section 249.8. NORTHEAST CHINA BASIN SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.

A use district entitled the "Northeast China Basin Special Use District," the boundaries of which are shown on the Zoning Map, is hereby established for the purposes set forth below. The following provisions shall apply within the Northeast China Basin Special Use District:

(a) Purposes.

(1) Purpose. In order to accommodate the development of an open air ballpark for major league baseball with an associated parking structure and related commercial uses, such as sports clubs, shops and restaurants, in a setting of waterfront parks and promenades in an area which (A) will enhance public enjoyment of the
Bay by bringing many people of all ages to a place of public assembly and recreation adjacent to the shoreline; (B) will be close to downtown and within walking distance of many thousands of residents, workers, shoppers and visitors; (C) will be conveniently served by transit, including an extension of Muni Metro service from Market Street to the site and beyond with convenient transfer from and to BART, a number of Muni bus and trolley lines, Caltrain service from the Peninsula to a station near the site, the potential of ferry service from various north and east bay points to the ballpark site; (D) will be conveniently served by the broad South of Market street grid, a proposed new 150-foot wide King Street boulevard in front of the ballpark, and easy access to the 101 and I-280 freeways; and (E) will have convenient access to a sizable pool of existing and proposed on and off-street parking which can be made available in the evening and on weekends; and, further, in order to assure that the ballpark and parking structures are attractively designed and will be a visual asset to the City, there shall be a Northeast China Basin Use District with the controls set forth below.

(b) Controls
(1) General: The provisions of the M-2 use district established by Section 201 shall prevail except as provided in paragraphs (2) through (5) below.

(2) Conditional Uses:

An open air ballpark with a maximum seating capacity of 48,000, an associated parking structure and various uses accessory to or related to a ballpark use, including sports clubs, restaurants, and retail shops, shall be permitted as conditional uses.

(3) Parking
In recognition of the public transit anticipated to be available to serve a ballpark in the proposed location and in recognition of the large supply of parking in the vicinity, much of which can be made available for ballpark use in the evening and on weekends, the minimum requirement for off-street parking spaces for an open air ballpark shall be 1,200 spaces. This requirement shall be in lieu of the parking requirements set forth in Section 151 of this Code.

(4) Architectural Design
In recognition of the prominence of the location and the visual importance of the uses described in subsection (b)(2) above, such uses shall be subject to conditional use review and approval by the City Planning Commission. A conditional use may be authorized by the City Planning Commission if the facts presented are such to establish that the architectural design of the structure is appropriate for its intended use, location, and civic purpose. This criterion shall be in lieu of the criteria set forth in Section 305(c) (1-4) of this Code.

Section 3.
Part II, Chapter II of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by amending the Zoning Map to enact the following change in the height and bulk classification:

**Description of Property**
The property in the area generally bounded by King Street, Second Street (inclusive of the right of way), China Basin Channel, and Third Street, as shown on the map attached hereto.

**Height and Bulk**
District to be 

Approving District 

40-X 

150-X 

Section 4.

Part II, Chapter II of the San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by amending the Zoning Map to adopt the following special use district classification:

**Description of Property**
The property in the area generally bounded by King Street, Second Street (inclusive of the right of way), China Basin Channel, and Third Street, as shown on the map attached hereto.

**Use District**

Use District 

M-2 

The Northeast 

China Basin Special Use 

District 

Section 5.

Any provision of this ordinance may be amended by the Board of Supervisors.
Residential Rent Tax

PROPOSITION Q

Shall the City, with certain specified exceptions, charge a 0.75 percent tax on income from residential rental units, with the revenues to be used for homeless shelters and certain low and moderate income housing programs?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Landlords pay a $16.00 tax on the first $10,000 or less of rental income for the year plus $1.60 for each additional $1,000. This tax does not apply to buildings containing three or fewer units.

A City law limits rent increases on a residential unit so long as the tenant continues to live in the unit. There is no City law limiting rent increases on units that become vacant.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition Q is an ordinance. Under Proposition Q, the City would charge a 0.75 percent tax on all rental income from residential rental units, beginning January 1, 1990. This tax would not apply to income from a unit whose rent is controlled by the City or other governmental agency when that unit becomes vacant. Also, the tax would not apply to income from the following types of residential rental units:

1. A unit in a building containing fewer than five residential units where an owner of at least 50 percent of the building has lived in the building for at least six consecutive months;
2. A unit in a hotel or similar establishment that has not been occupied by the same tenant for thirty-two consecutive days; or
3. A unit in a hospital, monastery or similar institution.

The tax would be used to pay for homeless shelters and for certain low- and moderate-income housing programs.

Proposition Q would create a five-member affordable-housing advisory panel, appointed by the Mayor, that would help in deciding how to use the money from the tax. Proposition Q would expire in ten years unless the voters extend it.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to charge a 0.75 percent tax on rental income collected from certain types of residential rental units and you want this tax to be used for homeless shelters and certain low- and moderate-income housing programs. You also want to create an affordable-housing advisory panel to help in deciding how to use the money from the tax.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to charge this tax on residential rental income.

Controller’s Statement on “Q”

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

“Should the proposed Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would generate approximately $10 million annually for a period of 10 years through the imposition of a tax on rental income.”

How “Q” Got on the Ballot

On August 9, the Registrar of Voters received a proposed ordinance signed by Supervisors Jim Gonzalez, Thomas Hsieh, Willie Kennedy, and Bill Maher. The City Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION Q

A key finding in the Mayor's Housing Advisory Committee report, the Affordable Housing Action Plan states that: “The majority of available housing resources should be targeted to serve those income groups in greatest need.”

Prop Q is a step in that direction. Prop Q taxes property owners by 3/4 of one percent on rents creating an annual pool of $10 million dollars dedicated solely for housing assistance. It is supported by the housing industry as an alternative to vacancy control — an alternative that truly helps those most in need.

Prop. Q is an innovated approach to creating much needed housing assistance which could be used for the following:

a. Use to provide temporary housing and other shelter for our homeless.

b. Assisting first-time homebuyers whose income does not exceed moderate levels.

c. Rehabing existing sub-standard housing.

d. Rent subsidies for low and moderate income households.

This first-in-the-nation tax on rental receipts is a way to make certain that housing funds go for new affordable housing and not for the creation of new costly bureaucracies — a much needed alternative to vacancy control.

It is time that our City gets serious about providing housing assistance for those most in need.

We urge your Yes Vote on Prop Q.

Barbara Kolesar
Coalition for Better Housing

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION Q

San Francisco IS serious about providing affordable housing. Since my AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACTION PLAN was released this summer, we have doubled the City’s affordable housing budget without resorting to the kind of ill-conceived and convoluted tax contained in Proposition Q.

In September, we made an additional $10,000,000 available for affordable housing through the Redevelopment Agency without raising taxes.

Furthermore, that $10,000,000 is already earmarked for transitional housing for the homeless, rehabing sub-standard rental housing and assisting moderate income first-time homebuyers.

Over the course of the next year we hope to raise an additional $30-40 million for housing through a variety of state, federal, private and local sources.

I am proud of the fact that the Mayor’s Housing Advisory Committee held public hearings on our DRAFT AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACTION PLAN and listened to the public. After receiving testimony from dozens of individuals and organizations, the committee was able to fine-tune its final report to reflect the wisdom and suggestions of those who took the time to participate in that public process.

With PROPOSITION Q, however, there were no public hearings, no public process. And if PROPOSITION Q passes, there can be no fine-tuning. It is an ill-conceived tax that affects landlords, tenants, non-profit residential hotels and small businesses. If passed, it can only be changed through another, costly election. Short of that, it would remain in place to 10 years.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION Q.

Mayor Art Agnos

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION Q

NO ON Q

New taxes shouldn't be taken lightly. Unfortunately, with Proposition Q, that is exactly what is happening. A brand new, $10,000,000 a year tax is being proposed without public hearings or discussion.

Proposition Q, the Rent Receipts Tax, raises $10 million a year by taxing landlords through a new 7.5% tax on gross rental income. The money raised would then be directed into a City-managed fund to be spent on various "affordable housing" programs to help low-income tenants.

BUT PROPOSITION Q WILL RAISE RENTS AS WELL AS TAXES. Under current law, every time landlords' expenses go up they have a right to raise rents to "pass through" the new costs to tenants. Some landlords may not do it now, but when they are hit with a new $10 million tax, they will definitely reconsider, wouldn't you?

And it will be those tenants who are least able to pay, the ones Prop. Q's proponents seem to care about, whose rent could go up the most. Low income tenants, the elderly and the disabled, will be hit hardest by "passthrough" rent increases. The proponents of Proposition Q could have drafted it in such a way as to prohibit the tax being passed on to tenants, BUT THEY CHOSE NOT TO.

To make matters worse, Proposition Q has no escape clause or review mechanism. Under the provisions of Prop. Q the City must collect the $10,000,000 tax each year from thousands of San Franciscans including small property owners.

PROPOSITION Q, AS WRITTEN, WOULD LOCK US INTO THIS NEW TAX FOR THE REST OF THIS CENTURY. VOTE NO ON Q

Mayor Art Agnos

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION Q

Shame! Shame! Shame!

Mayor Agnos does more than "bend the truth a little" in his argument against Prop. Q.

Prop Q institutes a new tax on rental income amounting to $7.50 per $1000. Mayor Agnos doesn't tell you that this tax is proposed by the housing industry.

Why?

Because Prop Q, an alternative to vacancy control, gives housing assistance to those most in need — $10,000,000 annually!

Mayor Agnos knows this tax cannot be passed through unless expenses increase enough to trigger a Rent Board hearing. And that's rarer than straight talk from a politician.

If the Mayor is concerned for low income people why did he sponsor and pass recent legislation charging tenants an annual fee to pay the entire cost of the Rent Board?

Isn't it just a little curious that Mayor Agnos is suddenly worried about property owners?

What's really going on here?

There are basically two approaches to housing matters — an expensive bureaucracy paid for by charging tenants an annual fee to control the industry or working with the industry on creative ways to directly intervene for those most in need. The Mayor favors the former and Prop Q offers the later.

The housing industry would rather pay its share of vacancy control costs in the form of assistance to those most in need of help than feed another expensive city bureaucracy.

Prop Q costs you nothing and creates housing assistance for many. VOTE YES ON PROP Q.

Russ Flynn, President
Coalition for Better Housing

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

This city has demonstrated a paucity of thought in past and present housing policies, resulting in unnecessary hardships both for tenants and would be homeowners.

Thus the only sensible response to the housing crisis and the burden of tenants is not vacancy control, but a policy that increases supply and ownership alternatives.

The Black community and other minority communities are ill-served by vacancy control. Study after study reveals that in cities where vacancy control is part of its housing policy, minorities are hurt the most. Freezing rents at today’s already high costs does nothing to alleviate the problems of low-income and poorly housed citizens of this City.

We support the housing industry’s proposal — Prop Q — that creates an annual pool of $10 million for direct housing assistance.

This money will be used to help those in need of help the most: money for rent subsidies, money to fix sub-standard units and money for new low-income housing so desperately needed by the poor of this City.

Prop Q doesn’t create new controls that benefits many who don’t need housing assistance — it puts dollars where they are most needed.

For the past eight years, I have been a student of rent control and related housing policies on the national and local level. I served as a Hearing Examiner and then as Executive Assistant to the District of Columbia Rental Housing Commission for a period of four years and as Executive Director to the City of Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board from 1985 to 1987.

It has become increasingly apparent that restrictive rent control policies do more harm than good. One need only look to Berkeley and Santa Monica to see that such policies only exacerbate the housing crisis that has devastated minorities, the elderly, single parent households and the working poor.

Berkeley has lost one third of its entire rental housing stock in less than ten years. According to the University of California, 40% of its students can no longer find rental housing. Depending upon who one believes, Berkeley has lost between 15% and 33% of its Black tenants since 1980.

In the meantime, Santa Monica has suffered a 36% decline in Black renters, a 29% decline in Hispanic renters and a 25% decline in the number of school age children living in rental units.

It is time we face the facts. The affordable housing crisis will not be resolved by shackling the industry in a maze of red tape and costly bureaucratic over regulation. The entire community must become involved. All must share the cost.

I strongly support Proposition Q. I see it as a positive step in the right direction. It leaves intact the rent control protections that San Francisco renters presently enjoy and it goes a step further. Proposition Q will result in more housing and better housing for those who need it.

AND, after all, isn’t that the bottom line?

Gregory R. McConnell

We urge you to vote Yes on Prop Q.

Rev. H. L. Davis, Jr.
First Union Baptist
Rev. Arnold G. Townsend
Assoc. Minister
First Union Baptist Chruch
Rev. G. L. Bedford, Sr.
Founder Consultant Banneker Inc.
Rev. Willie Moore, Pastor
Solid Rock Missionary Baptist Church
Rev. Harvey Robertson
Associate Minister
Mt. Sinai Baptist Church

Most property owners are aware that we will have to share in the costs that go with housing assistance. On point we would rather pay money into a fund to help those in need of help rather than feed a vacancy control bureaucracy. It’s as simple as that.

VOTE YES ON PROP. Q.

Fred Hock
Property Owner

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

I am a strong supporter of Prop Q simply because it responds to what housing activists and the housing industry agree is the real solution to the housing crisis in this city — the creation of more rental housing!

In the southeastern section of our city there are families who are actually living in garages — firetraps, if you will, with no hope in sight to better their condition. But we could help these San Franciscans if we had more housing projects like the Maria Alicia Apts. at 16th & Valencia, built by non-profits and providing units in the $400-600 range.

The residents of San Francisco have consistently shown their support for the creation of affordable housing. How the City can accomplish this challenge is at issue on this ballot.

By supporting Prop Q the City will be able to generate an estimated $10 million to accomplish this task. This sizable amount has never before been generated by the City for this purpose.

The City has been lacking a specific commitment in this area, and this Proposition is a start in the right direction.

I commend the housing industry for voluntarily setting the wheels in motion and I urge you to join me in voting YES ON PROP Q.

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

We support the housing industry’s proposal — Prop Q — that creates an annual pool of $10 million for direct housing assistance. This money will be used to help those in need of help the most. Money for rent subsidies, money to rehab substandard existing units and money for new low-income housing so desperately needed by the poor of this City.

Prop Q doesn’t create new controls that benefit many who don’t need housing assistance — it puts dollars where they are most needed.

We urge you to vote Yes on Prop Q!

Mamie How,
Current Rent Board Commissioner
Tim Carrico,
Current Rent Board Commissioner

I am in my eighties and on a limited income. I am very concerned about the problems of older people getting by as time goes on. I am in support of programs which help low-income people instead of programs which would provide cheap apartments to those who can more easily support themselves.

San Francisco should be concerned with people who have lived here for a long time not people who are just moving in from other parts of the county.

I SUPPORT PROPOSITION Q

Mary Ann Fitzpatrick

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION Q

This is a scheme by real estate interests to undermine growing public support for vacancy control.

Vote NO on Q.

Joel Ventresca,
Past President
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

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

Renters: Vote NO on Prop Q! NO tax on tenants!
Don’t be taken in by this real estate industry attack on vacancy control.

Walter DeVaughn, Co-Convenor
The Gray Panthers of San Francisco
to climb skyward.
The Housing Committee at Old St. Mary’s
St. Peter’s Housing Committee
written by landlords for landlords.
San Francisco Tenants Union
Ted Gullicksen for the San Francisco Tenants
Union Business Committee

Proposition Q is a tax which will be imposed on renters. It is a smokescreen to sabotage vacancy rent control. It will not produce affordable housing it — will produce luxury housing with studio apartments renting from $570 — $750.
Vacancy rent control will preserve affordable housing; Proposition Q is written to prevent enactment of vacancy control. It is

Proposition Q is a cynical attempt to drive a wedge between renters and providers of non-profit housing and services to the homeless.

Rene Cazenave – Council of Community Housing Organizations

Kelly Cullen – Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Maryann Dillon – Mission Housing Development Corporation
Greg Francis – Coalition on Homelessness
(Organizations listed for identification purposes only.)

Stop the RENT TAX! Vote NO on Q. San Francisco doesn’t need more homelessness. Vote NO on Proposition R!

Tony Kilroy
Ruth Picon
Carol Migden
Joel Veniresca
Kelly Cullen
John Baessler
Dino DiDonato
Greg Day
Chuck Lantz
Catherine Dodd
Ed Emerson
Susan Bierman

Here we go again! They’re trying to stick us with a new tax! New taxes never go away, they just get bigger.
The City can’t even collect all the taxes it levies now, so why create new taxes?

Bob Geary
Richard Sevilla
Leslie Katz
Susana Montana

It’s time city government started living within a budget like the rest of us. Vote NO on Q!

San Franciscans Against New Taxes

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

Proposition Q —
• imposes a hidden tax
• makes housing less affordable
• diverts attention from the real housing crisis — SKY-ROCKETING RENT INCREASES AND SPECULATION!
Vote NO on Q!

Carole Migden

Renters Beware!
Proposition Q will raise rents. Every time landlords’ expenses go up they have the right to raise rents to “pass-through” the new costs. Some landlords may not do it now, but believe it, when they’re hit with this new $10 million tax, they will raise rents. 

Cruelest of all, it will be those least able to pay whose rent will go up the most. Low income tenants, the elderly and disabled will be first to get the biggest “passthrough” rent increases. Sometimes the cure is worse than the disease! That’s certainly true with Prop. Q. Vote NO!

Affordable Housing Alliance
Golden Gateway Tenants Association

Proposition Q’s big landlords and realtors, by soaking tenants, small landlords, seniors, non-profit developers etc., are like burglars who take the bedsheets, soap and toilet paper. Arrest their greedy scheme.

Brian Doohan

UNFAIR TO SENIORS

A tax on tenants in residential hotel rooms (Sec. 2.4(l)) is just too greedy. Many senior citizens pay $400 of their $500 check in rent. Prop. Q will cost them meals, clean clothes or other necessities.

San Francisco Eviction Watch

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

SECTION 1. Findings and Statement of Intent.
1.1 There is a shortage of affordable, decent, safe, and sanitary housing in San Francisco. This shortage has its most severe impact on persons of low and moderate income, the elderly, the physically disabled and children.

1.2 There has been a substantial increase in the number of homeless persons in San Francisco and there exists an acute shortage of temporary housing for homeless persons, and particularly homeless children.

1.3 Controls on rents upon vacancy of existing rental units does not alleviate the shortage of housing. Controls on rents on vacancy of existing rental units does not target benefits to those persons in need of assistance.

1.4 It is in the interest of the public health, safety and welfare to mitigate the shortage of housing, and to meet, to the extent monies are available, the City’s fair share of regional housing and to increase the supply of housing through the creation of new housing units and the renovation of existing substandard units.

1.5 It is in the interest of the public health, safety and welfare to target benefits to those persons most in need of assistance by providing assistance in the purchase of homes by first-time home buyers and by providing rent subsidies to persons of low and moderate income.

1.6 The people of San Francisco intend hereby to impose a special tax to generate funds for the creation of home ownership opportunities and residential rental housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income, with special emphasis on housing for the elderly and permanently disabled, through new construction and rehabilitation of existing substandard dwelling units, for the creation of temporary and short-term housing for the homeless, with special provision made for shelter for homeless children, and for the provision of assistance in purchasing and renting housing by persons of low and moderate income.

SECTION 2. Definitions.

2.1 Administrative agency shall mean the Mayor’s Office of Housing or such other administrative agency as the Mayor may designate to administer the monies collected pursuant to this initiative ordinance.

2.2 Advisory panel shall mean the affordable housing advisory panel described in Section 3.7.

2.3 Fund shall mean the affordable housing fund described in Section 3.4.

2.4 Residential rental unit shall mean all residential dwelling units in San Francisco for which is not controlled upon vacancy of the unit by any local, State or Federal law, ordinance, statute, rule or regulation, or governmental contract. A residential rental unit shall include land and appurtenant buildings and all housing services, privileges, furnishings and facilities supplied in connection with the use or occupancy therefor, including garage and parking facilities. The term residential rental unit shall not include (1) housing accommodations in hotels, motels, inns, tourist houses, rooming and boarding houses, provided that at such time as an accommodation has been occupied by a tenant for thirty-two (32) continuous days or more, such accommodation shall become a residential rental unit subject to the provisions of this initiative ordinance; (2) dwelling units in non-profit cooperatives owned, occupied and controlled by a majority of the residents; (3) housing accommodations in any hospital, convent, monastery, extended care facility, asylum, non-profit home for the aged, or in dormitories owned and operated by an institution of higher education, a high school, or an elementary school; and (4) owner-occupied building containing four (4) residential rental units or less, wherein owner or owners of at least 50% of the fee interest in the building have resided for at least six continuous months.

2.5 Rental income shall mean consideration received in connection with the use or occupancy of a residential rental unit, including parking, furnishings, or housing services of any kind, valued in money, whether received in money or otherwise, including all receipts, cash, credits, and property or service of any kind or nature, and also the amount for which credit is allowed by the owner or manager of the residential rental unit to the occupant, without any deduction therefrom whatsoever.

SECTION 3. Affordable Housing Tax.

3.1 Regulation of Rents on Vacant Units. The tax provided for in this initiative shall not be imposed on any residential dwelling unit if the rent for that unit is limited, controlled or regulated upon vacancy by any local, State or Federal law, ordinance, statute, rule or regulation, or governmental contract.

3.2 Imposition and Rate of Tax. Beginning January 1, 1990, there shall be paid a tax of 0.75 percent on all rental income collected from residential rental units.

3.3 Payment of Tax. All amounts of taxes imposed by this initiative ordinance are due and payable to the Tax Collector of the City. The Board of Supervisors may enact such ordinances as it deems necessary and proper for the collection and enforcement of this tax.

3.4 Affordable Housing Fund. The Tax Collector shall transmit all monies collected pursuant to this initiative ordinance to the Treasurer for deposit to the credit of a fund to be known as the “Affordable Housing Fund.”

(a) Monies in the fund shall be administered by the administrative agency.

(b) Interest earned from the fund shall become part of the principal and shall not be drawn from the fund for any purpose other than those for which the fund is established.

(c) Any unexpended balances remaining in the fund at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Section 6.308 of the Charter and shall be carried forward and accumulated in the fund.

(d) Monies in the fund may be used in conjunction with funding from other sources in-creasing the housing intended by this initiative.

3.5 Funds for Homeless Shelters. Commencing July 1, 1990, and for the fiscal years 1990-1991, 1991-1992 and 1992-1993, not less than 10% of the total estimated annual revenue in the fund for the prior fiscal year shall be used to provide temporary housing and other shelter to the homeless.

3.6 Further Use of Affordable Housing Fund. Monies in the Affordable Housing Fund may be expended for homeless shelters as provided in section 3.5 and for the other following purposes only:

(a) to assist in the purchase of homes by first-time homebuyers whose income does not exceed moderate levels, through low interest loans and other financing vehicles;

(b) for the acquisition, construction and financing of housing, the rehabilitation of existing substandard housing units, including the preparation of architectural plans, engineering studies, estimates, land acquisition, and such other and further expenses relating to the financing, construction, rehabilitation and completion of such housing;

(c) for all expenses reasonably related to the operation, maintenance and improvement of such residential rental housing and shelter for the homeless, including reserves for furniture and equipment, and for unforeseen contingencies;

(d) to provide rent subsidies for low and moderate income households; and

(e) for reasonable costs of collection of the affordable housing tax and administration of the fund.

The determination of what constitutes housing affordable to persons and families of low and moderate income shall be in accordance with the then current Department of Housing and Urban Development guidelines.

3.7 Affordable Housing Advisory Panel. The Mayor shall appoint a five member affordable housing advisory panel which shall, in conjunction with the administrative agency, determine the use of the monies in the fund for each fiscal year. The members of the advisory panel shall include one representative of residential rental property owners, one representative from the non-profit housing community, one for-profit housing developer, a tenant representative, and the head of the administrative agency or a designee from the administrative agency.

3.8 Public Hearing. The administrative agency annually shall prepare a plan for the disposition of the monies in the fund for the next fiscal year. At least one public hearing shall be conducted jointly by the administrative agency and the advisory panel prior to issuance of the final plan for each fiscal year.

SECTION 4. Miscellaneous.

4.1 Regulation of Rents for Tenants in Place. Nothing in this initiative shall be construed to affect the authority of the Board of Supervisors to regulate residential rents of tenants in place.

4.2 Expiration. This initiative ordinance shall expire 10 years after the date of enactment.

(Continued on page 22)
PROPOSITION R

Shall the City law that limits the types of buildings eligible for condominium conversion and limits to 200 the annual number of conversions be amended to create a parallel procedure that makes all residential rental buildings eligible for conversion and allows an additional 500 units to be converted through 1993, after which the 500 unit limit would expire?

YES 83
NO 84

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Under City law, certain buildings containing six or fewer residential rental units; stock cooperatives; and community apartments may be converted to condominiums. 40 percent of the tenants in the building must state an intent to buy their units. Such conversions are limited to 200 units each year. If less than 200 units are converted in a year, the limit for the following year is still 200.

Current law provides certain protections to tenants living in a building whose owner wants to convert to condominiums. Tenants must have the first chance to buy these units. Tenants who do not buy their units may continue to rent their units for 180 days or until their lease expires, whichever is longer, and may renew their leases for up to one year. Senior citizen or disabled tenants who do not want to buy their units may continue to rent them as long as they want.

THE PROPOSITION: Proposition R is an ordinance that would create an additional way to convert residential rental units to condominiums. Proposition R would allow residential rental units in any building to be converted to condominiums if approved by tenants from at least 51% of the units and other conditions are met. Conversions under current law would continue to be limited to 200 units each year limit. Proposition R conversions would be limited to 500 units each year from 1990 through 1993. If fewer than 500 units are converted in a year, the remainder may be carried over to the next year. After 1993, there would be no limit on Proposition R conversions.

With certain exceptions, the rights of tenants living in a building whose owner wishes to convert are similar to those provided to tenants under the current conversion law. The rights of senior citizens and disabled tenants who did not wish to buy their units would be similar to those under current law. Other tenants who did not want to buy their units generally could rent for five years.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to allow rental units to be converted to condominiums under these conditions.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to allow rental units to be converted to condominiums under these conditions.

Controller's Statement on "R"

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

"Should the proposed ordinance be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it could increase certain tax revenues of the City and County, the amount of which, being dependent upon the revised assessed valuation of the additional condominiums created, if any, cannot be determined."

How "R" Got on the Ballot

On August 3, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition R to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on July 26 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,786 of the signatures submitted were valid; 2,387 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.
Condominium Conversions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION R

For most San Franciscans the "American dream" of homeownership is a thing of the past or limited, unfortunately, to a privileged few. The Mayor's Housing Advisory Committee reports that "only 5% of San Francisco households could afford to buy the median priced house." The cost of homes today prohibit most renters from ever enjoying the stability, security and financial benefits of homeownership.

The T.O.P. initiative — Proposition R — is modeled after law enacted by Santa Monica voters that creates opportunities for tenants to purchase their units and protect tenants who choose not to buy. Under T.O.P. a conversion can occur only if 51% or more of the tenants approve and certain tenant protections are guaranteed. T.O.P. forces property owners who want to convert to offer tenants "good deals" (below market prices and financing packages) in exchange for their approval of the conversion. Unlike current law, T.O.P. puts power in the hands of the people who live in the building.

T.O.P. Provisions:
1. Conversions can not occur in buildings where evictions have occurred — except for failure to pay rents, violation of tenancy, or where a tenant is causing substantial damage to the rental unit.
2. Senior citizens and permanently disabled tenants are entitled to lifetime leases.
3. Tenants who do not wish to purchase are given an automatic five year lease.
4. Rents for those who remain in the building are covered by rent control laws.

Santa Monica has California's toughest rent control and tenant protection laws. This type of law is working there and would create ownership opportunities for many San Franciscans who otherwise would not qualify or afford today's prices.

Homeownership helps preserve, stabilize and improve neighborhoods while generating millions of new property tax dollars.

Vote YES on Prop R.

Barbara E. Herzog

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION R

The City's current condominium conversion ordinance allows up to 200 rental units per year to be converted to condominiums. Enacted in 1982, it represented a compromise between "free market" advocates who were willing to accept the loss of 500-1000+ rental units a year and affordable housing/community advocates seeking to ban conversions altogether. That compromise has worked.

Proposition R sets up a second, brand new conversion process that allows 2000 new conversions over the next four years and unlimited conversions thereafter.

Under the banner of "homeownership for tenants," Proposition R will pit a small group of wealthier tenants and "condo packagers" against the vast majority of moderate and middle income renters.

Even if we accept the proponents' argument that Proposition R will somehow "force" property owners to offer tenants their units at $10,000-$30,000 below market, would "dropping" the price of a unit from $250,000 to $200,000 or from $360,000 to $330,000 help many renters to realize the American Dream of homeownership? We think not.

Will investors and speculators figure out ways to use the numerous loopholes in this industry-sponsored initiative to convert thousands of rental units to condos? YOU BE THE JUDGE.

Finally, the much-touted tenant "protections" included in the T.O.P. initiative (Proposition R) are either the same as current city law or, in some cases, significantly weaker than those mandated by the state and local subdivision codes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION R.

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

In 1982, through Supervisor Willie Kennedy's leadership, a fair and effective ordinance regulating condominium conversions was enacted. Before then, thousands of our most affordable rental units were converted to expensive condominiums, and the majority of their occupants were evicted. This proposal would turn back the clock, allowing unlimited condominium conversions.

Proposition R's sponsors claim it will expand ownership opportunities for existing tenants. In fact, it would create homeownership for a lucky few at the expense of thousands of renters.

Proposition R will weaken the current law in the following ways:
- It will allow conversions even if none of the existing tenants intend to purchase their units. The sponsors tout the initiative's requirement that 51 percent of tenants "approve" conversion; but current law requires at least 40% of the tenants to formally declare their intent to purchase their units.
- It weakens current protection for purchasers by eliminating requirements that condominium developers correct building code violations and provide needed parking spaces before selling the units — a windfall for developers, a timebomb for buyers.
- Promoters claim Proposition R would provide new protection for tenants, including limits on pre-conversion evictions. But these limits only go back six months — developers could evict all non-purchasing tenants seven months before applying for conversion and still win approval.
- Current law requires that certain converted units remain affordable; Proposition R would prohibit this policy.
- Proposition R has been written so that not a word can be changed through legislation, but only through another costly election.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION R.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION R

The official arguments against Prop R were drafted by Politicians who would rather see the current conversion laws maintained — laws that give the City's bureaucracy and the Board of Supervisors ultimate power over conversions.

Prop R simply establishes a new process that gives the power to approve conversions to tenants who live in the building — where the power belongs.

Prop R was placed on the ballot through the initiative process by more than 16,000 signatures — from mostly renters. It is sponsored by renters and property owners alike.

Prop R requires approval from tenants in at least 51% of a building's units before an application for conversion can even be filed. Existing law requires 40% to sign a non-legally binding "intent to purchase" statement that is meaningless in court.

Today Santa Monica is home of California's toughest tenant protection laws. A similar law enacted by Santa Monica voters has yielded average savings of $30,000 per unit. Both property owners and renters are pleased with this law.

Once again San Francisco's politicians think they know what's best for the City's tenants — even if the defeat of Prop R cost tenants homeownership opportunities and economic benefits.

The passage of Prop R will deny the politicians control of conversions and perhaps some lost campaign contributions.

Tenants — not politicians — should control their buildings. Vote yes on Prop R.

Barbara Hersig
Condominium Conversions

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION R

The San Francisco Republican Party recommends a YES vote on Proposition R. The high price of housing in San Francisco is due to high demand and low supply. "R" is one step in the right direction.

The only way in which low and moderate income persons in San Francisco can hope to enjoy the benefits of home ownership is through tenant initiated condominium conversions. By permitting tenant initiated condominium conversions, tenants are empowered with choice: renters who choose not to purchase are protected with guaranteed five year leases and elderly and disabled renters receive lifetime leases.

"R" is a "win-win" proposition. Vote YES!

James E. Gilleran, Chairman
San Francisco Republican County Central Committee

Mayor Art Agnos' Housing Advisory Committee recommended that we:
"Support tenant-sponsored cooperation and condominium conversions while protecting tenants who elect not to participate."
(Quote from pg. 21 of Mayor's Housing Advisory Committee report-5/12/89)

Prop R does just what the Agnos Housing Committee proposes. This measure was designed after a similar program approved by the electorate of Santa Monica several years ago. After approximately three years since its passage, the Santa Monica program continues to have the support of both tenants and owners.

Prop R provides an opportunity for many San Franciscans, who otherwise would not be able to buy their own homes, a chance to do so. Those who don’t are protected under the existing rent ordinance.

Vote Yes on Prop R

Mike McGill, Member of Mayor Art Agnos' Housing Advisory Committee

I support Proposition R because it creates a way in which I can become a property owner. As a single individual, who lives on my earnings I’ve often felt that no matter how much I saved I would never be able to own property. Proposition R will offer me that chance, therefore I strongly support it.

Omar J. Mosley
San Francisco Tenant

About three years ago Santa Monica — home of California’s toughest tenant protection laws — enacted a Prop R type conversion law. The idea behind the law is simple — the only way a property owner can convert is to seek and get tenant approval.

This type of law takes control away from planning departments and politicians and places it with tenants. Property owners must negotiate with tenants terms that are acceptable before any conversion in a building can occur. Prop R places power over conversions with the people who live in the building — not with politicians.

It doesn’t take a rocket scientist to understand why Politicians oppose this ballot measure — a ballot measure more than 16,000 individuals signed through the initiative process.

Under a similar type program around 1,000 units have been converted in Santa Monica with average savings of about $30,000 per unit.

San Franciscans deserve the same kind of break.

Vote Yes on Prop R.

Mamie How
Rent Board Commissioner

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

Your Yes on Prop R vote would not only create exciting home ownership opportunities for many San Franciscans, it would also generate millions in new tax dollars through new assessments. Many apartment buildings are assessed well below market value because they have not sold in many years — this is particularly true of those held prior to Prop 13’s enactment. Tenant approved conversions under existing state law would require new assessments and new tax revenues. That’s a win-win proposition.

Home ownership and new tax dollars — Yes on Prop R

Bill O’Keeffe, Sr., President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

The bankrupt housing policies of San Francisco have effectively eliminated for tenants what should be an inalienable right to home ownership.

This denial is a result of myopic utopian policies. This initiative opens up for tenants, not only the dream that has been a nightmare, but guarantees them a leveraged negotiated posture in the purchase of their apartment, while at the same time protecting existing tenancy rights.

Joe O’Donoghue, President
Residential Builders Association

As a single mother trying to raise my child in this city, I thought the chances of my ever owning my own home were slim to none. I was thrilled to learn that a new opportunity might be available to me with this Tenant Ownership Program.

I have friends in Santa Monica who have been able to buy one or two bedroom condominiums at a $30,000 savings. The reason, owners and tenants negotiate selling price prior to the conversion being approved. I know of many others who love the building in which they live and would be thrilled to have the security of homeownership. I hope Prop R passes.

Lynne Williams

I support Prop R because it gives power to tenants living in a building to make the ultimate decision as to conversions of rental units to homeownership. Today that power resides with a bureaucracy.

San Franciscans have a long history of supporting measures that give control to those directly affected. Sure some members of the Board of Supervisors oppose this measure because it takes power away from them and that hurts fund raising.

Vote Yes on Prop R — a vote for tenant control.

Debbie Berry
San Francisco Tenant

As a senior citizen I worry about the apartment building I live in. Prop R does two things for me that I like. With Prop R, I’ll never have to worry about finding another place because I’m guaranteed a lifetime lease with the same protections that I presently have under the existing rent ordinance.

I also worry about the maintenance and up-keep of this building. I call home. If the tenants own the building I won’t have to worry. I like the idea of my neighbors owning their units. It gives an added reason to care about what goes on here.

Please vote Yes on Prop R.

Samuel Clark

Being a handicapped person, I appreciate the security Prop R affords me as a renter. In a changing world security is important. I do not wish to join the growing numbers of homeless. Prop R protects my interests both in that my rent is not unnecessarily raised and in that I can not lose my apartment due to conversion of the building.

Sylvia Stevens
San Francisco Handicapped Tenant

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

San Franciscans should encourage homeownership opportunities because it benefits the City and our neighborhoods — benefits those who choose to buy and those who rent.

It’s only human nature to take better care of something that you own. As more people have a stake in the City, attitudes change about what goes on around them. People take a renewed interest in making sure our neighborhoods are safe, clean and positive environments in which to live.

Prop R forces property owners who want to convert to seek tenant approval and that is something current law forgets. Seeking approval requires property owners to offer “good deals” and that creates homeownership opportunities for many who otherwise couldn’t buy. Buying helps stabilize and upgrade neighborhoods. Vote Yes on Prop R for a better San Francisco.

Tai Chi Luong

Sooner or later the conservative Deukmejian State Supreme court or the even more conservative Reagan-Bush US Supreme Court is going to overturn local rent control laws. Even rent control advocates say that rent control is only a temporary solution.

The only way to really help tenants is provide them with a way to buy the units they now live in. Everyone knows that homeownership is better than renting.

Prop R gives tenants — and not bureaucrats or owners — the final say on how a building should be converted and at what price units should be sold to existing tenants. A building converted with the Prop R gives lifetime contractual protection to elderly tenants who do not want to buy and doesn’t leave this protection to the whim of the Deukmejian or Bush courts.

Prop R provides an opportunity for first time homebuyers without a massive use of City tax funds.

Help tenants become homeowners and Vote for Prop R.

Bonnie Rutter
San Francisco Tenant

In 1977 when I first came to San Francisco I purchased a 3 flat building in which I lived for 5 years. I pride myself on maintaining a good relationship with all the tenants in my building and have been asked by several of them over the years if I would be interested in selling the building to them.

If I ever decide to sell the building, I would much prefer to sell to the tenants who have lived in the building almost as long as I have owned it, rather than to an outside investor who would probably move into one of the flats, free the building from rent control and force out the current tenants.

Proposition R would allow my current tenants to become homeowners in San Francisco.

Alfred Goodwin

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION R

What will be the effect of Proposition R on the majority of San Franciscans who can’t afford to buy even a condominium?

• Displacement
• Higher Rents
• Fewer Rental Units

Don’t let the affordable housing crisis get worse. Vote No on R.

The Housing Committee at Old St. Mary’s
St. Peter’s Housing Committee

WHEEL OF MISFORTUNE
R could cost you your home!
San Francisco neighborhoods have enough homelessness. Don’t let Geary Boulevard, Judah and West Portal turn into Civic Center

Plazas . .

Brian Doohan

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

San Francisco doesn’t need more homelessness. Vote NO on Proposition R!

Kelly Cullen
Ed Emerson
Jose E. Medina
Rick Hauptman, Vice President, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Demo Club
John Baessler
Marcelo Rodriguez
Victor Seeto
Susan J. Bierman

Renters: Vote NO on Prop. R! Block real estate industry scheme for massive condo conversions of scarce apartments! Prevent wholesale dislocation of seniors and our sons and daughters!

Walter DeVaughn, Co-Convenor
The Gray Panthers of San Francisco

Gentrification-induced displacement of low, moderate, and middle income families will increase if Proposition R is adopted.

The escalating competition for housing and increasing costs have already forced out thousands from their homes, neighborhoods, and the City.

City Hall should pursue anti-displacement policies.

Vote NO on R.

Joel Ventresca
Past President
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council

Proposition R allows landlords to evict all the tenants in a building just 7 months before applying for conversion without any repercussions. Stop illegal evictions! Vote NO on R!

Westbay Law Collective

Proposition R is a backdoor attempt by real estate interests to subvert San Francisco’s Condominium Conversion law enacted to protect tenants. The thousands of homeless in San Francisco are proof of how much affordable rental housing has been lost already.

Condo conversions destroy even more affordable rental housing.

Proposition R will not help tenants. It will end limits on conversions; meaning the eviction and displacement of thousands more tenants.

The SFTU urges a NO vote on Proposition R. There is already too little affordable rental housing in San Francisco and too many evictions.

Ted Gullicksen, for the San Francisco Tenants Union
Business Committee

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

The promoters of Proposition R claim that it is modeled on existing law in Santa Monica. In fact, according to an August 26, 1989 statement of Dennis Zane, mayor of Santa Monica, Proposition R differs substantially from the Santa Monica Ordinance.

According to Mayor Zane:

"— Santa Monica’s law requires that 50% of the existing tenants agree in writing to purchase their units before a conversion can take place, Proposition R has no requirement that any of the tenants agree to purchase their units.
— Santa Monica’s law requires that 67% of the tenants in a building consent to a conversion, Proposition R requires only 51%.
— Santa Monica’s law provides that the consent to convert must come from the tenants of the building. Proposition R allows the consent to be comprised of landlords and/or tenants. Under Prop-

osition R, a building could be converted without the consent of any tenants whatsoever!
— Santa Monica’s law requires a fund to be set up to help low and moderate income tenants buy their units and make improvements, while Proposition R prohibits the establishment of such a fund.

While the Santa Monica law is designed to balance the needs of landlords and tenants, Proposition R is weighted heavily in favor of landlords, without many of the tenant protections present in the Santa Monica Ordinance. Proposition R is a giveaway to developers and speculators."

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION R.

Mitchell Omerberg

Don’t be fooled by the condominium developers. San Francisco already has a law that:
• prevents conversions in buildings where there have been any evictions for the purposes of converting in the past 18 months (not just 6 months like Prop. R)
• guarantees senior citizens and permanently disabled tenants life-time leases
• guarantees rents for those who remain in the building are covered by rent control laws

What are the condominium developers up to?

Proposition R is merely a loophole in the condo conversion law designed to help landlords make a quick profit and evade rent control. All the real renters' organizations oppose this fraud.

No on R!

Golden Gateway Tenants Association
San Francisco Housing and Tenants Council
Bruce Lee Livingston
Hank P. Barnard

Jodi Reid
Milo Nadler
Barbara Gualco
Lillian Rippert
Denise A. Stephenson
Ellen R. Baughman
James Michael Faye
Mitchell K. Omerberg

The following officers and members of the Latino Democratic Club of San Francisco urge you to vote NO on Proposition R. This misleading political ploy will increase rents in San Francisco.

Richard Sevilla

Ruth Picon
Sam Ruiz
James Morales
Marcelo Rodriguez
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION R

As tenants' rights attorneys, we have reviewed Proposition R. It's full of loopholes which will benefit developers and speculators, not tenants who wish to purchase their units.

Proposition R:
— Allows the conversion of a building to condominiums, and the eviction of all of the tenants, even if none of the tenants living in the building consent. This is done by changing the accepted definition of "tenant" existing in state law (Proposition R, section 1401 (k)), to allow the consent of building landlords to count towards the 51% "tenant" approval requirement.
— Allows the conversion of a building to condominiums, and the eviction of the tenants, even if none of the existing tenants agree to purchase their units (Proposition R, section 1402). Current law requires that 40% of the existing tenants agree to purchase their unit.
— Allows the conversion of a building to condominiums, even if all of the building's tenants have been evicted to facilitate the conversion, including the elderly and disabled (Proposition R, sections 1401(b), 1402(b)). The promoters of Proposition R don't tell you that its eviction "protections" apply only to tenants living in the building at the time the condominium conversion application is filed with the City. A developer is free to evict all of a building's tenants, wait the six months required by Proposition R, and then apply for permission to convert. The City would be required to allow the conversion.

Rather than furthering the American dream of homeownership, Prop. R will further the San Francisco nightmare of eviction of the elderly and other long term tenants. We support tenants being able to buy their own units, but through a fair and equitable law, not Proposition R.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION R.

Robert De Vries
Carolyn A. Gold

DON'T PLAY "LANDLORD MUSICAL CHAIRS" WITH YOUR HOMES! When their music stops, there are fewer rental units, more evicted tenants, and more expensive housing for the rest of us. Don't be fooled — stop speculative condo conversions. NO on R!

Carol Migden

You don't have to go to Santa Monica to see why Proposition R won't work. For four years San Francisco operated under a law that was virtually identical to Prop R. Most of its provisions — including the tenants' "agreement" to conversion and protections for tenants who don't buy — were adopted in 1979 and are still in effect.

Unfortunately, without a reasonable annual limit on conversions, the law just doesn't work.

Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein commissioned the only comprehensive study of condominium conversions ever done in San Francisco.

The startling conclusion: 89% of the original tenants in converted buildings were evicted or otherwise displaced by the conversion, inspite of the Santa Monica-style tenant “approval” process.

That’s one of the reasons I worked so hard, along with Supervisor Kennedy and the rest of the Board, to enact into law the provision that limits condominium conversions to 200 per year.

Proposition R would set us back 10 years. It would allow an additional 2,000 conversions over the next 4 years.

But worse than that, Proposition R has a time bomb ticking. Four years after its passage, an unlimited number of rental apartments could be converted to condominiums.

I urge you to VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION R.

Nancy G. Walker

San Francisco Democratic Party
David Spero
Nancy Russell, Director, North of Market Planning Coalition*
David Brigoode
John Bardis

*For identification purposes only
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AMENDING PART II, CHAPTER XIII OF THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE (SUBDIVISION CODE) BY ADDING ARTICLE 11, CONSISTING OF SECTIONS 1400 THROUGH 1411, AND BY AMENDING SECTION 1332 TO PERMIT THE CONVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL RENTAL PROPERTY TO CONDOMINIUM OR OTHER OWNERSHIP SUBJECT TO CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.

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

Section 1. Part II, Chapter XIII of the San Francisco Municipal Code (Subdivision Code) is hereby amended by adding Article 11, consisting of Sections 1400 through 1411, to read as follows:

TELLANT INITIATED CONVERSIONS

Sec. 1400. Tenant Initiated Conversion.

It is the purpose of this Article to permit Tenant Initiated Conversions where there is tenant approval and where the conversion will afford a substantial number of the tenants in the building the opportunity to purchase their units. While recognizing that these conversions will reduce the City's supply of rental units, they will not decrease the overall supply of housing and are beneficial to the general welfare in light of the new opportunities for home ownership created by this Article and the protections provided herein for non-purchasing tenants.

This Article 11 provides a plan for Tenant Initiated Conversions that is exclusive of, independent from, and alternative to the plan for conversions set forth in Article 9. If this Article 11 applies to a conversion, then the provisions of Article 9 shall not apply to any extent to that conversion. Any annual limitation set forth in Article 9 on the number of units which shall be converted in any year shall not be applicable to any conversion carried out pursuant to this Article 11.

The Sections of this Article 11 modify the applicable provisions of Articles 3 through 8 inclusive of this Code in the case of Tenant Initiated Conversions.

Sec. 1401. Definitions. For purposes of this Article, the following words and phrases shall have the following meanings:

(a) Applicant. The owner of a building for which a Tenant Initiated Conversion application is filed.

(b) Cosigning Tenant. Any tenant agreeing to the conversion by his or her signature on the Tenant Initiated Conversion Application who has personally occupied his or her unit in the building continuously for a period of at least 6 months prior to the date of the signing of the Tenant Initiated Conversion Application.

(c) Disabled Person. Any person who is receiving benefits from a federal, state, or local government or from a private entity on account of a permanent disability that prevents the person from engaging in regular, fulltime employment.

(d) Tenant Ownership Conversion. Any conversion to condominium, community apartment, stock cooperative, cooperative association, limited stock cooperative, or any other means authorized under state law.

(e) Participating Tenant. Any tenant, whether or not a Cosigning Tenant, who occupies a unit in the building on the date an application for a Tenant Initiated Conversion is filed.

(f) Permitted Eviction. Eviction of a tenant for any of the following reasons:

(1) the tenant has failed to pay the rent to which the landlord is lawfully entitled under the oral or written agreement between the tenant and the landlord or habitually pays the rent late or gives checks which are frequently returned because there are insufficient funds in the checking account;

(2) the tenant has violated a lawful obligation or covenant of tenancy other than the obligation to surrender possession upon proper notice and failure to cure such violation after having received written notice thereof from the landlord;

(3) the tenant is committing or permitting to exist a nuisance in, or is causing substantial damage to, the rental unit, or is creating a substantial interference with the comfort, safety or enjoyment of the landlord or other tenants in the building, and the nature of such nuisance, damage or interference is specifically stated by the landlord in the written notice to quit to the tenant;

(4) the tenant is using or permitting a rental unit to be used for any illegal purpose;

(5) the tenant has, after written notice to cease, refused the landlord access to the rental unit as required by state or local law; or,

(6) the tenant holding at the end of the term of the oral or written agreement is a tenant not approved by the landlord.

(g) Price Index. The housing component of the Bay Area Cost of Living Index, U.S. Dept. of Labor.

(h) Qualifying Building. Any building used for residential rental purposes in the City and County of San Francisco for which no eviction has occurred, except a Permitted Eviction, within a period of 6 months prior to the date a Tenant Initiated Conversion Application for the building is filed.

(i) Senior Citizen. Any person 62 years of age or older.

(j) Subdivider. In addition to the definition set forth in Section 1308, the holder of a recorded option to purchase a Qualifying Building, provided the Tenant Ownership Conversion Application is submitted with the written consent of the owner of record of the Qualifying Building.

(k) Tenant. Any person who is an authorized tenant of an owner of a Qualifying Building that is the subject of a Tenant Initiated Conversion Application. An authorized tenant is one who is residing in the unit with the express written or oral consent of the owner. The term "tenant" shall include an owner who occupies a unit in the building as his principal place of residence.

(l) Tenant Consent to Conversion. A form prepared by the City which shall demonstrate the consent of a tenant to the filing of the Tenant Initiated Conversion Application. The Tenant Consent to Conversion shall be substantially in the form and substance provided in Section 1410.

(m) Tenant's Sales Price. The maximum price for each unit as set forth in the Tenant Initiated Conversion Application.

(n) Unit. Any legal residential rental unit in a building for which a Tenant Initiated Conversion Application is filed.

(o) Unpermitted Eviction. Eviction of a tenant for any reason other than those set forth in the definition of a Permitted Eviction.

(p) Waiting List. The list of Tenant Initiated Conversion Applications maintained by the Director pursuant to Section 1403.

Sec. 1402. Application for Tenant Initiated Conversion. An Application Packet for a Tenant Initiated Conversion shall contain the following information in addition to that required by previous provisions of this Code (other than Article 9). Unless otherwise stated, the term "application" shall mean an Application Packet for a Tenant Initiated Conversion.

(a) Identification of the building that is the subject of the application and its owners;

(b) A declaration that the building is a Qualifying Building;

(c) A building history detailing the date of construction, major uses since construction, major repairs since construction, current ownership of buildings and underlying land, and the proposed form of Tenant Initiated Conversion;

(d) A report of residential record ("3-R Report"), obtained from the Bureau of Building Inspection within the preceding 12 months and a statement that a copy of such 3-R Report was delivered to each tenant in the building;

(e) A rental history detailing for each unit the approximate size in square feet, the number of bedrooms, the current or last rental rate, any vacancies for the three years immediately preceding the Application to the extent known or reasonably discoverable by the Subdivider, the names of the current tenants for each unit, indicating the names of the current tenants who are Senior Citizens or Disabled Persons, the length of time that the current tenants have occupied their units, and the names of all persons other than tenants known to reside currently or to have resided in the building during the three year period prior to the date of filling of the application to the extent that such information is known or is reasonably discoverable by the Subdivider;

(f) Subject to the standards specified in Section 1407, a building inspector's report made by either the Bureau of Building Inspection or a certified engineer or architect acceptable to the Bureau of Building Inspection noting any Building and Housing Code violations and deficiencies, including electrical, plumbing, boiler, and energy conservation requirements. Where a building to be converted to condominiums is 2 years old or less, a Certificate of Completion issued by the Bureau of Building (Continued on next page)
LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION R (Continued)

Inspection may be accepted in lieu of a building inspector’s report;

g. A statement of repairs, alterations, and improvements, and their projected cost, that will be performed before the close of escrow for the sale of the first unit in the building;

(h) The plan for the assignment and use of all parking spaces;

(i) The plan for the use of all common area facilities;

(j) An estimated maintenance budget and reserve fund, based upon actual maintenance expenses for at least the preceding 2 years, which states the estimated monthly maintenance assessment for each unit, and which contains a statement that the monthly maintenance budget may be increased at the time the unit is offered for sale to the tenant;

(k) The procedures for the allocation and use of the reserve funds;

(l) The following sales information for each unit occupied by a tenant:

(1) the maximum sales price;

(2) the minimum down payment; and

(3) if seller financing is offered, the minimum amount to be financed, the maximum rate of interest, and the minimum term of the loan offered by the seller to the tenant;

(m) The signatures of Cosigning Tenants from at least fifty-one percent of the total number of units in the building, except that in a building of 5 or fewer units, such signatures shall be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Number of Units Providing in the Building</th>
<th>Co-Signing Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The signatures shall have been obtained within 6 months prior to the date of filing of the application and the date of signature shall be indicated on the form. If more than one tenant occupies a unit pursuant to a written lease, the signature of all tenants shall be required, but if more than one tenant occupies a unit pursuant to an oral lease, the signature of only one tenant shall be required. If there are both written and oral leases with multiple tenants, the signature of all tenants with written leases shall be required;

(n) A declaration that:

(1) the signature of each Cosigning Tenant was obtained only after the delivery, in writing, to such tenant of the information required in subsections (a) through (i) of this section;

(2) all notices to tenants required by the SRA, as defined in Section 1301, have been given of the application; and

(3) each tenant has been informed that the application may not immediately receive final subdivision approval but may be placed on the Waiting List.

A summary of tenant contacts including all meetings held with tenants and all information provided to them about the project and their options, a list of all tenants who have expressed a desire to buy their own units, proposed methods of dealing with those tenants who do not plan to buy, especially Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons, and any proposed program for relocation services;

(p) A declaration, signed under penalty of perjury, that all of the information provided in the application is true.

Application Packets for Tenant Initiated Conversions shall have been deleted the following information required by provisions of this Code:

(1) Except as otherwise required by other sections of this Article 11, the statements required by Section 1323 (a), paragraphs 1, 2 and 3, shall be deleted.

(2) Except in the case of a vesting tentative map, the environmental evaluation data required by Section 1323 (b) shall be deleted.

Section 1403. Annual Conversion Limitation.

The Director of Public Works shall not give final subdivision approval to applications for Tenant Initiated Conversions if such approvals would allow the conversion of units in excess of the number set forth below for each year indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>500 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>500 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>500 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>500 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There shall be no limit thereafter. When an application is submitted to the Director that cannot be finally approved because of the numerical limitations of this Section, the Director shall file the application and place it on the Waiting List. Applications shall be placed on the Waiting List in the order in which they are filed. The Director shall then process the application for tentative subdivision approval pursuant to sections 1404 and 1405. Placement of an application on the Waiting List does not vest in the Subdivider any right to final subdivision approval if the time limits for recording of the final subdivision map expire before the application has been accepted for final subdivision approval from the Waiting List. When applications can be accepted for final approval from the Waiting List because of the withdrawal or denial of other applications, the passage of time, or other circumstances, the Director shall accept applications in order, beginning with the first on the Waiting List, and shall finally approve such applications, subject to the Subdivider meeting all other conditions for receiving final approval of the application. If the annual limit on the number of units the applications for which may be finally approved in any year is not reached in that year, the unused portion of the annual limit shall accumulate and shall be added to the allowable limit for the following year or years. No application shall be finally approved that results in the conversion of units in excess of the number permitted for that year plus an amount accumulated from prior years.

Sec. 1404. Notice of Application; Hearing. Within ten days of the filing of an Application Packet for a Tenant Initiated Conversion, the Director shall mail notice to every tenant in the building of the filing of the application, of the right of the tenant to request a hearing on the application, and of the means of obtaining information regarding the requirements that the applicant must meet, including requirements designed to protect the tenants. If any tenant requests a public hearing from the Director in writing within 10 days of the date that such notice is sent, the Director shall hold a public hearing with respect to the application. Notice of any hearing regarding the application, whether required by this Section or by other provisions of this Article, shall be mailed to each tenant in the building by the Director at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

Sec. 1405. Action on Applications. The Director shall approve any Tenant Initiated Conversion Application, subject to the conditions specified below, unless:

(a) It fails to meet any of the requirements of this Article; or

(b) It fails to meet any mandatory requirement of the SRA (as defined in Section 1301); or

(c) It was the result of fraud, misrepresentation, or similar coercion;

(d) The Director determines that there has been an unpermitted eviction of a tenant in the building within 6 months prior to the date of filing of the application.

Sec. 1406. Conditions of Approval. A Tenant Initiated Conversion Application shall be approved subject to the following conditions, to which the Subdivider shall give written consent prior to the approval of the final map or the recording of the final parcel map. The written consent shall include an agreement with the City, each Participating Tenant, and each tenant afforded rights under this Article, binding upon the Subdivider and any successors in interest, to comply with each and every condition imposed in connection with approval of a Tenant Initiated Conversion Application. The City, any Participating Tenant, and any tenant afforded rights under this Article shall have the right to enforce the terms of this agreement in addition to any other remedies provided by law. The conditions are as follows:

(a) The Subdivider shall offer the exclusive right to purchase each unit in the building occupied by a Participating Tenant to the Participating Tenant of the unit. The Subdivider shall offer the unit for sale in writing to the Participating Tenant of the unit within one year of receipt of the final public report from the Department of Real Estate of the State of California and shall continue to offer the unit for sale to the Participating Tenant for a period of not less than 90 days from the date of the first written offer, unless otherwise agreed by the Subdivider and the Participating Tenant. If no public report is required for the building, the Subdivider shall offer the unit for sale to the Participating Tenant of the unit within one year of the date of recording the final parcel map and shall continue to offer to the Participating Tenant for a period of not less than 90 days from the date of the first written offer, unless otherwise agreed. The offer shall be made upon the terms set forth in the application, without change, except that if the offer is made more than one year after the date of filing of the

(Continued on next page)
application, the tenant’s sale price may be adjusted according to any change reflected in the Price Index from the date of filing to the date of the offer. Escrow shall be opened within 30 days from written acceptance by the Participating Tenant. Unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the escrow shall close within 6 months from the date of written acceptance of the offer by the Participating Tenant. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no Subdivider shall be obligated to close escrow sooner than the end of an additional 6 months on the sale of a unit to a Participating Tenant if the Subdivider is unable to close escrow on the initial date because of the requirements of a lender whose loan is or will be secured by the unit or the Qualifying Building, because of a requirement of the California Department of Real Estate that the sale of a minimum number of units in the building close escrow simultaneously, or for other reasons not within the control of Subdivider. In the event the Participating Tenant does not exercise his or her right to purchase within the time period set forth in this subsection, the Subdivider may elect to terminate the escrow without complying with the terms set forth in the application, to the Participating Tenant or any other person. However, in the event such transfer is to someone other than the Participating Tenant, the transfer shall be expressly made subject to the rights of the Participating Tenant to continue to occupy the unit as provided for in subsections (c) and (d) below. If the Participating Tenant vacates the unit within 90 days after the Subdivider offers it for sale to the Participating Tenant, the Subdivider’s obligation to offer the unit for sale is terminated. A Participating Tenant may transfer his rights to purchase.

(b) The Subdivider shall offer the exclusive right to purchase each unit in the building occupied by a tenant who is not a Participating Tenant to that tenant. All of the provisions of subsection (a) above shall apply to the offer and sale, except that there shall be no restrictions on the price at which the Subdivider may offer the unit for sale.

(c) All non-purchasing Participating Tenants who are Senior Citizens or Disabled Persons on the date a Tenant Initiated Conversion Application for the building was filed shall be given the right to continue to personally reside in their units as long as they choose to do so, subject only to a Permitted Eviction. Such right shall be non-assignable except that, within 60 days after approval of the final map or the recording of the final parcel map, any Senior Citizen Participating Tenant who is entitled to the protections of this Section may designate in writing the name of one person who is entitled to continue living in the unit under the same terms as the Senior Citizen if the Senior Citizen predeceases him or her and if the person designated is residing in the unit at the time of the death of the Senior Citizen. The written designation shall be given to the Director by the tenant within the 60 day period. The person designated by the Senior Citizen must be a tenant of the unit at least 55 years of age on the date of the filing of the Tenant Initiated Conversion Application and must have resided in the unit for a continuous period of 6 months prior to the date of filing of the Tenant Initiated Conversion Application.

(d) Each non-purchasing Participating Tenant, other than a Senior Citizen, a designee of a Senior Citizen, or disabled person shall be given the non-assignable right to continue to reside personally in his or her unit subject only to a Permitted Eviction for a period of 5 years from the date of filing of a Tenant Initiated Conversion Application for the building. It is the intent of this subsection and subsection (c) to prohibit landlords from endeavoring to recover possession of a rental unit occupied by a person protected by this Section other than for a reason defined in this Article as a Permitted Eviction. As to units subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance, this provision prevails over anything to the contrary in that Ordinance insofar as it defines and regulates allowable evictions.

(e) All rights under this subsection and subsections (c) and (d) shall expire upon the termination of the lease relationship between the then owner of the unit and the Participating Tenant entitled to the protections of these subsections, whether through the tenant’s voluntary termination of the relationship, a Permitted Eviction, or upon the 5 year termination or lifetime lease termination, whichever is applicable. If the units under subsections (c) and (d) are exempt from or not subject to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance (hereafter “Rent Ordinance”), the following rent restrictions shall apply. The amount of rent that may be charged to a tenant entitled to remain for 5 years shall not exceed the rent charged on the date of the filing of the application plus an increase proportionate to the increase in the Price Index. This rent restriction shall be in effect from the date of the filing of the application until whichever of the following events first occurs: (i) the tenant purchases a unit in the building or (ii) the application is disapproved, or (iii) the expiration of the five year term. The amount of rent that may be charged a tenant and a tenant’s designee entitled to a lifetime lease shall not exceed the rent charged on the date of the filing of the application adjusted to include the following: any annual percentage rent increase which would be permitted where the unit is subject to the Rent Ordinance, plus any increase in the cost of utilities which the landlord would be permitted to pass through to the tenant under the Rent Ordinance. If the landlord wishes to seek any additional rent increases or to recover the cost of capital improvements from tenants with lifetime leases, the landlord must file an application or petition with the San Francisco Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board on a form or forms approved by it. On such an application or petition is filed, it shall be decided according to the provisions of the Rent Ordinance. Once the application or petition is filed and for the duration of the occupancy of the unit by the tenant entitled to protection from an unpermitted eviction, all the provisions of the Rent Ordinance shall apply, notwithstanding any provision which would otherwise exempt the unit.

(f) The Subdivider shall bear the cost of moving expenses of any Participating Tenant who relocates from the building to be converted. The Participating Tenant at his or her option, shall be reimbursed either for the actual moving expenses up to a maximum of $1,000, or for the fixed amount allowed by the moving expense schedule of the Central Relocation Services agency. In the event the unit is occupied by more than one tenant, the moving expense reimbursement herein provided shall be shared proportionately by the tenants in relation to the actual costs of moving the property of each tenant. The Subdivider or any successor in interest shall be subject to the requirement of this subsection when a Participating Tenant elects voluntarily to vacate the unit within the 5 year period such tenant is entitled to occupy the unit pursuant to subsection (d) and gives due notice therefore. As to Participating Tenants who are Senior Citizens or their designees and Disabled Persons, there shall be no time limit on this requirement.

(g) Any Participating Tenant who requests assistance in finding relocation housing shall be referred to the Central Relocation Services agency of the City and County of San Francisco, or, with the mutual consent of the tenant and Subdivider, such assistance may be provided by the Subdivider or a real estate brokerage firm selected by the Subdivider. The Subdivider shall pay any fees charged by any of the foregoing for providing assistance in finding relocation housing. The requirements set forth in this subsection shall be in effect for the period applicable to the requirement relating to moving expenses as set forth in subsection (f).

(h) As a condition of approval of a final map, the Subdivider shall submit to the Director evidence of the following:

(1) approval of the management documents for the project by the California Department of Real Estate;

(2) approval of the estimated operating budget for the project submitted to the California Department of Real Estate;

(3) evidence of compliance with regulation 2792.9 of the Regulations of the Real Estate Commissioner, California Administrative Code, Title 10;

(4) a letter to the California Department of Real Estate authorizing a designated tenant or tenants to act as agent to complete the processing of the application for, and to obtain the final public report for the project issued by the Department of Real Estate. The letter shall be signed by 25% of the tenants in the building, based on one tenant per unit. If the Subdivider fails to obtain a final public report within 6 months of the date the final map is recorded, the Director shall release the letter to the designated tenant or tenants or the Department of Real Estate.

It shall be a violation of this Article for a Subdivider to withdraw or abandon an application for a final public report after the final map has been recorded, except for good cause.

(Continued on page 88)
PROPOSITION S
Shall the ordinance establishing Domestic Partnerships be adopted? YES 86
NO 87

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors passed and the Mayor signed Ordinance No. 216-89 which establishes Domestic Partnerships. Before the ordinance took effect a referendum petition was filed. The referendum petition requires that the ordinance be submitted to the voters. The ordinance does not go into effect unless and until a majority of voters vote in favor of it.

THE PROPOSITION: Ordinance No. 216-89 allows unmarried couples to formally establish their relationship as a “Domestic Partnership.” They may establish their relationship by either (a) filing a Statement of Domestic Partnership with the County Clerk or, (b) signing such a Statement and having it notarized and witnessed and deposited with the witness. Domestic Partners are defined as two unmarried, unrelated people over the age of 18 who live together and agree to be jointly responsible for their basic living expenses such as food and housing.

Also, under the ordinance, the City may not use marital status in making a decision unless it uses Domestic Partnership status in the same way. The ordinance requires hospitals and other health care facilities to allow a patient’s domestic partner the same visiting rights allowed a patient’s spouse. The ordinance also allows a citizen to sue anyone who violates the ordinance.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the ordinance establishing Domestic Partners to go into effect.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the ordinance establishing Domestic Partners to be rejected.

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

“Should the proposed Ordinance be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, costs could increase as a result of subsequent actions by City boards and commissions in an amount presently indeterminate and possibly substantial”.

How “S” Got on the Ballot
On July 14, the Registrar of Voters certified that the referendum petition calling for Proposition S to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

18,800* signatures were required to place a referendum petition on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on July 5 by the proponents of the referendum petition showed that 21,723 of the signatures submitted were valid; 2,923 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION S

Imagine having spent a lifetime with a partner, sharing a home, sharing responsibilities. Your partner becomes ill, is hospitalized — and you don’t even have the right to visit him or her in the hospital. Your partner dies — and you don’t have the right to bereavement leave from work.

That’s the cruel reality for many San Franciscans.

That’s why we need to vote YES on S.

In the time of AIDS, we need to encourage people to establish long-term, stable relationships to protect their health and prevent spread of the disease. The City’s policy of recognizing long-term domestic partnerships is an important part of our effective AIDS program.

That’s why we need to vote YES on Proposition S.

Proposition S will end unfair, irrational discrimination against non-married couples. And will help in the fight against AIDS.

Although the law was passed unanimously by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor, some people want to repeal it. They want you to believe there’s more to it than there really is. But the simple truth is...

Proposition S won’t cost taxpayers money. No health or pension benefits are provided and no new bureaucracy is created.

Proposition S won’t cost business, either. It doesn’t require private employers to do anything but will assist them in voluntarily adopting employee benefit policies.

Proposition S doesn’t undermine the traditional family. It simply recognizes the reality that there are many different types of families in San Francisco.

Proposition S doesn’t affect marriage. Only the state can make laws about marriage. But Proposition S does provide a way for gay and lesbian couples — who cannot marry — to legalize their long-term relationships.

Stand up for fairness.

Vote YES on S.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION S

The ordinance before us here is overly complex. It seeks our blessings to not one but three out-of-wedlock relationships: 1-man and woman, 2-woman/woman, an unnatural relationship, but not legally proscribed generally. 3-man/man, morally reprehensible generally, and legally proscribed in virtually every other state in the U.S. Properly these three relationships should have been presented for public consideration ONE BY ONE. Instead, quite greedily and surreptitiously, this ordinance rolls them up and hurls them together at our moral fences. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION S.

The impropriety and complexity of the ordinance goes much deeper. The unnatural male relationship. Besides requesting that we condone the relationship itself, this ordinance tells us that we must pretend that this relationship is an actual union and, after we have strained our imagination thus far, we are to give the relationship equal status with the properly wed natural couple. This ordinance would forbid us to officially recognize any special merit in the traditional solemn wedlock of man and woman, over the unnatural coupling of male and male. How audacious. How wild. How presumptuous upon the public patience can one ill-written ordinance be! VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION S.

Our City, beloved so long by so many, has fallen into national disgrace. Many people fear the City will soon be a place unsuitable to raise children. The tens of thousands of voters who signed the Referendum to block this ordinance think that we can still save the City. VOTE NO ON S.

Rabbi Leib Feldman

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

From Time Immemorial, Society has had a substantial interest in the coupling of man and woman together under some kind of Solemnity, or sacred bond. This type of Union was good for Society. It created the warm and stable environment for children and the perpetuation of Society’s existence. It took dedication and sacrifice, and Society knew this, and appreciated it, and encouraged it with special recognition and rewards.

On the other hand, in the coupling together of ANY 2 people, free of any solemn bond, Society had no special interest. These people could part anytime — the next year, the next month, the next day. There was in it no stability, no future for Society. Thus, it would not only be illogical, but UNJUST as well, to put these two disparate categories of human couplings on an equal level of social esteem and recognition.

Nevertheless, illogical and unjust, the ordinance before us here purports to do just that. This alone is reason enough to reject it outright. We don’t even have to reach the many underlying moral issues involved here; or the fact that one of these sexual relationships is legally reprehensible in virtually every other state in the U.S.; or the fact that we are called upon here to decide this issue (perhaps unconstitutionally) on all three of these types of relationships at once; or the fact that this ordinance could easily bring about a serious economic burden to the City. We don’t even have to reach these questions. Suffice it that this ordinance states that our official Municipality, a real part of all of us, is going to recognize in Solemn Matrimony nothing more than it would recognize in 2 people, any 2 people, living together. This alone, is enough to bring an emphatic rejection of this ordinance. VOTE NO on Proposition S.

Rabbi Leib Feldman
Proponent of Referendum Against S

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION S

It is sad that the official opponent of Proposition S is trying to scare and confuse the voters. Because this law is really very sensible and simple. Ask yourself...

Should someone who is in a long-term, committed relationship have the right to visit his or her partner in the hospital?

Yes, of course.

Should someone who is in a long-term, committed relationship have the right to leave work to attend the funeral of his or her partner?

Yes, of course.

Should the City of San Francisco encourage long-term, stable relationships, especially during the time of AIDS?

Yes, of course.

Should the City of San Francisco treat all of its citizens equally regardless of marital status?

Yes, of course.

Is it wrong for one person to try to impose his moral or religious views on all of the rest of us?

Yes, of course.

That’s what Proposition S is all about. Sometimes it doesn’t cost anything to be fair and just. It only takes the courage to stand up for what’s right. That’s the case with Proposition S.

How should we vote on Proposition S?

Yes, of course.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION S

It has always been the San Francisco way to honor a fair deal for working men and women. Proposition S is a simple, no-cost way to guarantee that tradition of fairness for all the workers in the city. Proposition S provides non-married city workers with an essential dignity: the right to be absent from work to attend the funeral of their lifetime partner. It also ensures hospital visitation rights for non-married couples regardless of where they work. These seem like basic human rights, especially in a city with a reputation for fairness and decency like San Francisco. Yet without Proposition S many people in San Francisco would be denied these rights. The labor unions representing 79,000 San Francisco workers voted overwhelmingly to endorse Proposition S. We urge you to join us in voting Yes on S.

San Francisco Labor Council
Walter L. Johnson
Secretary-Treasurer

The Domestic Partners Legislation should be retained.
As environmental activists, we support efforts to improve the quality of people’s lives.
Retain the Domestic Partners Legislation.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION S

Regina Sneed

Dick Grosboll
Ken Smith
Tony Kilroy
Miriam Blaustein
Patrick Lynch
Nan McGuire
Reuben Goodman

Zach Cowan
Andrew Nash
David Spero
Norman Rolfe
Ira Kurlander

Proposition S is about equity — about what is right. It strengthens bonds between persons who are helping each other in responsible relationships.
Proposition S is for all of us.

Citizens for Representative Government
Dennis Antenore

Dale Carlson
Rene Casenave
Darryl Cox
Sue Hestor
Terry Salpeter
Calvin Welch

The Republican Party has long championed civil rights and individual rights. We are the party which abolished slavery, provided for equal protection under the laws, and expanded the franchise to vote.
Proposition S is another issue of simple justice.
It would allow unmarried couples to register with the City Clerk as domestic partners. They must be over the age of 18, live together, share the basic necessities of life, and not have been in another domestic partnership in the previous six months.
The registration program pays for itself.
Those registered would be entitled to only one right or benefit under the legislation — the simple right of hospital visitation.
The legislation does not provide for any other benefit nor does it impose any costs on private businesses.
We believe it is good governmental policy to encourage the strengthening of stable, interdependent, caring, and lasting relationships — particularly in the era of AIDS. Proposition S will help achieve these goals without creating any costs to the private sector or any undue burdens on the taxpayers. Vote Yes on Proposition S.

Brian Mavrogeorge
Kenneth Blumenthal
K. Martin Keller
Robert R. Bacci
Christopher L. Bowman

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

This isn’t a “Gay and Lesbian Law”. It involves senior couples, unmarried couples, and others. It doesn’t hurt anyone; it helps. It is right. Please join me in voting for Proposition “S”.

Chuck Lantz
Helen Lantz

California Nurses Association, Region 12 supports San Francisco’s Domestic Partnership Law which can enable ALL families to be eligible for benefits, including access to health care.

Mariann Monteleone, RN
Catherine Dodd, RN

Our involvement in ministry and religious life has taught us that many Gay men and Lesbians are involved in loving, committed relationships. Propositions S does not create new relationships for Gay men and Lesbians, it merely grants a measure of legal recognition for these relationships.

The opponents of Proposition S act out of prejudice and ignorance when they claim that the domestic partners law undermines the family. Far from undermining family values, Proposition S will strengthen family life by giving a small degree of integrity and dignity to loving and responsible relationships which are ignored in our civil laws.

All people who have experienced the God-given gift of loving and caring for a life partner are demonstrating true traditional values. So-called religious leaders who promote fear and bigotry against loving relationships are not divinely inspired.

Vote Yes on Proposition S.

Rev. Robert Arpin
Lauren Artress, Cannon Pastor, Grace Cathedral
Richard Cotten
Fr. Robert Cromey
Rev. Carol Davis
Lewis Day
Rev. James DeLange

Kelly Denton-Borhaug, Minister, Evangelical Lutheran Church
Paul Dirdak, Trinity United Methodist Church
Rev. David Forbes
Rev. Derek Ford
Jane Hagmaier
Rev. Marcia Herndon
Rev. Glenda Hope, San Francisco Network of Ministries
Armand Kreft
Rev. Jeremy Landau, United Methodist AIDS Project
Rev. Chuck Larsen, Golden Gate Metropolitan Community Church
Peter Lawson, Rector, St. James Church
Charles Lewis
James Lokken, Assistant Pastor, St. Francis Lutheran Church
Rev. Bruce McSpadden, San Francisco United Methodist Mission
Rev. Gary Ost, Rector, St. Lukes Episcopal Church
Fr. Robert Royall
Rev. Kim Smith
Billey Talmadge
Elizabeth Todd
Rev. Fran Toy
Robert Valentis

Proposition S reflects the consensus position of the elected leadership of San Francisco. It is the reasonable and moderate product of years of work and negotiation. Very simply, it offers the hand of fairness to non-married couples by providing them with funeral leave and hospital visitation rights.

Sadly, Proposition S has become the target of a misleading and divisive campaign. The truth is that Propositions S will promote equal treatment for anyone in a long-term relationship. It will affirm at no cost to the taxpayers, San Francisco’s commitment to tolerance and progress. Proposition S reflects the diversity of San Francisco, which is our greatest strength. Please join us in voting Yes on S.

Public Defender Jeff Brown
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assemblyman John Burton
Sheriff Michael Hennessey
State Senator Milton Marks
Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi
District Attorney Arlo Smith

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION S

Domestic partners protection is important to our lives as women. There are many different combinations of family that are unique and important to each of us. We respect people’s liberty to choose the family arrangement that makes sense for them. This freedom of choice should not impose a penalty that deprives couples and families from supporting and enriching each other’s lives.

How painful to be told that the life you built with another person has no value. How tragic to be told you may not visit an ill or dying loved one because you lack the appropriate legal credentials.

No person should be denied self-worth simply because of who she or he loves.

The domestic partners law protects San Franciscans from discrimination. We urge all women to vote YES on S.

Sherry Agnos
Elizabeth Colton
Hongisto
Robert Achenberg
Laura Campbell
Lenore Chinn
Sherri Chiesa
Kim Corsaro
Margaret Crosby
Jo Daly
Pam David
Libby Denebeim

Mary Dunlap
Dorothy Ehrlich
Angie Fa
K.C. Frogge
Marcia E.M. Gallo
Abby Ginzberg
Amy Gordon
Helen Grieco
Vivian Hallinan
Jean Harris
Barbara Hargrave
Stephanie Hedgecoe

Sue Hestor
Carol Isen
Sharon Johnson
Lani Kaahumanu
Leslie Katz
Susan Kennedy
Holly Krasser
Lynne Laidaw
Helen Lantz
Phyllis Lyon
Barbara Maggiani
Susan Maher

Julianne Malveaux
Esther Marks
Joanie Marquart
Del Martin
Melissa McTucker
Carole Migden
Leahvila Milletlo
Rhian Miller
Kathryn Moir
Joyce Newsstat
Pat Norman
Margaret Norris
Louise Ogden
Eva Paterson
Ruth Picon
Terry Salpeter
Maggi Rubenstein
Sharyn Saslasky
Mimi Silbert
Hon. Carol Ruth Silver
Zwazi Sowo
Hon. Nancy Walker

San Francisco has always drawn strength from the diversity of its people. San Franciscans take pride in the fact that ours is a city of many different communities, lifestyles and views.

We are living in hard times, when poverty, immigration restrictions, the AIDS epidemic and drug addiction have placed very difficult challenges before our families. Our communities have met these challenges by strengthening our family networks and we believe that the city must recognize the diversity of these families and grant equal treatment to them.

Proposition S — the domestic partners legislation — helps to provide equal treatment to those families which do not fall within the narrow boundaries of married couples. It provides funeral leave and hospital visitation rights to all couples.

We join with our entire city to stand for equality under the law and compassion for our diverse families in a period of great difficulty.

As leaders in San Francisco’s minority communities, we urge you to join us in voting YES ON S!

Rosario Anaya, Board of Education
Adrian Bermudez Jr., Democratic Central Committee
Barbara Cameron, Community United Against Violence
Sara Campos, Latino Democratic Club
Gwen Craig, Police Commissioner
Henry Der
Claude Eberhardt, Deputy Mayor
Yvonne Golden

Supervisor Jim Gonzales
Juan Gutierrez, Mission Cultural Center
Emil De Guzman, Senior Escort Program
Jesse L. Jackson, President, National Rainbow Coalition
Peter Jamero, Human Rights Commission
Leni Marin, S.F. Commission on the Status of Women
Sandra Mack, S.F. Federation of Teachers
Jose Medina, Police Commissioner
Gilbert Monroy, Citizens’ Committee on Community Development
Pat Norman
Gail Orr-Smith, Deputy Mayor
Ruth Picon, Latino Democratic Club
Santiago Ruiz, Mission Neighborhood Centers
Mario Salgado, La Raza Centro Legal
Richard Sevilla, Latino Democratic Club
Julie Tang, SFCCD
Doris Thomas
Karen Goodman Pierce
Rolando Quan, Chinese American Democratic Club
Anita Sanchez
Supervisor Doris Ward
Carmen Vasquez, S.F. Women’s Bldg.
Reggie Williams
Sodonia Wilson, Board of Education
Leland Yee, Board of Education
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We urge a Yes vote on Proposition S. Simple decency calls us to grant basic rights to those who are in committed relationships, regardless of sexual orientation. City employees should be allowed to visit their companions in the hospital, take time off work for mourning if they die, and share in both the benefits and responsibilities of their relationship, regardless of marital status. Any law that encourages stability in personal relationships is good social policy, especially in the midst of the AIDS epidemic. The domestic partnership ordinance is not a threat to marriage or family life, but an act of justice, compassion, and fairness for all San Franciscans.

The opponents of domestic partners are trying to impose a single view of religious values on the people of San Francisco. This runs counter to the respect for diversity that is the cornerstone of religious life in America. No single religion has the right to dictate to society the definition of "family". Proposition S is a matter of civil law, not religious dogma.

Promote fairness and family stability by voting YES on Prop S.

Mary Arwood, Episcopal Priest
Rev. Rachel Birnbaum
Rebecca Fernandez
Emilio Gonzales
Barbara Gualco
Brent Hawk, Rector, Episcopal Church of St. John the Evangelist
Michael Hiller, Assistant Pastor, St. Francis Lutheran Church
James Jelinek, Rector, St. Aidan's Episcopal Church
Gregor Killingsworth, Minister, United Church of Christ
Ronald McBride, Episcopal Priest
Rev. Anita Ostrom
Rob Roy Rhudy, Episcopal Priest
Richard Schuper
Erica Silverberg
Julie Anne Todd
Rev. Catherine Roskam

Jewish tradition requires of a relationship commitment, faithfulness, mutual respect and caring and sanctity of the home. These qualities can exist in relationships with or without the benefit of a marriage license. State law prohibits the marriage of two people of the same gender. Yet lesbian and gay couples have repeatedly demonstrated their loving commitment and faithfulness to each other. Proposition S provides a means of public acknowledgement for the sanctity of these relationships, yet in no way diminishes nor discourages traditional marriage.

Jewish tradition also encourages visiting the sick. Proposition S ensures that in times of crisis a person will not be prevented from visiting his or her domestic partner in the hospital. Please join us in voting yes on Proposition S.

Robert Achtenberg

Alvin Baum
Jewish Family and Children's Service
Rabbi Allen Bennett
Rabbi Gary Greenbaum
Rabbi Yoel Kahn
Lisa Katz
Dr. Eric Keitel
President, Sha'ar Zahav
Carole Migden
San Francisco Democratic Party
Dr. Mike Rankin
Sharyn Sasafsky
Rabbi Martin Weiner
Joyce Newstat

It's offensive to suggest that opposition to the stadium equals opposition to domestic partners. San Franciscans for Planning Priorities, committee against Proposition P, strongly supports Proposition S.

VOTE YES ON S and NO ON P.

Jack Morrison, Former Supervisor
Richard Hongisto, Supervisor
Co-chairs, San Franciscans for Planning Priorities
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION S

As faithful Roman Catholics, we recommend a YES vote on Proposition S. Catholic theology has always been careful to distinguish between the sacrament of marriage and marriage as a civil institution. Proposition S will have no harmful effect on marriage or family life, but will encourage stability and faithfulness in the relationships of unmarried people. Our duty as Christians also requires us to show compassion for others without passing judgment.

Gary Adams, M.Div.
Margaret Aposto
J. Arango
Daniel Baratta
Joseph Bloom
Marguerite Breault
Kevin Calegari
Leo Campbell
Catholic Coalition for Human Justice
Douglas Cleverger
David Coe
Raymond Collins
Vince Delahay
Louis Dunn
James Foster
Joyce Geoffroy
D.M. Gillette
John Golding
Ramon Gonzales
Stephen Green
Juliana Grenzeback
Michael Jacinto
Catherine James
Joseph Kelleher
Antonia Koot
Daniel McLaughlin
Melissa McTucker
Supervisor Bill Maher
Hugh Malleney
Cliff Morrison
Michael Nolan
E.J. McCarthy
Manuel Perez
Kim Powelson
Michael Sieczkarek
Catherine Squier
L. Stec
Robert Valentis
Michael Vargas
John Wilhite

As AIDS service providers we strongly support the Domestic Partners ordinance — Proposition S. The ordinance’s provisions for bereavement leave and hospital visitation rights for domestic partners preserve the tradition of respect for individuals which has been crucial in San Francisco’s humane response to AIDS.

In the course of the HIV epidemic, we have worked with thousands of domestic partners — gay, bisexual and straight — who care for their loved ones with the same devotion as any other loving couple. To deny these people such basic rights as bereavement leave and hospital visitation rights would run contrary to the solidarity and compassion which San Francisco has fought the HIV epidemic — a spirit which has been praised around the world.

Passing domestic partners will help ease the pain of AIDS for many San Franciscans. We urge you to vote yes on Proposition S.

Paul Boneberg,
Executive Director, Mobilization Against AIDS
Pat Christen,
Acting Executive Director, S.F. AIDS Foundation
Jacqueline Mollema,
Vice President, Visiting Nurses/Hospice
Gerald Lenoir,
Executive Director, Black Coalition on AIDS
Phil Tingley,
Executive Director, American Indian AIDS Institute
ACT UP/San Francisco
Martin Delaney,
Executive Director, Project Inform

As environmentalists and neighborhood activists, we support the domestic partners ordinance. We commend the Supervisors for this fair and humane legislation.

Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Trent Orr, Recreation and Park Commissioner

Peter Moylan, SFT Board Member
Steve Krefting
Rick Hauflman, Vice-Pres. Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
Zach Cowan
John Holzclaw
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The San Francisco Democratic Central Committee strongly urges you to support Proposition S.

Proposition S promotes equal treatment for all citizens. It provides the same hospital visitation rights and funeral leave to non-married couples that married couples already enjoy.

San Francisco Democratic Party
County Central Committee
Elected Members
Carole Migden, Chair
Adrian Bermudez, Jr.
Susan Bierman
Kimiko Burton
Lulu Carter
Ellen Chaitin

Greg Day
Terence Hallinan
Agar Jaicks
Leslie Katz
Tony Kilroy
Steve Krefting
Marilyn Miller
Connie O'Connor

Ruth Picon
Alexa Smith
Arlo Hale Smith
Jim Wachob
Alicia Wang
Simeon White
Ex Officio Appointees
Anne Daley
Norman Ishimoto

Ed McGovern
Jim Morales
Beverly Prior
Matthew Rothschild
Alfredo Rodriguez
Arnold Townsend

Freedom means freedom not for just a few, but for everyone. We support personal choices, therefore we support Gay rights. Vote yes.

Jim Schmitt, Green Party
Rick Wall, Humanist Party

The Domestic Partners Legislation should be retained.
As environmental activists, we support efforts to improve the quality of people's lives.
Retain the Domestic Partners Legislation.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION S

Regina Sneed

AN OPEN LETTER TO RABBI FELDMAN:
As co-sponsor of the petition against Domestic Partners, you see yourself following Moses' command in the Old Testament Book of Leviticus; you consider this God's will.

You're entitled to that belief.

But before you support discrimination against gays, remember that you also are a "minority group", and are safe only in a tolerant, egalitarian society.

Centuries ago, "Christians" burned millions of people at the stake. Most were alleged "witches", but among the many other "heretics" burned with them, were homosexuals.

And Jews.

More recently, the Nazis gassed Jews, homosexuals and various other minorities, in the same ovens.

The general rule: no minority is safe unless all minorities are safe.

Likewise, no minority is truly free or equal, unless all minorities are.

If you impose your religious views today, what will you say when someone else imposes their religious views tomorrow?

Grassroots
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION S

AN OPEN LETTER TO REVEREND MCILHENNY:
Two centuries ago, Thomas Jefferson advocated:
“A WALL OF SEPARATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND
STATE”.
But the idea is much older.
Twenty centuries ago, Jesus advocated:
“RENDER UNTO CAESAR WHAT IS CAESAR’S, AND
RENDER UNTO GOD WHAT IS GOD’S”.
Jesus was a pioneer of modern, enlightened ideas like separation
of church and state, peace, charity and tolerance toward all.

If Jesus came back tomorrow, He’d probably support equal rights
for gays and everyone else.
After all, He said:
“LOVE THY NEIGHBOR AS THYSELF”
“DO UNTO OTHERS AS YOU WOULD HAVE
THEM DO UNTO YOU”.

Doesn’t that sound like equal rights?
Based on Moses’ condemnation, “witches” and gays were
burned at the stake together.
But neither was condemned in the Ten Commandments.
And neither was condemned by Jesus.
Rather, the Ten Commandments said:

By co-sponsoring the petition against Domestic Partners, you
and Rabbi Feldman make clear that your opposition is based on
religion. But Jesus never condemned homosexuals, did He?
Most Christians see Jesus as superseding the Old Testament. Do
you see Moses’ commands in Leviticus as still in effect?
If it is sin to disobey Moses’ command against homosexuality,
is it also sin to eat pork?
If homosexuality violates God’s plan, why does it exist?

Grassroots

“THOU SHALT NOT KILL.”
And Jesus said:
“JUDGE NOT, LEST YE BE JUDGED”
“LET HIM WHO IS WITHOUT SIN CAST
THE FIRST STONE”.

There is no reason to think Moses was infallible. Most Christians
don’t observe his taboo on pork.
Discrimination and persecution of minorities are not Christian,
or moral. Tolerance is.
End inequality; vote Yes.

Grassroots

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION S

Proposition S will erode family values
Catholics, Protestants and Jews view the institution of the family
and marriage seriously, and are opposed to any efforts to erode its
value. Putting domestic partnership on a par with marriage, creating
an alternate track are erosions.
Proposition S gives all the public benefits of marriage to
domestic partners and none of the responsibilities.
Marriage in both religious and civil law is a public commitment
for life. Domestic Partners neither must commit publically nor for
anything longer than six months. Marriage is set up to protect
society and stability. The law as it now reads will legalize tempo-
nary relationships.
Proposition S is special interest legislation
This legislation is being set up as a “special” law which will affect
only a few with possibly enormous costs to the City and its citizens.

Prop S will increase bureaucracy and be impossible to ad-
minister.
In the last budget hearings, the Human Rights Commission of
the City was already asking for more staff and money to administer
this program. The law is written so vaguely and loosely that the
complications in the future will be immense.
Prop S tries to do too much.
Some of the benefits, if they are cost effective, can be given to
persons who need them in other ways than by creating an alternate
track to marriage as this legislation does.
Be Reasonable, Vote No on Proposition S

Wayne H. Alba
Member, Filipino Community
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As citizens active in the San Francisco community and concerned with its well-being, we are convinced that the Domestic Partners Ordinance has serious flaws.

THE ORDINANCE IS DISCRIMINATORY

It grants the same benefits and privileges to unmarried partners who can discontinue their responsibilities with a mere signature on the same basis as married partners whose termination of responsibilities must be determined in a legal process.

It opens the door for spousal dependent benefits for unrelated unmarried persons, while such benefits are not extended to related persons who are the principal support of an aged parent or dependent sibling.

THE ORDINANCE HAS POTENTIAL FOR SERIOUS FISCAL CONSEQUENCES FOR TAXPAYERS AND CURRENT BENEFICIARIES

It is anticipated that domestic partners will seek the whole range of spousal benefits, including monthly spousal retirement and survivor pensions. City pension funds are partially supported by tax payers. There is a current consideration for domestic partnership participation in the City Health Plan, the cost of which is borne by beneficiaries. Current beneficiaries can justifiably expect increases in premiums and/or reduction of services.

THE ORDINANCE RAISES LEGAL QUESTIONS, WHICH WOULD HAVE TO BE DECIDED BY ADJUDICATION

The legal status of partners in relation to state and federal laws in several contexts, including the entitlement to welfare and other benefits, would need determination.

THE ORDINANCE IS ALSO OPEN TO ABUSE. PARTNERS CAN READILY ENTER IN AND OUT OF RELATIONS FOR ECONOMIC CONSIDERATION SUCH AS HEALTH BENEFITS OR ELIGIBILITY FOR WELFARE.

Issues about funeral leave and hospital privileges can be addressed separately without the need for an open-ended ordinance which can have unknown consequences.

Mildred E. Favetti
Rosemary K. Shanahan
Edna Lorraine Castle

Anna N. Guth
Barbara A. Grudo
Alice Cathleen Mibach

Mary Ann Schwab
Mary C. McKenna
Paquita P. Reyes, M.D.

Gloria Krzyzanowski
Dolores E. Williams
Alice P. Asturias

While we as Catholic lawyers are sympathetic with those who advocate extended health care and sick leave/bereavement benefits, the Domestic Partnership Ordinance is seriously flawed and should be repealed. It would grant to certain people many of the benefits of marriage, while excusing them from the obligations of marriage.

Rather than eliminating discrimination, the Ordinance actually discriminates against certain unmarried relatives, such as brothers or sisters living together. Furthermore, the Ordinance may provide a foundation for serious, unanticipated legal liabilities for "domestic partners" and open the floodgates of litigation. The potential costs to the taxpayers of the benefits envisioned by the Ordinance's proponents are staggering.

Most importantly, this Ordinance creates "pseudo-marriages" which trivialize the legal status of marriage under state law, undermine traditional family values and erode the cornerstone of a civilized, nurturing society.

This Ordinance creates problems — not solutions! VOTE NO!

Edward J. Watson, President
Edward V. O'Gara, Jr., Member, Executive Committee
St. Thomas More Society of San Francisco,
An Association of Catholic Lawyers
Founded in 1937

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors is urging us to adopt their Domestic Partners law and worry about the details later.

How much will it cost?

No one has the foggiest notion. The City's budget analyst and the City official who oversees employee health insurance have both stated that extending benefits to the partners of unmarried city workers will, among other things, drive up insurance premiums. But our Mayor and Board of Supervisors won't hang a price tag on this loosely wrapped package until after the election even though the City controller states that costs could be substantial.

Instead of buying another of those proverbial pigs in a poke, let's send a message to the budget-busters at City Hall.

Vote no on S.

Thomas C. Scanlon, Retired Treasurer,
City and County of San Francisco
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Proposition S could prove to be the lawyers’ employment act of 1989.

At a time when the courts are already wrestling with the vagaries of palimony, this proposition offers a new definition of unmarried bliss without defining the legal obligations of the partners whose relationships would be officially recognized by the City and County of San Francisco.

It would appear, moreover, that the City has yet to establish guidelines for granting benefits to single employees who register under this law. Thus any attempt to police or regulate benefits provided will almost certainly produce a rash of expensive law suits making San Francisco still more inhospitable to large and small businesses alike. Ill-conceived, financially irresponsible policies such as these are driving our business community to our neighbors and undermining our community.

No matter how these legal disputes are ultimately resolved, the big winners will be the lawyers, and the big losers will be the taxpayers of San Francisco.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION S

Bernard David Walter,
Business litigator and former S.F. Assistant District Attorney

Proposition S is on the ballot because over 27,000 San Franciscans signed a petition to place an unwise and irresponsible law before the voters.

A similar measure, proposed by gay rights advocates, was vetoed in 1982 by Mayor Dianne Feinstein.

Proponents describe Proposition S as “a way for gay and lesbian couples — who cannot marry — to legalize their long-term relationships.” This could be accomplished by paying a modest $35 city fee to register as “domestic partners.”

An immediate effect of this law would be to extend benefits available only to married city employees and their dependents to the registered domestic partners of single employees.

The city’s staff warns that these expanded benefits will be costly, but the language of Proposition S is so ambiguous that no one can accurately estimate the economic consequences. We do know, however, that the Board of Supervisors has urged approval of insurance benefits for unmarried couples — whatever the cost may be — and the Mayor has appointed a task force to devise guidelines for implementation of this coverage.

The Mayor and the Board argue that Proposition S will help prevent AIDS by encouraging “stable, long-term relationships.” But, in fact, it would officially sanction any relationship, irrespective of the longevity or stability, and encourage unmarried city workers to register “partnerships of convenience” as a means of qualifying for benefits.

How would that prevent AIDS?

As written, Proposition S raises legal questions that would inevitably involve both the city and registered “partners” in expensive litigation. And the direct cost of additional city benefits have not and cannot be determined in advance.

Vote No on Proposition S.

San Franciscans for Common Sense

If Proposition S is simply an attempt to “end unfair, irrational discrimination against unmarried couples” (as the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors claim), why have proponents found it necessary to resort to deception and distortion?

We are told that Proposition S “won’t cost taxpayers money” and that no “health or pension benefits are provided and no new bureaucracy is created”.

The truth is, Proposition S would set the stage for a massive benefit rip-off. In tandem with the Domestic Partners ordinance that it passed, the Board of Supervisors approved a resolution asking that the unmarried mutes of city workers (both gay and heterosexual) be allowed to enroll in city and private health insurance plans. In addition, the Mayor has appointed a task force to draw up guidelines for implementing coverage of nontraditional relationships. Who will pay for these “extended family” benefits?

We are told that Proposition S would “encourage stable, long-term relationships” and thereby help to prevent the spread of AIDS.

The truth is, even casual acquaintances could register as domestic partners under this proposed law. And how could the city hope to distinguish between stable, unstable or fraudulent relationships aimed at qualifying for city benefits? Proposition S has nothing to do with AIDS, it is simply an attempt to appease a political pressure group and slip a special benefits program through the back door.

If “discrimination” is rampant in San Francisco, we should deal with it in a straightforward manner. Special interest legislation which relies on deception and subterfuge is not an acceptable solution.

Vote no on proposition S.

Jack Bellingham, Investment Advisor
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PROPOSITION S

AMENDING POLICE CODE TO ADD ARTI-
CLE 40 PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATION
AGAINST DOMESTIC PARTNERS BY
CITY AND COUNTY; PROVIDING
PROCEDURE TO ESTABLISH AND TO GIVE
NOTICE OF TERMINATION OF DOMESTIC
PARTNERSHIPS; AND PROHIBITING DIS-
CRIMINATION IN HOSPITAL VISITATION
RIGHTS.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and
County of San Francisco:
Section 1. The San Francisco Police Code is
amended by adding Article 40, Sections 4001
to 4010, to read:
NOTE: All language is new; additions and
substitutions have not been under-
lined.

SEC. 4001. DISCRIMINATION AGAINST
DOMESTIC PARTNERS
The City and County shall not discriminate
against Domestic Partners or Domestic Part-
nerships in any way. This includes (but is not
limited to) not using marital status as a factor in any
decision, policy or practice unless it uses Do-
mesic Partnership as a factor in the same way.

SEC. 4002. DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS:
DEFINITIONS AND INFORMATIONAL
MATERIAL

(a) Domestic Partnership Defined. Domestic
Partners are two people who have chosen to
share one another’s lives in an intimate and
committed relationship of mutual caring, who
live together and have signed a Declaration of
Domestic Partnership in which they have
agreed to be jointly responsible for basic living
expenses incurred during the Domestic Partner-
ship, and have established their partnership
under Section 4005 of this Article.

(b) Additional Qualifications to Become Do-
mesic Partners. To be Domestic Partners, nei-
ther person may be married, the two may not be
related to each other in a way which would bar
marriage in California, and both must be 18 or
older. Any different Domestic Partnership of
which either was previously a member must
have ended more than six months before the
new Declaration of Domestic Partnership was
signed (but this requirement does not apply if
the earlier Domestic Partnership ended because
of the death of one of its members).

(c) “Live Together” Defined. “Live together”
means that two people share the same living
quarters. It is not necessary that the right to
possess the quarters be in both names. Two
people may live together even if one or both
have additional separate living quarters. Do-
mesic Partners do not cease to live together if
one leaves the shared living quarters but intends
to return.

(d) “Basic Living Expenses” Defined. “Basic
living expenses” means the cost of basic food,
shelter and any other expenses of a Domestic
Partner which are paid at least in part by a
program or benefit for which the partner quali-
fied because of the Domestic Partnership. The
individuals need not contribute equally or
jointly to the cost of these expenses as long as
they agree that both are responsible for the cost.

(e) "Declaration of Domestic Partnership" Defined. A Declaration of Domestic Part-
nership is a form, provided by the County Clerk, in
which two people agree to be jointly responsible
for basic living expenses incurred during the
Domestic Partnership and that all the other qual-
ifications for Domestic Partners are met when
the Declaration is signed. The form shall be
contained in a booklet or packet with the infor-
mational materials described in paragraph (f).
The form will require each partner to provide
his or her primary residence address. The form
must be signed under penalty of perjury. Unless
it is filed with the City, the form must be wit-
nessed and notarized. The City Attorney shall
prepare appropriate forms.

(f) Informational Material. The San Francisco
Human Rights Commission shall prepare infor-
mational material which will describe ways in
which committed relationships may give their
relationships the legal effect they would like
them to have. The informational material
shall state that the City is not providing legal
advice and assumes no responsibility for the
accuracy of the information provided.

SEC. 4003. ENDING DOMESTIC PARTNERS-
ERSHIPS

(a) Termination. A Domestic Partnership
ends when:
(1) the partners no longer meet one or more
of the qualifications for Domestic Partnership;
or
(2) one partner sends the other a written notice
that he or she has ended the partnership;
or
(3) one of the partners dies.

(b) Notice of Termination.
(1) To Domestic Partners. When a Domestic
Partnership ends, the partners must execute a
notice of termination naming the partners and
stating that the partnership has ended (hereafter
“Notice of Termination”). The Notice of Ter-
mation must be dated and signed under penalty
of perjury by at least one of the partners. If the
Declaration of Domestic Partnership for the
partnership was filed with the County Clerk, the
Notice of Termination must be filed with the
County Clerk; in all other cases, the Notice of Ter-
mination must be notarized and a copy given to
whomever witnessed the Declaration of Do-
mestic Partnership.

(2) To Third Parties. A Domestic Partner who
has given a copy of a Declaration of Domestic
Partnership to any third party in order to qualify
for any benefit or right, must give the third party
a copy of the Notice of Termination. If that
partner has died, the surviving partner must give
the notice of termination to those third parties
whom he or she knew were given a copy of the
Declaration by the deceased partner in order to
qualify for a benefit or right. The Notice must be
sent within 60 days of the termination of the
Domestic Partnership.

(c) Failure to Give Notice. Failure to give
notice as required by this subsection will neither

prevent nor delay termination of the Domestic
Partnership. Anyone who suffers any loss as a
result of failure to send either of these notices
may sue the partner who has failed to send the
required notice.

SEC. 4004. LEGAL EFFECT OF DECL-
ARATION OF DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP

(a) Rights and Duties Created. Neither this
Article nor the filing of a Statement of Domestic
Partnership shall create any legal rights or duties
from one of the parties to the other other than the
legal rights and duties specifically created by this
Chapter or other ordinances or resolutions of the
San Francisco Board of Supervisors which spe-
cifically refer to Domestic Partnership.

(b) Duration of Rights and Duties. Once a
Domestic Partnership ends, the partners will
incure no further obligations to each other under
this Article.

SEC. 4005. ESTABLISHING EXISTENCE
OF DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP

(a) Domestic partners may establish the exis-
tence of their Domestic Partnership by either:
(1) Presenting an original Declaration of
Domestic Partnership to the County Clerk, who
will file it and give the partners a certificate
showing that the Declaration was filed by the
County Clerk;
or
(2) Having a Declaration of Domestic Part-
nership notarized and giving a copy to the
person who witnessed the signing. (See Section
4002(e) of this Article.)

(b) The County Clerk shall only accept for
filing Declarations of Domestic Partnership
submitted by Domestic Partners who have a
residence in San Francisco, or where one of the
partners works in San Francisco.

(c) Amendments to the Declaration. A Partner
may amend a Declaration of Domestic Partner-
ship filed with the County Clerk at any time to
show a change in his or her primary residence
address.

(d) New Declarations of Domestic Part-
nership. No person who has created a Domestic
Partnership may create another until six months
after a Statement of Termination has been
signed and either (i) filed with the County Clerk
if the Declaration creating the partnership was
filed or (ii) notarized; provided, however, that
if the Domestic Partnership ended because one
of the partners died, a new Declaration may be
filed anytime after the Notice of Termination
has been filed or notarized.

(e) Evidence of Domestic Partnership. Any-
one who requires a person to provide evidence
of the existence of a Domestic Partnership must
accept (but may choose not to require) as com-
plete proof a copy of a Declaration of Domestic
Partnership.

SEC. 4006. RECORDS, COPIES, FILING
FEES

(a) County Clerk’s Records. The County
Clerk shall keep a record of all Declarations of
Domestic Partnership, Amendments to Decla-
rations of Domestic Partnership and all Notices
of Termination received by the Clerk. The re-

(Continued on next page)
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cords shall be maintained so that Amendments and Notices of Termination are filed with the Declaration of Domestic Partnership to which they pertain.

(b) Filing Fees. The County Clerk shall charge a fee of $35 for filing Declarations of Domestic Partnership and shall charge a fee of $7 for providing certified copies of Declarations, Amendments or Notices of Termination. There will be no charge for filing Amendments or Notices of Termination.

SEC. 4007. VISITATION IN HEALTH CARE FACILITIES

(a) Patient Designation. Where a health care facility restricts a patient’s visitors, the health care facility shall allow every patient to name those individuals whom the patient wishes to allow to visit, unless:

(1) no visitors are allowed; or

(2) the facility determines that the presence of a particular visitor would endanger the health or safety of a patient or patients, or would endanger the primary operations of the facility.

(b) Domestic Partners Who Do Not Make Designations. If a patient with whom visiting is restricted has not made the designation provided for in subsection (a), and if the patient has not indicated that she or he wishes no visitors, the facility must allow the patient’s Domestic Partner, the children of the patient’s Domestic Partner, or the Domestic Partner of the patient’s parent or child to visit, unless:

(1) no visitors are allowed; or

(2) the facility determines that the presence of a particular visitor would endanger the health or safety of a patient or patients, or would endanger the primary operations of the facility.

(c) Health Care Facility Defined. A “Health Care Facility” is any clinic, health dispensary or health facility licensed under Division 2 of the California Health and Safety Code, any mental hospital, drug abuse clinic or detoxification center.

SEC. 4008. RETALIATION

No person who seeks the benefit of this Article shall be discriminated against in any way for seeking that benefit. No person who assists someone else in obtaining the benefit of this Article shall be discriminated against in any way for such assistance.

SEC. 4009. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) Civil Service Commission and Human Rights Commission. This Article may be enforced by the Civil Service Commission insofar as the actions, decisions, policies and practices at issue pertain to employees of the City and County in their capacity as employees. In all other respects, this Article may be enforced by the San Francisco Human Rights Commission pursuant to Sections 12A.5 and 12A.9 of the Administrative Code.

(b) Civil Action. This Article may be enforced by a civil action. A complaint to the Human Rights Commission is not a prerequisite to enforcement in a civil action. The plaintiff in such an action shall be entitled to recover only compensatory damages and no punitive damages.

(c) Remedies. Any court that finds that this Article has been violated or will be violated may use all the powers which it has to remedy or prevent a violation.

(d) Statute of Limitations. Any action to enforce this Article must be commenced no later than two years after the claimed violation.

SEC. 4010. OTHER LAWS.

Nothing in this ordinance shall be construed to interfere in or mandate the exercise of discretion regarding matters over which any board or commission of the City and County has exclusive charter authority; or to conflict with any rights or requirements established by charter, state or federal law, including, but not limited to, the rights and obligations attendant to marriage under state and federal laws. Nothing in this ordinance shall be deemed to alter or to require the alteration of eligibility requirements for social service, public health, and other entitlement programs provided or administered by the City and County. Nothing in this ordinance shall be deemed to alter any existing memorandum of understanding to which the City and County is a party.
AIDS Research and Services

PROPOSITION U

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support the continuance and expansion of community-based AIDS research and services, to recognize the efforts of volunteers and health professionals providing such research and services and to urge the state and federal governments to increase funding for such research and services?

YES 93

NO 94

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City has no voter-approved policy regarding the support of community-based AIDS research and services.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition U would make it City policy to support the continuance and expansion of community-based AIDS research and services, to recognize the efforts of the volunteers and health professionals in community-based AIDS research projects and health and social service organizations and to urge the state and federal government to increase funding of and assistance to community-based AIDS research and services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the continuance and expansion of community-based AIDS research and services, to recognize efforts of the volunteers and health professionals in community-based AIDS research projects and health and social service organizations and to urge the state and federal government to increase funding of and assistance to community-based AIDS research and services.

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

Controller’s Statement on “U”

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

“Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “U” Got on the Ballot

On August 9, the Registrar of Voters received a proposed declaration of policy signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Terence Hallinan, Willie Kennedy, and Nancy Walker. The City Charter allows four or more Supervisors to place an ordinance on the ballot in this manner.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION U

This policy statement declares San Francisco's support for the continuance and expansion of community-based AIDS research projects and health and social service organizations. It urges the state and federal governments to increase funding of and assistance to these organizations.

Over 7000 San Franciscans have been diagnosed with AIDS, many others suffer from AIDS-Related Conditions, and over 30,000 San Franciscans are believed to be infected with the HIV virus.

The timely development of new drugs and treatments is essential to saving the lives of people with AIDS, ARC and HIV infection. Community-based organizations in San Francisco and other cities are conducting effective research projects to assist in the development of successful drugs and treatments. Such research, however, is often hindered by inadequate financial support from the federal government, or by bureaucratic delays.

Similarly, San Francisco's network of community-based organizations is a national model for cost-effective AIDS health and social services, but inadequate state and federal financial support threatens the survival of these organizations.

Further, the expansion of AIDS prevention programs is necessary, particularly in minority communities, in order to save lives and prevent further spread of the disease.

This policy statement, without incurring any costs to the taxpayers, will send a message to Washington and Sacramento that San Franciscans cannot continue to bear the full burden of these services.

The statement also recognizes the heroic efforts of the volunteers, physicians, and health professionals in community-based AIDS research and services.

Vote YES on Proposition U.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

---

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

---

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION U

As AIDS service providers, physicians, researchers, activists and patients we urge you to support Proposition U.

This initiative will support community-based AIDS programs. Their work includes not only prevention, education, and patient care, but medical treatment and research as well. Recently, one of the most important AIDS treatments discovered (Aerosol Pentamidine) was developed by a San Francisco community group. These groups not only do this important work; they do it at lesser cost than comparable programs in other cities.

Despite this efficiency, in recent months the financial strain on these groups because of increased patient load has jeopardized their vital work. Pleas for increased financial assistance from the federal and state government are being rejected by AIDS bureaucrats. This is unacceptable. The cost of fighting AIDS cannot continue to be borne by the taxpayer of San Francisco and private donations.

We believe that passage of this policy statement will send a clear signal to state and federal policy makers to reconsider increased financial support to preserve the community-based groups which comprise the "San Francisco model." We urge you to vote yes on Proposition U.

Paul Boneberg,
Executive Director, Mobilization Against AIDS

Pat Christen,
Acting Executive Director, S.F. AIDS Foundation

Donald Abrams, M.D.
Assistant Director AIDS Activities, SFGH

Gerald Lenoir,
Executive Director, Black Coalition on AIDS

Phil Tingley,
Executive Director, American Indian AIDS Institute

Adolfo Mata,
Co-Chair, Latino Coalition on AIDS/SIDA

Martin Delaney,
Executive Director, Project Inform

ACT UP San Francisco

George W. Rutherford, M.D.
AIDS Research and Services

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION U

San Franciscans To Improve Candlestick (STIC) supports the AIDS research initiative. We agree that the federal government isn't doing what's needed.

But it's not enough to "send a message to Washington". We need to do more ourselves — without delay.

That's one of many reasons we oppose Prop. P (Downtown Stadium).

While money is so badly needed, for AIDS research and many other necessities, the China Basin stadium would cost city taxpayers $70 - $80 million — $30 million in land, $20 million investment, $10 million "loan", around $10 million for a parking garage and up to $10 million cost overruns.

Taxpayers shouldn't have to subsidize pro sports — especially during a major epidemic.

Instead, we favor improving Candlestick, because this would be so much more economical that it can be done at private expense, since the land, foundation and structure are already paid for.

We put Prop. V (Candlestick Improvement) on the ballot to tell the Supervisors to further study the various proposals to improve Candlestick at private expense instead of building a new stadium downtown at taxpayer expense.

It's not just an issue of saving the Giants.
It's also an issue of saving the taxpayers.
And saving the people with AIDS.
Yes on U (AIDS Research)
Yes on V (Candlestick Improvement)
No on P (Downtown Stadium).

STIC

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition U

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY FOR PROPOSITION U SUBMITTED BY THE PROONENTS

DECLARING THE POLICY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO SUPPORT COMMUNITY-BASED AIDS RESEARCH AND SERVICES.

WHEREAS, over 7000 San Franciscans have been diagnosed with Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), many others suffer from AIDS-Related Conditions (ARC) and over 30,000 San Franciscans are believed to be infected with the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV); and

WHEREAS, the timely development of new drugs and treatments, and the providing of health and social services, are essential to saving the lives of people with AIDS, ARC, and HIV infection; and

WHEREAS, the expansion of AIDS prevention programs is necessary, particularly in minority communities, in order to save lives and prevent further spread of the disease; and

WHEREAS, community-based organizations in San Francisco and other cities are conducting effective research projects to assist in the development of successful drugs and treatments, but such research is hindered by inadequate support from the federal government; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco's network of community-based organizations is a national model for cost-effective AIDS health and social services, but inadequate state and federal support threatens the financial survival of these organizations.

THEREFORE, it shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support the continuance and expansion of community-based AIDS research and services; and

FURTHER, we, the citizens of San Francisco, recognize the heroic efforts of the volunteers and health professionals in community-based AIDS research projects and health and social service organizations; and

FURTHER, we the citizens of San Francisco, urge the state and federal governments to increase funding of and assistance to community-based AIDS research and services.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PROPOSITION V
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for the Board of Supervisors to explore proposals to improve Candlestick Park at private expense instead of any proposal to construct a downtown baseball stadium?

YES 96  NO 97

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Giants baseball team plays its home games at Candlestick Park. The City is considering the construction of a ballpark in the China Basin area in which the Giants would play their home games.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition V would make it City policy that the Board of Supervisors explore proposals to improve Candlestick Park at private expense instead of building a downtown baseball stadium.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy that the Board of Supervisors explore proposals to improve Candlestick Park at private expense instead of building a downtown baseball stadium.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make it City policy that the Board of Supervisors explore proposals to improve Candlestick Park at private expense instead of building a downtown baseball stadium.

Controller’s Statement on “V”

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

"Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How “V” Got on the Ballot

On August 3, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition V to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on July 26 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 10,560 of the signatures submitted were valid; 1,161 more than the required number of signatures.

* This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION V

Improving Candlestick instead of building a new downtown stadium is better land use. Any downtown stadium would inevitably cost the taxpayers at least $70 – 80 million. First, we should consider:

FAN PREFERENCE: A Chronicle commissioned poll showed that of Giants' fans with a preference, 34% prefer Candlestick park (as it is), 23% want a downtown stadium, 23% have no preference, and 20% want Santa Clara.

WEATHER: The main complaint about Candlestick is bay winds. China Basin is closer to the water and would be much more “wide open” than Candlestick! China Basin fans would not enjoy measurably improved weather.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT: Unlike China Basin, Candlestick has few close neighbors. Candlestick activity and improvements have few unwanted effects and would serve to enhance transportation in the Bayview/3rd Street corridor!

PARKING and TRAFFIC: Most fans drive to games, generating demand for 10,000 – 25,000 parking spaces. Even capacity crowds at Candlestick have little impact on downtown traffic. Candlestick has 17,000 spaces on-site, with room to expand. China Basin would have only 1500 on-site spaces (reserved, probably, for luxury box holders).

CAPACITY: Candlestick holds around 60,000, that’s 33% more than the 45,000 proposed for China Basin. Improvements might increase the Candlestick capacity to 70,000 – 80,000... enough to accommodate a Super Bowl!

Candlestick Park is the home of the Giants and the model used to construct many of the ballparks in our nation. The Cable Cars and Palace of Fine Arts were rebuilt, not replaced. Let’s see what can be done with what we have already. When the people’s wishes are shown in this election, Giants management will have to reconsider Candlestick.

Vote to improve Candlestick Park.
Vote Yes on Proposition V!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Kevin Starr
Joel Ventresca
San Franciscans To Improve Candlestick

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION V

San Francisco land is too precious to allow a facility as large as Candlestick to be left for use only ten days a year.

Candlestick improvement and the Bayshore/3rd Street Corridor light rail proposal would be mutually supportive. They benefit the Bayview Community in particular and the City as a whole. The Municipal Railway has proposed a new light rail yard in the Bayshore industrial area beyond Candlestick Park. These improvements would certainly enhance attendance at Candlestick Park.

It is natural to connect a new Bayshore light rail yard with the existing yard at Geneva and San Jose Avenues by means of a new light rail link on Geneva Avenue. This would enhance access to BART for many City neighborhoods. It would also provide the Cow Palace with a direct link to regional transit. Renovation of the Cow Palace for indoor events and sports would be a natural consequence.

Improve Candlestick Park, improve the south east transit accesses... Vote Yes on Proposition V!

For additional information, call "STIC" at 415-928-0139.

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

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

Improving our current ballpark, the third largest in the nation, and making it a better place to play and watch baseball makes more sense than spending millions on an expensive, redundant, and unnecessary downtown stadium.

Candlestick Park is a city asset with a huge buffer zone between it and the surrounding residential area. There are 64,000 seats, 77 acres of parking, and 17,000 parking spaces. It is a public facility, on public land, and it is operated by the public.

Let's keep the Giants in San Francisco and in Candlestick.

Vote YES on V.

Joel Ventresca
Immediate Past President
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

On August 15, 1989, the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, an organization of 57 city-wide neighborhood associations, voted overwhelmingly to support Proposition V.

FIX THE STICK, VOTE YES ON V

Bob Lurie's a tough negotiator.
He likes to "play hardball".
But he could change his mind, as he's done before.
Chronicle sports columnist Bruce Jenkins (7/28/89) says:
"The first thing we should remember in the San Francisco ballpark crisis is that the Giants won't go anywhere as long as Bob Lurie (bless him) runs the club.

"How'd you like to be the native San Franciscan who let the Giants leave town?"
"It won't happen with Bob; it would ruin his social life.

"We've said all along that the Giants will play in S.F. forever—
even if the November vote goes against them."

If China Basin is defeated, Lurie's more likely to decide to stay if Candlestick Improvement passes.
So if you want the Giants to stay but don't want to build them a downtown stadium, vote:

No-on-P/Yes-on-V

STIC

"MOST POLL RESPONDENTS PREFER CANDLESTICK PARK OVER A NEW DOWNTOWN BALLPARK." (Chronicle 6/9/89)

According to the Baldassare poll:

- only 23% of Bay Area residents want the Giants "to move to a new stadium in San Francisco";
- almost as many — 20% — want them "in the San Jose area";
- but a much larger number — 34% — want them "to remain in Candlestick".

Within San Francisco, those preferring Candlestick outnumbered those preferring downtown by a similar margin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candlestick</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preference for Candlestick would be even greater with various improvements, planned and proposed, particularly windscreens and transit.

The regional preference is because most fans drive from the south; they want to avoid downtown. San Franciscans' preference is more because of the expense of another stadium and its destructive effects on South-of-Market.

Some people say Art Agnos and Bob Lurie don't care about fan preferences. But surely they'd listed to the combination of fan and voter preferences...

STIC
Candlestick Park Improvements

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION V

The Examiner (8/11/89) reported that a game at Candlestick is much cheaper than most cities.

The following prices are the minimum per adult, based on "combined cost of a hot dog, 14-ounce beer, soda, peanuts, parking and cheapest adult admission":
- Cubs' Wrigley Field ..... $22.00
- Toronto Skydome ........... $18.12
- Fenway Park, Boston ..... $17.25
- Shea Stadium, NYMets .... $17.10

... Candlestick Park .......... $12.85
Of 26 major-league stadiums, only four were cheaper.

Why is baseball cheaper in San Francisco?
One reason is because prices at Candlestick are subject to the city parks and recreation commission.
But that protection will be lost if the Giants move to China Basin.
Part of the deal with Spectacor and Lurie is that they'll be allowed to raise prices as much as they want, whenever they want.
Candlestick has 33% more seats — around 60,000. The more seats to fill, the cheaper the prices, even more so thanks to Parks-
& Rec control.
For the sake of taxpayers and fans:
"STICK" WITH AFFORDABLE BASEBALL!

Herb Caen suggests one way to improve Candlestick substantially that wouldn't cost a penny:
"One of the town's best-kept secrets is the wonderful weather at Candlestick around noon, which should be the starting time but isn't."
"As the wind doesn't come up until exactly 3:17:05, why don't

the Giants play a lot of nooners each season?
"You don't suppose it's because they'd detract from the horror stories of the 'stick, do you?"
Before $100-million-plus is spent, it's at least worth trying.

Of the various proposed ways to improve Candlestick, improving transit access would have the widest benefits.
While some relatively inexpensive freeway alterations would be beneficial, the biggest benefit would come from building the Bayshore Corridor Muni lightrail.
Connecting downtown, Mission Bay, Bayview/Hunters Point, Candlestick, the Cow Palace and outer Mission, it would improve access from all directions; with connections for BART, Caltrans and Samtrans, it would provide public transit access from around the Bay Area.

Candlestick would then be accessible by both car and mass transit, while China Basin, for practical purposes, would be accessible only by mass transit.
The downtown stadium, would be a nuisance; improving Candlestick's transit access would be a blessing, felt everywhere from downtown to the peninsula.

Espanola Jackson
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION V

AN OPEN LETTER TO BOB LURIE

Our vote is not intended as anything personal.

Please understand: it’s in your interest to “keep the customer satisfied”.

Two years ago, we voted against moving the Giants downtown. The Chronicle poll showed San Franciscans preferring Candlestick 48%/31%, and Bay Area residents preferring Candlestick by an even larger margin.

You’re already making a profit at Candlestick, with attendance high and steadily rising.

China Basin’s only planned weather protection is “white fabric windscreens”.

But if windscreens will work at China Basin, they’ll work better at Candlestick!

Except for a short outfield fence, only half of China Basin will be enclosed. Candlestick has high walls all around, and screens-

Professional sports should be self-supporting.

Grassroots wrote and qualified this initiative to show a sensible

and fair alternative to China Basin.

The single-facility-multiple-use approach saves so much, Can-

dlestick improvement can be done without taxpayer subsidy.

We invited Kevin Starr, Harold Hoogasian and Joel Ventresca to

be Proponents, to show agreement of fiscal conservatives and

liberal activists: a new stadium downtown is no way to use our

land or money!

And we agree with the Examiner’s Rob Morse:

“Selling names of stadiums may be OK in places like Sacra-

mento, but not here.”

“New, Improved Candlestick”, not “EXXON FIELD”!

This is not just another “advisory” measure.

Public votes like this one are legally binding on the Supervisors,

under City Charter Section 9.108, which says:

“... WHEN APPROVED BY A MAJORITY... VOTING ON SAID DECLARATION, IT SHALL THEREUPON BE

THE DUTY OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO ENACT AN ORDINANCE OR ORDINANCES TO CARRY SUCH POLICY OR POLICIES INTO EFFECT...”

Grassroots
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION V

Some people say there's no connection between the homeless and a $115,000,000 stadium.
But if the Mayor is up all night negotiating real estate deals with developers, he'll obviously have less time for anybody else.
Herb Caen (Chronicle 8/23/89) reports:
"Stevie Wonder, who's involved with the American Task Force For the Homeless, will do a nationally televised ... concert ... in NY ... expected to raise ... $2,000,000-$4,000,000. Painful local angle: he wanted to do this show ... in S.F. but both his mgr.,
Carmen Efferson, and his local rep, Michael Fenenbock, struck out with the mayor's office.
"'Carmen', says Wonder's flack, Andrew Pincus, 'called that office five times and never got a callback.'
"'I called four times,' says Fenenbock, 'and never got an answer.'"

CONVERTING CANDLESTICK TO WORLDPARK

After discussion with Bob Lurie, and following his suggestion that a retractable dome would work for Candlestick Park, George Reppas, a Developer/Inventor, recently had patented the retractable dome.
Reppas' WorldPark plan makes the best use of land in a land-short city. It calls for a private development, with no taxpayer subsidy of Candlestick Park to yield the following benefits:

FAN COMFORT
• A retractable dome that always remains open except at game time with bad weather.
• No: wind, cold weather, rainchecks.

NATURAL GRASS

COVERED AND SAFE PARKING
• Nine tier parking garage for 20,000 cars feeding directly to your seating level. No crowded corridors and safe access to your car.
• Tail-gating on the top level!
• Space for new expanded rest-rooms and concession stands.

MULTI PURPOSES USE
• New third level seating; 85,000 capacity for Super Bowl, Olympic Games.
• Exhibitions, concerts, outdoor/indoor sports events.

IMPROVED ACCESS
• A new overpass from 101 South with a ramp running on the southern perimeter of Bay View Mountain branching to your parking/seating level.
• 101 North expanded off-ramp leads to ramps on the Northwest side.

17,000 JOBS
• Business Park development to be built on the existing but seldom used parking lot provides 17,000 jobs, avoids further downtown congestion, and adds $10 million property tax revenues annually.

NO COST TO CITY
• The Candlestick site can be a first rate multi-purpose facility with no other land swaps or costs to the City.

MUNI ACCESS
• WorldPark justifies the conceptualized Muni light rail system on the Bayshore corridor paralleling Third Street and servicing Hunter's Point, Bay View, WorldPark, Cow Palace and link up to Ocean Avenue.
Candlestick Park is a valuable resource that can be improved and put to better use.

Espanola Jackson
District 7 Democratic Club
Bay/View-Hunters Point
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PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION V

Proposition V is a red herring cast forth by the opponents of the China Basin ballpark. Improvements to Candlestick will not keep the Giants in San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition V.

The Giants are a unique and irreplaceable civic treasure. Major league baseball generates substantial social and economic benefits for San Francisco and the Giants are one of the last forms of affordable family entertainment in our City — yet we face the prospect of losing them.

We urge you to vote NO on Proposition V because:
• Improving Candlestick and/or installing a dome would cost more money than building the China Basin ballpark.
• Access to Candlestick by public transit and US 101 is poor. Proposition V does not address the transportation issue. A new China Basin ballpark will not only be convenient to the downtown area, but it will be served by every major public transit system in the Bay Area and be easily accessible from both US 101 and I-280.
• The City will actually save money when the Giants leave Candlestick. The on-going cost required to accommodate two sports on one field — moving grandstands, replanting grass, relining the field — will no longer exist.

Don’t be fooled. Proposition V will not keep the Giants in San Francisco. Only a new China Basin Ballpark will keep our Giants where they belong. Vote NO on Proposition V.

San Francisco Ballpark Alliance
Barbara Bagot, President

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY FOR PROPOSITION V
SUBMITTED BY THE PROONENTS

SHALL THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS EXPLORE PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE CANDLESTICK PARK AT PRIVATE EXPENSE, INSTEAD OF ANY PROPOSAL TO CONSTRUCT A DOWNTOWN BASEBALL STADIUM?
PROPOSITION W

Shall It be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to conduct municipal elections by mail, provided that the Registrar finds that it would maximize voter convenience, the Controller finds it would save the City money and the Chief of Police finds that it can be done with sufficient safeguards against fraud?

YES 100
NO 101

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: At all elections, voters may vote at their polling places or by absentee ballots which must be returned in person or by mail.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition W would make it City policy, before each municipal election, for the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor to take the necessary actions to hold that election entirely by mail if:

1. The Registrar of Voters finds this would maximize voter convenience and participation and would minimize costs and prevent fraud;
2. The Controller finds it would save the City money; and
3. The Chief of Police finds there are sufficient safeguards against fraud.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to hold City elections by mail under certain conditions.

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

Controller’s Statement on “W”

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

“Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, the cost of conducting a municipal election could be reduced by an indeterminate amount, possibly as much as $300,000 per election.

How “W” Got on the Ballot

On September 7, 1988 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition W to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot. 9,399* signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on August 2, 1988 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that of the signatures submitted 10,578 were valid; 1,179 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION W

HIGHER TURNOUTS — LOWER COSTS

This policy declaration approves holding municipal elections by mail, provided the particular plan has been approved by the Registrar, Controller and Police Chief.

This is a new way of running elections without polling places; all voters are sent absentee (mail) ballots.

When this idea was proposed in 1982, only 30% of San Franciscans supported it. When voted on again last year, 44% supported it.

This third attempt was designed to deal with the main opposition by requiring security safeguards approved by the police chief.

Vote-By-Mail has three big advantages:

SAVINGS: UP TO $300,000/ELECTION (Controller’s estimate) because we don’t need to rent polling-places or hire poll-workers.


CONVENIENCE. That’s why it increases turnout. It’s easier to find time to mark your ballot at home and mail it in, than to make it to your polling-place on Election Day. It’s also easier to sit and read the arguments and then mark your ballot, than to stand in a polling-booth and remember what “Equipment Lease Financing” is about.

The only serious fear is security. But we already have large-scale mail-balloting (absentees), without significant problems.

Former Registrar Jay Patterson has said the following: “The 1982 fears of voter fraud were unjustified then and are even more unjustified now that we have automated tracking of all absentee ballots... In addition a signature comparison is done on all returned mail ballots, a safeguard that does not exist in precinct voting...”

If the Police Chief considers the Registrar’s proposed security safeguards adequate, why not save the money?

Arlo Hale Smith
Paul Kangas
Grassroots

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION W

The backers of Proposition W are real cut-ups. They concede that the vote-by-mail concept was rejected in two previous elections, the last time only a year ago. They now claim to be primed for victory!

Maybe they’ll abide by baseball rules: three strikes and you’re out. Please vote NO on Proposition W.

In the final analysis, there is only one issue: fraud. Proposition W will increase the chances for election fraud. It’s that simple.

On the subject of fraud, the backers of Proposition W cite a former registrar of voters (who was dismissed from his job) and rely on a police department which has all it can handle to fight violent crime, much less regulate elections. I’m telling you, these guys are genuine comedians.

Let’s get serious. The integrity of our elections should not be tampered with or taken lightly. Please vote NO on Proposition W.

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Senator Quentin Kopp, Chairman

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

In June 1988, San Francisco voters decisively rejected a Charter amendment to allow special elections by mail. So what would Proposition W allow? Voting by mail in all elections. Once more with feeling, vote NO on proposition W! The proponents of voting by mail claim that it would increase voter convenience and decrease election costs. I doubt it. But since when has “cheap and easy” become the standard for judging democratic elections? There can be no doubt that Proposition W will open the door to massive voter fraud. Simply put, it’s easier to forge a signature than impersonate a voter. And what about all those “registered voters” on the rolls who have died or moved away? They can’t show up in person to vote, but anyone could forge and return their mail ballot.

Vote NO on W!

Let’s examine Proposition W in detail. It would allow the Registrar of Voters to develop a new vote-by-mail plan “prior to every municipal election”. What kind of crazy idea is that? Should our elections be subject to constantly changing regulations? Mail ballot in June, regular ballot in November, a revised version of mail ballot next year? This provision alone is enough to confuse voters completely and reduce voter turnout.

Another provision of Proposition W would require the Chief of Police to certify that any vote-by-mail plan “contains sufficient safeguards against fraud”. Now, San Francisco has an excellent police chief, but he’s hardly an expert on election fraud. Even an expert might not detect the flaws in a vote-by-mail plan until after a corrupt election has occurred. Some consolation. Protect the honesty and integrity of our electoral process. Please vote NO on Proposition W.

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Senator Quentin Kopp, Chairman

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION W

Senator Kopp’s fears are outdated. Experience has accumulated with massive “absentee” mail-balloting. Strong safeguards are already in place. Substantial abuse would consistently be detected.

The previous Vote-By-Mail measures would have changed the City Charter. It should be made permanent, in the Charter — but not until we’ve tested it!

This year’s version is just a “Declaration of Policy”. It is totally non-binding. It approves (but doesn’t require) Vote-By-Mail, provided:

• The Registrar develops a particular plan, and believes it would increase turnout, save money and be secure from abuse;
• the Controller agrees;
• the Police Chief (with his many expert advisors) agrees;
• the Supervisors agree;
• even then, the Mayor could veto it;
• and any voter claiming substantial abuse potential could challenge any plan in court.

We remember the People’s Temple non-resident voter scandal. But:

• it didn’t escape detection (tragically, the DA decided to ignore it);
• it happened under existing procedures and could happen again (but would again be detected!).

Current Registrar Germaine Wong agrees with former Registrar Patterson that sufficient safeguards exist to assure detection — and support prosecution — of any abuse massive enough to affect elections (most are decided by over 20,000 votes).

As Registrar, she can’t endorse initiatives, but her job is to answer your questions about elections. She’ll gladly explain security safeguards — how increased turnout makes elections safer! — and how low-turnout elections (like the June 1987 measures decided by 7% of the population) are themselves a kind of election fraud!

Questions about any proposition? Phone Grassroots: 252-0662.

Arlo Hale Smith
Paul Kangas

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

The following is condensed from Registrar Jay Patterson's 1/22/88 report to the Supervisors supporting the 1988 Vote-By-Mail proposal:

"... The proposal would have no adverse impact on the Registrar's office or on voters... and would result in significant cost savings and service enhancements. Based on the experience of San Diego... in 1981... voter turnout in special elections could be increased by nearly 100% while election costs could decrease by 33%. "... the Registrar's absentee voting operation is much more automated and efficient than it was in 1982. Savings could be as high as $250,000 - $300,000 per election..."

(Emphasis added)

Arlo Hale Smith

---

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION W

We urge you to vote No on Proposition W. Express your opposition to mandatory "Vote-by-Mail".

Proposition W opens the door to widespread voter fraud. Once ballots are mailed to households there are no controls to prevent them from falling into the wrong hands or to prevent unauthorized individuals from forging verification signatures. Computers can't tell us everything.

Voters want their ballots to remain secret. Yet, under the double envelope system of Vote-by-Mail (where you place your ballot in the inner envelope and sign the outer envelope), any election official, clerk, or temporary employee will have access to how you voted.

80% to 85% of San Francisco's voters prefer to go to the polls rather than vote by absentee ballot. Many voters decide on issues and candidates at the last minute after carefully weighing the facts; others like to know that their vote won't get lost in the mails or if they punch the wrong hole when voting, they can be issued a new ballot. Under the Vote-by-Mail scheme, these voters would be denied the opportunity to vote at their polling places. Would they be as likely to vote if they could only Vote-by-Mail?

Finally, regarding costs, the experience of communities in Oregon and Washington which use Vote-by-Mail is mixed. Monies saved by eliminating polling places are offset by multiple mailings to voters and the hiring of scores of temporary workers for weeks to verify signatures.

Vote No on Proposition W.

Christopher L. Bowman, Member Republican County Central Committee of San Francisco

Harold M. Hoogasian

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

The San Francisco Republican Party recommends a NO vote on Proposition W. This is the second time in less than two years that the voters are being asked to vote on this issue. Enough is enough!

The arguments that made voting by mail a bad idea the first time and led to its decisive defeat are the same arguments that make it a bad idea this time:

1. The integrity of the election process demands that each voter verify in person or in writing that they are qualified to vote before receiving a ballot. Our voting rolls contain many "registered voters" who have moved, died or are otherwise ineligible. Imagine the potential for fraud if unsolicited ballots are mailed to all those names!

2. Any alleged cost savings are not enough to justify sacrificing the integrity of the election process.

The current system of neighborhood polling and absentee balloting works. If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it! Vote NO on “W”.

James E. Gilleran,
Chairman
San Francisco Republican County Central Committee

Tom McConnell, Chairman, Issues Committee
San Francisco Republican County Central Committee
Curt Augustine
Christopher L. Bowman
Robert R. Bacci
Kenneth Blumenthal
Mildred "Millie" Danch
J. Bingham Dean
Sam T. Harper
Jun Hatoyama
K. Martin Keller
Carol Marshall
Brian Mavrogeorge
Bruce M. O’Neill
Pablo Wong

---

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY FOR PROPOSITION W
SUBMITTED BY THE PROONENTS

We the People of San Francisco hereby adopt the following city policy:

Summary: THIS WOULD DECLARE A CITY POLICY TO ALLOW CONDUCTING MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS BY MAIL PROVIDED THAT THE PARTICULAR PLAN HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE REGISTRAR (IN TERMS OF MAXIMIZING VOTER CONVENIENCE AND TURN-OUT), BY THE CONTROLLER (IN TERMS OF MINIMIZING COSTS) AND BY THE CHIEF OF POLICE (IN TERMS OF ELECTION LAW ENFORCEMENT).

As provided for under City Charter Sect. 9.106, we declare it to be official city policy to maximize voter convenience and participation, minimize costs and prevent fraud and other election abuses.

Therefore it is our policy that, prior to every municipal election, the Registrar shall determine whether a Vote-By-Mail plan with adequate safeguards is available, such as to maximize voter convenience and participation, and save the city money, without significantly increasing vulnerability to fraud or other election abuses.

If such a plan is available, the Registrar shall present it in a detailed report to the Controller and the Chief of Police. The Controller (or his or her designated representative) shall determine whether the plan would in fact save the city money, and how much. The Chief of Police (or his or her designated representative) shall determine whether the plan contains sufficient safeguards against fraud and other election law violations.

If all three officials approve the plan, they shall present it to the Supervisors and Mayor for appropriate action.

This policy declaration is a statement of the will of the people, concerning the principles of maximizing voter convenience and turn-out, minimizing costs and preventing fraud and other election abuses; and concerning the conditions under which we would approve elections by mail, and the officials we believe should be involved in election planning. City officials shall make a reasonable effort to implement the principles here declared, as best they can, consistent with their own best judgement and with legal and practical considerations. □

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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IS GOING TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON ELECTION DAY A PROBLEM?

If you are unable to go to your polling place to vote on Election Day (Tuesday, November 7, 1989), you may vote by absentee ballot in one of two ways:

1. **Vote at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.** Starting on October 10 through November 7, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., you can vote in Room 158 at City Hall.

2. **Vote by mail.** Complete the application for an absentee ballot on the back cover. Tear or cut off the back cover, fold it in half with the address of the Registrar of Voters on the outside, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated, and mail the form.

Voters who have specified disabilities may apply to be a **permanent absentee voter.** Please refer to page 13.
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
158 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

DO NOT REMOVE LABEL

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside (do not cut or tear off)

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION
Must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than October 31, 1989
November 7, 1989 Consolidated Municipal Election

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FIRST NAME
MIDDLE INITIAL
LAST NAME
DATE OF BIRTH

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX OR MAIL DROP ADDRESS)
NUMBER AND STREET
CITY
ZIP CODE

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (if different from above)
P.O. BOX OR STREET
CITY
STATE
ZIP CODE

I HAVE NOT AND WILL NOT APPLY FOR AN ABSENTEE BALLOT BY ANY OTHER MEANS.

X SIGNATURE (DO NOT PRINT)
DATE
DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER
EVENING PHONE NUMBER

⇒⇒⇒ I understand that voters with specified disabilities may qualify as Permanent Absent Voters. See page 13.

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
VOTE!

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

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot
Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters

DEMOCRATIC
16th Assembly District
5th Congressional District
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name ____________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________ Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required) ________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) ____________________________

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

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

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

**USING BOTH HANDS**
**INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.**

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

**A 第一步**
購買選票時，將選票插入手動機器內，將選票插入。

**B 第二步**
請將卡帶插入自動機，將選票插入。

**C 第三步**
請將卡帶插入自動機，將選票插入。

**D 第四步**
請將卡帶插入自動機，將選票插入。

**STEP 1**

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

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

**STEP 2**

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

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

**STEP 3**

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

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

**STEP 4**

**第四步**
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格供選民投票使用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>GOVERNADOR / Governor</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARK CALNEY</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. FRANK WONG</td>
<td>Retired Systems Engineer / Ingeniero en Sistemas Jubilado</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>Political Science Teacher / Profesor de Ciencias Políticas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>Singer / Cantante</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES PINEDA JR.</td>
<td>Administrator; Army Veteran / Administrador; Veterano del Ejército</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANKLIN R. GERATY</td>
<td>Retired Intelligence Agent / Agente Jubilado de Espionaje</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>Farmer-Electrician-Rancher / Granjero-Electricista-Ranchero</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LYDON BYRNE</td>
<td>Entrepreneur / Empresario</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIANNE FEINSTEIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES A. MAHON III</td>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>Attorney General, California / Procurador General, California</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VICEGOBERNADOR / Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEO T. MC CArTHY</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor of California / Vicegobernador de California</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>MERVIN EVANS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>GRAY DAVIS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Treasurer</td>
<td>WESLEY SANDERS, JR.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate/Bond Counsel</td>
<td>KATHLEEN BROWN</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>Procurador General/Attorney General</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA REINER</td>
<td>District Attorney of Los Angeles County</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS/Insurance Commissioner</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL BLANCO</td>
<td>Living Trust Attorney</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY MURPHY</td>
<td>Certified Insurance Consultant</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER A. ZELMAN</td>
<td>Director, Consumers' Organization</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY COLLIS</td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL PRESS</td>
<td>Consumer Advocacy Commentator</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY BOURHIS</td>
<td>Insurance Consumers Attorney</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</td>
<td>JOSEPH G. COLMAN</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td>EMIL G. POLLACK</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOUIS JOHN PAPAN</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDWARD TABASH</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRAD SHERMAN</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOM BALDWIN</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS</td>
<td>NANCY PELOSI</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN THIS DISTRICT</td>
<td>(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</td>
<td>JOHN L. BURTON</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee</td>
<td>Vote for no more than 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIEMBRO, COMITÉ CENTRAL DEL CONDADO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRIAN BERMUDEZ, JR.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. BOILEAU</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Research Director / Director de Investigaciones del Sindicato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIMIKO BURTON</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERAL</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Supervisor / Supervisor de Admisiones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE RACHEL KATZ</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVEN KREFTING</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIA MARTINEZ</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Aide / Asistente al Congreso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNIE O'CONNOR</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRIT LEVI</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RN, MFCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVE NEUBERGER</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Representative, SEIU / Representante Sindical, SEIU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGER CARDENAS</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTIDO DEMOCRATA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMITÉ DEL CONDADO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMOCRATIC PARTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 5, 1990</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTY COMMITTEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWRENCE WONG</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Consultant / Consultor Financiero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCIA WANG</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMEON WHITE</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA A. PLUMMER</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent / Community Activist / Madre / Activista Comunitario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTH PICON</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Program Director / Directora de Programas para Ancianos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICK HAUPTMAN</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner / Community Leader / Comisionado / Líder Comunitario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURI SCHWARTZ</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Incumbent / Titular del Cargo Nombrado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position Details</td>
<td>Vote No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDENT DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA</td>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educador / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5</td>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15</td>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL DEPARTAMENTO #1</td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Law Teacher / Abogada / Maestra de Derecho</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney / Fiscal Asistente del Distrito</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
<td>Sheriff’s Department’s Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td>Incumbent/Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASESOR</td>
<td>Assessors</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td>Real Estate Portfolio Manager / Administrador de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogado; Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Supervisor / Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td>Deputy Assessor / Asesor Asistente</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSOR PUBLICO</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters — State Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Housing and Homeless Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.</td>
<td>YES 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Passenger Rail and Clean Air Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.</td>
<td>YES 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Governor’s Review of Legislation. Legislative Deadlines. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.</td>
<td>YES 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Property Tax Exemption for Severely Disabled Persons. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.</td>
<td>YES 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>The Traffic Congestion Relief and Spending Limitation Act of 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.</td>
<td>YES 200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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185 SI 贅成

Esta acta dispone que una emisión de bonos por cinco millones de dólares (8,500,000.00) para pagar empréstitos para la construcción de viviendas, incluyendo: (1) proyectos de viviendas para personas que no tienen una vivienda, (2) reparaciones para mejorar las condiciones de vivienda para personas que necesitan mejoras, (3) mantenimiento de viviendas para personas que requieren mantenimiento, (4) rehabilitación de viviendas para personas que necesitan rehabilitación, (5) creación de nuevas viviendas para personas que no tienen una vivienda, y (6) programas para mejorar las condiciones de vivienda para personas que necesitan mejoras.

187 NO 反對

Esta acta dispone que una emisión de bonos por cinco millones de dólares (5,000,000.00) para pagar empréstitos para la construcción de ferrocarriles para carruseles y para vehículos de limpieza.

189 SI 贅成

Esta acta dispone que una emisión de bonos por cinco millones de dólares (5,000,000.00) para pagar empréstitos para la construcción de la aerolínea de San Francisco.

190 NO 反對

Esta acta dispone que una emisión de bonos por cinco millones de dólares (5,000,000.00) para pagar empréstitos para la construcción de la carretera de San Francisco.

192 SI 贅成

REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR, FECHAS DE Y NUEVOS TRÁMITES PARA LA LEGISLACIÓN, ENSAYO CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Extiende el tiempo en el que el Gobernador puede revocar la legislación propuesta. Cambia la fecha en que entra en vigor la legislación. Impuesto flotante: ningún efecto fiscal.

193 NO 反對

EXTENSIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. Extiende la fecha en que entra en vigor la legislación. Impuesto flotante: ningún efecto fiscal.

195 SI 贅成

ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESORGANIZADOS DE 1988. Esta acta establece una medida de descongestión del tráfico para reducir el tráfico en los días laborables, y en el tráfico en las principales vías de comunicación. Impuesto flotante: ningún efecto fiscal.

197 NO 反對


200 SI 贅成


203 NO 反對

STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.


MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands "peace officer" definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.

CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.

RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).

WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.
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| 211 SI | 賛成 |

| 213 NO | 反對 |

| 215 SI | 賛成 |

| 217 NO | 反對 |

| 218 SI | 賛成 |

| 220 NO | 反對 |

| 222 SI | 賛成 |

| 224 NO | 反對 |

| 226 SI | 賛成 |

| 228 NO | 反對 |

| 230 SI | 賛成 |

<p>| 232 NO | 反對 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Legislature. Reapportionment. Ethics. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Reapportionment by Commission. Initiative Constitutional Amendment, Statute. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state's prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California's nine campuses, the California State University's 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 School Facilities Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Supuesto</td>
<td>Descripción</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 SI</td>
<td>LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Señale la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impacto Fiscal: Los ahorros de las instituciones de las edades por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente a un nivel de dos de la votación pública y la política redistribución por la curva. Los costos por las disposiciones para éste son probablemente menores.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 NO</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN FOR COMISIÓN, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento redujo los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hecho uno la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1980. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para ativar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 NO</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1980. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción, a mejoramiento de las universidades públicas de California, los cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores a Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes &quot;Hastings,&quot; la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California. Esta acta crea para el 1° de julio de 1980 inclusivo. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de las salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salubridad y seguridad.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 SI</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1980. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($350,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adyacencia o restauración, reparación, remodelación y rehabilitación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 NO</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1980. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejoras de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 51, N 52 & N 53
### A
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

**YES 263**

**NO 265**

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

**YES 269**

**NO 272**

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

**YES 277**

**NO 278**

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

**YES 280**

**NO 281**

### E
WITHDRAWN

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

**YES 284**

**NO 285**
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263 SI 贊成

BONDS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para construir una doble en bennes de $32.4,480,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que sean propiedad de la Ciudad y Condados de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de las daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del abastecimiento, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando se construya de $396,633,925 de dicha doble en bennes en un solo fondeo en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $32.4,480,000 se vea reducida por la cantidad real recibida en consecuencia del FED del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

265 NO 反对

1990年公共安全紧急公债。發行公債 $332,400,000，用於擴建與重建三藩市
市及傑克遜州長的葡萄酒，包括用於整修後的建築、減少量建築物的建築、消除建築物的建築，與修理完善通過、只使用在合計5年內所發行公債的數目不
超過15%。$50,000，且必須通過CA和SC的安全
緊急管理部。所獲得的救災資金是加州地震後
所獲得及減少災區及其他服務所獲得的救助資金將
減至$32,400,000公債的數目。

269 SI 贊成

¿Tendrá el Distrito No. 92-4 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (I) la reparación, o el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 o los choques subterráneos, (II) la mejora e instalación de los centros comunitarios dentro las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, (III) la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (IV) la conversión del uso de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos variados relacionados a los anteriores por medio de la recepción de un impuesto especial a ser recolocado durante veinte (20) años con una base anual (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias unidas y parcelas no residenciales, de $45.00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y de $32.20 por parcela durante el escritura (14) años siguientes al sexto año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varios familiares, de $23.00 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16.10 por unidad de vivienda durante los ocho (8) años siguientes al sexto año, con las deficiencias de parcelas residenciales de familias unidas, para las parcelas, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y las unidades residenciales de diferencias de demanda residencial, y las taxas mínimas, las exenciones para personas mayores, discapacitados y negocios públicos, así como se dispongan con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 92-12-81 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990, que deberá establecerse en límites de aproximadamente $12,000,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

272 NO 反对

277 SI 贊成

¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujeto a limites de diseño especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin líneas de buque, si el Contralor certifica que el costo de ello no sea intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

278 NO 反对

280 SI 贊成

¿Crear la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escuelas en las Paredes para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escuelas de las paredes, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan hasta 80% del fondo de que los impuestos en el fondo, con un mínimo anual de 1% de las ventas de los mercados comerciales de los Miez de $1,000,000 disponible en el fondo cada año?

281 NO 反对

ELIMINADA

284 SI 贊成

¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 40.7 horas (después de la cual un bombero gana horas extra) y permitir en cambio que 40.7 horas sean el tiempo que un bombero labora, (2) cambiar la semana laborable de tres días a cinco, y (3) estipular que los bomberos que trabajan de noche deben ser asignados por medio de una ronda, estipula la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 8 a.m.?

285 NO 反对

19-1N

N 51, N 52 & N 53
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290</td>
<td>NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293</td>
<td>NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298</td>
<td>NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305</td>
<td>NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309</td>
<td>NO 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 51, N 52 &amp; N 53</td>
<td>21-N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>288 SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
<th>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisoras la autorización de permitir a los ex- Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>290 SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
<th>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisoras la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS? En caso de serlo, ¿el Consejo de Supervisoras de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>292 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>293 SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
<th>¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>295 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>296 SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
<th>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de cinco a once miembros?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>298 SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
<th>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a siete miembros?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>299 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>300 SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
<th>¿Será necesario que los miembros de las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se ubiquen excepción a los miembros de otras comisiones, condiciones y directores auxiliares de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a dichos gobiernos y comisiones, o en los cuales se requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o utilidad especial que no pueda encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>302 SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
<th>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrado por el Alcalde o designado por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>304 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>305 SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
<th>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio con el Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990? Se considerarán haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>307 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>309 SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
<th>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referidas a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de aguas híperdóxicas?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>310 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- 市議會應否有權任命市議員繼續參加本市的健康服務制度？如果他們付全部費用。
- 市議會應否有權與加州公務員退休制度 (PERS) 簽約以使市府安全警報及其他安全工程師成公務員退休制度的成員而其退休制度只要市政府不須付附加的費用。
- 現有退休制度的退休教員是否與三藩市聯合校區或三藩市社區大學簽約作短期顧問而不喪失他們的退休權益？
- 人權委員會應否由15名改至11名？
- 人權委員會應否由15名改至11名？
- 人權委員會應否由15名改至11名？
- 市警衛、消防、社會服務、郵政、公共事業、公務員、裁判、法院及交通、裁判及法律等各委員會成員會費的規定從15名增至7名。
- 除婦女委員會外，市議會應否規定一曰代表市議會董事會或委員會應否有過多的同性會員？
- 市議會應否禁止任何人在市議會滿任期後再擔任同職員，市議會應否當作已任滿一期『四年』的參議員？
- 市民有否投票要求要求加州立法機構撤除無人發射的炸彈、火藥，使用有塗料等所涉及的民事責任？
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — If you do not wish to go to your polling place to vote, you may vote by mail or by going to the Registrar’s Office in City Hall in person. This is called absentee voting.

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


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now," "The Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters' rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.

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

CUT OUT THIS COUPON AND TAKE IT WITH YOU TO THE POLLS. After reading this pamphlet, write down the names of the candidates of your choice, and circle the numbers corresponding to "YES" or "NO" on the propositions. Completing this coupon will help you vote faster and help reduce lines at the polls. PLEASE NOTE — This is a Primary Election. You can only vote for partisan offices if you are registered as a member of a party, and if there are candidates from your party running.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE — OFFICE 1</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNOR</td>
<td>(Check Ballot for the number of candidates to vote for)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT. GOVERNOR</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARY OF STATE</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROLLER</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURER</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE COMMISSIONER</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>PUBLIC DEFENDER</td>
<td>PROP</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, BOARD OF EQUALIZATION</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>277</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBURBAN COUNCIL</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>STATE PROPOSITIONS</td>
<td>PROP</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SUPT. OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE — OFFICE 3</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBURBAN COUNCIL</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE — OFFICE 5</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBURBAN COUNCIL</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC DEFENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE PROPOSITIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPREME COURT JUDGE — OFFICE 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPREME COURT JUDGE — OFFICE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBURBAN COUNCIL</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court Judge — Office 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ELECTION DAY:

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO BE A PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

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

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

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

___ Lost use of one or more limbs.

___ Lost use of both hands.

___ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g. cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair).

___ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease.

___ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities.

___ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

___ PLEASE SEE EXPLANATORY LETTER ATTACHED.

Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>LAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Residence Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>STREET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Mailing Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>STREET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(if different than residence address given above)

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

Date __________________ Signature __________________

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

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

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

PAUL E. SCHWENGER

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

Paul E. Schwenger

The sponsors for Paul E. Schwenger are:


RICHARD D. HONGISTO

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

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:


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

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Attorney/Supervisor
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have absolutely no ownership or income interests in real property which create any conflict of interest as Assessor.

As attorney for 25 years, Supervisor for three terms, and past President of the Board, I have a proven record of unique, practical accomplishments.

Just as I’ve fought for reduced local government spending, I’ll work for new statewide lower assessment formulas with the same energy that created the nationally copied No-Smoking Ordinance; the Police Fingerprint Computer which reduced our crime rate; laws allowing earthquake victims to quickly replace damaged buildings.

My goal is to achieve fair, reduced property assessments.

Wendy Nelder

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

RONALD G. KERSHAW

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

Ronald G. Kershaw

The sponsors for Ronald G. Kershaw are:

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

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender represents people in trouble who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. The responsibility must be performed ethically, competently, and efficiently. During three terms in office, with the help of a superb staff of men and women, that duty has been fulfilled with compassion, dignity, and with the highest professional standards of the American legal system.

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

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:


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

ALEX SALDAMANDO

My address is 700 Arkansas Street
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My age is 47

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

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

Alex Saldamando

J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY

My address is 340 Magellan
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge

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


J. Dominique Olcomendy

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

KAY TSENIN

My address is 637 Steiner Street
My occupation is Attorney and Counselor at Law
My age is 43 years
My qualifications for office are: B.A., San Francisco State University (Dean’s List), graduate, University of San Francisco School of Law. Attorney for sixteen years specializing in civil litigation. Pro-Tem Municipal Court Judge in San Francisco for five years.

Born in China, moved to San Francisco as a child, graduate of George Washington High School.

Broad Community service includes founding of environmental law societies while in law school, Vice President for Legal Affairs for California National Organization for Women (NOW), Board Member for the Russian American Credit Union and San Francisco Trial Lawyers and Board Advisor for the Legal Advocates for Women. Vice-President, Alamo Square Neighborhood Association.

Strong commitment to equal justice for all without prejudice or bias. The following San Franciscans support me because they feel that the Superior Court needs a judge with my background, legal expertise and perspective on the law:

Sheriff Mike Hennessey, Supervisor Harry Britt, Dr. Leland Yee, Attorney Paul Melbostad, Jean Harris, Calvin Welch, Attorney Sue Hestor, Attorney Mary C. Dunlap, Roberto Esteves, Bob Ross, Matthew Rothschild, Pat Norman, Jonathan Bulkley, Susan P. Kennedy, Adrian Bermudez, Lawrence Brinkin, John H. Cusner, Attorney Anne Kiruveshkin, Eugene Kiruveshkin, N. Arden Danekas, Laura E. McBride, Donna Yutzy, Gale Armstrong.

Kay Tsenin

CARLOS BEA

My address is 2727 Pierce Street
My occupation is Judge Superior Court #5
My qualifications for office are: I am a Superior Court Judge in San Francisco and author of articles in several professional journals, such as California Trial Lawyers and Defense Research Institute’s. Am recognized by the State Bar for pro bono work with members of the Hispanic Community. Have served two terms as a member of the Board of Visitors, Stanford Law School. Was a panelist and lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar. Was an adjunct professor, Hastings College of Law and Stanford Law School. I graduated from Stanford Law School and have been an attorney in San Francisco since 1959.

Sponsors include: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Ollie Marie-Victoire, all the judges of the Superior Court, Angela Alioto, Ernest Chuck Ayala, Willie Brown, Jr., John Burton, Jim Gonzalez, Quentin Kopp, H. Jesse Arnelle, James Herman, Mary Noel Pepys, Robert McDonnell, G. Joseph Bertain, Edward McFetridge, Zeppelin Wong, Paul Renne, Leo Murphy, Jr., Gina Moscone, James Brosnahan, Barbara Caulfield, Robert Morales, Paul Haele, Michael Hardeman, Howard Nemeroviski, Edwin Heafey, Jr., Larry Mazzola, Vincent Fria, Putnam Livermore, William Coblentz.

Carlos Bea

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

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

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

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

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

Donna Hitchens

JEROME T. BENSON

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

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

SUPERVISORS:
Angela Alioto, Tom Hsieh, Wendy Nelder;

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

LABOR:
Mike Hardeman, Stan Smith, Kevin Ryan;

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

Jerome T. Benson

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

My address is 637 Steiner Street
My occupation is Attorney and Counselor at Law
My age is 43 years
My qualifications for office are: B.A., San Francisco State University (Dean’s List), graduate, University of San Francisco School of Law. Attorney for sixteen years specializing in civil litigation. Pro-Tem Municipal Court Judge in San Francisco for five years.

Born in China, moved to San Francisco as a child, graduate of George Washington High School.

Broad Community service includes founding of environmental law societies while in law school, Vice President for Legal Affairs for California National Organization for Women (NOW), Board Member for the Russian American Credit Union and San Francisco Trial Lawyers and Board Advisor for the Legal Advocates for Women. Vice-President, Alamo Square Neighborhood Association.

Strong commitment to equal justice for all without prejudice or bias. The following San Franciscans support me because they feel that the Superior Court needs a judge with my background, legal expertise and perspective on the law:

Sheriff Mike Hennessey, Supervisor Harry Britt, Dr. Leland Yee, Attorney Paul Melbostad, Jean Harris, Calvin Welch, Attorney Sue Hestor, Attorney Mary C. Dunlap, Roberto Esteves, Bob Ross, Matthew Rothschild, Pat Norman, Jonathan Bulkley, Susan P. Kennedy, Adrian Bermudez, Lawrence Brinkin, John H. Cushner, Attorney Anne Kirseshkin, Eugene Kirseshkin, N. Arden Danekas, Laura E. McBride, Donna Yutzy, Gale Armstrong.

Kay Tsenin

CARLOS BEA

My address is 2727 Pierce Street
My occupation is Judge Superior Court #5
My qualifications for office are: I am a Superior Court Judge in San Francisco and author of articles in several professional journals, such as California Trial Lawyers and Defense Research Institute’s. Am recognized by the State Bar for pro bono work with members of the Hispanic Community. Have served two terms as a member of the Board of Visitors, Stanford Law School. Was a panelist and lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar. Was an adjunct professor, Hastings College of Law and Stanford Law School. I graduated from Stanford Law School and have been an attorney in San Francisco since 1959.

Sponsors include: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Ollie Marie-Victoire, all the judges of the Superior Court, Angela Alloto, Ernest Chuck Ayala, Willie Brown, Jr., John Burton, Jim Gonzalez, Quentin Kopp, H. Jesse Arnelle, James Herman, Mary Noel Pepys, Robert McDonnell, G. Joseph Bertain, Edward McFetridge, Zeppelin Wong, Paul Renne, Leo Murphy, Jr., Gina Moscone, James Brosnahan, Barbara Caulfield, Robert Morales, Paul Haerle, Michael Hardeman, Howard Nemerovski, Edwin Heafey, Jr., Larry Mazzola, Vincent Friia, Putnam Livermore, William Coblenz.

Carlos Bea

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE
OFFICE #15

DONNA HITCHENS

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

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

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

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

Donna Hitchens

JEROME T. BENSON

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

CITYWIDE SUPPORT:
State Senator Quentin Kopp; Justice Harry Low; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Public Defender Jeff Brown; Sheriff Michael Hennessey; Former Chief of Police Alfred Nelder.
SUPERVISORS:
Angela Alioto, Tom Hsieh, Wendy Nelder;
JUDGES:
John Ertola, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Ina Gyemant, Paul Alvarado, Isabella Grant;
LABOR:
Mike Hardeman, Stan Smith, Kevin Ryan;
ATTORNEYS AND COMMUNITY:
William Coblenz; Harold Dobbs; Charles Breyer; Airport Commission President Morris Bernstein; Wayne Friday; Benny Yee; Louis Giraud; Doris Thomas; Christopher Bowman; Haddie Redd; Elizabeth Aguinal-Tarchi; Ron Huberman;

Jerome T. Benson

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE  
OFFICE #1

JAMES HARRIGAN

My address is 494 Mangels St.
My occupation is Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department.
My age is 42.

My qualifications for office are: I live in Glen Park with my wife, Serena Lee, and our three children.
I received my law degree with academic awards and Law Review distinction in 1975 from Golden Gate University, San Francisco.

I have completed more than 80 jury and court trials in Municipal and Superior Court, representing thousands of citizens and victims of crime in civil and criminal cases in private practice, as a public defender, and as Legal Counsel to the Sheriff.

My expertise includes: employment law, labor relations, criminal, landlord/tenant, and constitutional law. As Counsel to the Sheriff, I resolve the legal affairs of a major law enforcement agency. My work brings me before the civil and criminal justice system each day.

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

— Sheriff Michael Hennessey

I have not listed my sponsors. I firmly believe the voter’s decision should be based on one’s qualifications and experience — not on political connections.

I pledge equal application of the law. I ask for your support.
Thank you.

James Harrigan

JULIE TANG

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

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

Julie Tang

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

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: I'm honored that MAYOR
ART AGNOS and 8 PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SAN
FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION — who know my court-
room experience and qualifications in civil and criminal law —
endorse me.

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

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

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

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

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

WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR

My address is 3615 Buchanan St. #206
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are: I am the most qualified can-
didate for this office. I have had judicial experience, serving as
Municipal Court judge pro tem for over five years, and have been
commended by the Presiding Judge for the quality of my service.
I have been a journeyman lawyer for 15 years, with both criminal
and civil experience, and have done over 30 jury trials.

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

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

Sponsor’s include: John LoSchiavo, SJ, Thomas J. Cahill,
Joseph P. Russoniello, Juan Sanchez, Emil K. Moy, Fr. James E.
Goode, Daniel M. McCormick, Charles A. Barca, Robert W.
Cromey, Melvin M. Belli, Sr., Thomas F. McDonough, Anthony
P. Sauer, SJ, Albert Chaquette, Dennis A. Sweeney, Timothy A.
Christensen, Robert F. Mulhern, Patricia Gregory, William L.
Finley, LeRoy Hereh, Peter D. Ashe, H. Christopher Brady,
Donald W. Schwartz, William J. Dowling, Gregory A.
Wettersten, Florence M. O'Malley, Winifred Kelley O’Connor.

William J. O’Connor

Ellen Chaitin

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

LILLIAN K. SING
My address is San Francisco Municipal Court,
400 Van Ness Ave.
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the San Francisco
Municipal Court
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: I am an incumbent judge, and
have been a judge since 1981. I am the first Asian-American
woman judge in the history of Northern California. In 1988, I
was awarded Trial Judge of the Year by San Francisco Trial
Lawyers Association, one of the highest awards a Bar Associa-
tion can bestow. Last year, I was unanimously elected as Munici-
pal Court’s Presiding Judge. As Presiding Judge, I implemented
the Pro Tem Judge Program, drastically reduced backlog in
civil/criminal cases, brought Trial Court Funding to San Fran-
cisco, spearheaded San Francisco’s first judicial forum “Access
To Justice” attended by 680 people. I served as a faculty member
with the California Center for Judicial Education/Research
which trains all new judges in California and am a faculty judge
with the National Institute for Trial Advocacy which trains trial
lawyers. In 1988 I lectured throughout China on the U.S.
Legal/Judicial System.

Join San Francisco judges led by Presiding Judges Choppelas,
and Marie-Victoire, Mayor Art Agnos, President Harry Britt,
and the entire 11 Board of Supervisors, Assembly Speaker Willie
Brown, Assemblyman John Burton, Senator Milton Marks, For-
mer Police Chiefs Nelder/Cahill, DA Arlo Smith, PD Jeff
Brown, Sheriff Michael Hennessey and retain me as judge.

Lillian K. Sing

JEROME A. DEFILIPPO
My address is 1534 38th Avenue
My occupation is Attorney at Law
My qualifications for office are: A third generation San Fran-
ciscan. I have practiced law in The City since 1973, served as
the Legal Officer of the San Francisco Police Department and a
Deputy City Attorney. I am committed to the impartial applica-
tion of our laws in all judicial proceedings. Having served twenty
years as a Police Officer attaining the position of Lieutenant, I
am well aware of the frustrations each of us feel by the impact
of crime in our City. If elected, I am committed to the imposition
of the maximum sentence allowed by law for persons convicted
of violent crimes or narcotic sales.

Partial list of sponsors follows:
Ann Alberigi, Catherine Archbold, Alfred Arnaud, Martin
Bastiani, Chief Thomas Cahill, Ann Carrick, Peter Cimarelli,
Hon. Antoni Cincotta, Clement Collins, Jean DeFilippo, Cantor
Martin Feldman, Nancy Feldman, H. Welton Flynn, John
Fracchia, Carol Fujikawa, John Gallagher, Judith Gallen, Kath-
leen Gee, Dr. William Gee, Susanna Lee, Margaret Leong,
Maureen Mahoney, Carmelita Mathais, Phyllis Moylan, James
Pagano, Renzo Panelli, Timothy J. Riordan, Rollin Schroth, Joan
Swendsen, Spiro Tentis, Paul Vigo, Rita Young

Jerome A. DeFilippo

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

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

“Official Arguments”

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

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

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

Rebuttals

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

Paid Arguments

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

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

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

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

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

YES 263
NO 265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

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

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

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

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

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

Your “Yes on A” vote will provide for:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vote YES on A.

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

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

David E. Anderson
Zoo Director
Phil Arnold
Assistant General Manager
Recreation & Park
William Brewster Ely IV
Headmaster, Town School
Mary Burns
General Manager
Recreation & Park
Margaret K. Burks
Executive Director, Zoological Society
Jack W. Castor
Animal Keeper Shop Steward, Local 858
Todd Cecil
Children’s Zoo Keeper
Sherri Chiesa
President, Local 2
Robert Todd Cockburn
Executive Director, Clean Water Program
Rosemary Davidson
Urban School
Dolores A. Donovan
Animal Control & Welfare Commission

Keith G. Eickman
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Roy Eisenhardt
Director, California Academy of Sciences
Becky Evans
Conservation Activist
Norman Gershon
Director, Ecosystem Survival Plan
Arthur J. Goedewaagen
Board Member, SPEAK
John E. Haefnerk Jr.
Professor Biology, SFSU
Roger Hoppes
Director, Children’s Zoo
Michael Housh
Assistant to the Mayor
David J. Howe
Animal Keeper
Mark Hurley
Animal Control & Welfare Commission
Norma J. Kristovich
Zoo Docent Council
Connie Lurie
Vice Chairman, Zoological Society Board

Michael Mellor, President
Friends of the San Francisco Public Library
Exploratorium
F. Van Kasper, Chairman
William K. Cobents, Vice Chairman
C. Richard Kramlich, Vice Chairman
G. Steven Burrill, Treasurer
Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Zoological Society Board
Frances May McAteer
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Amy Meyer
People for GGNRA
Andrew Nash
President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Trent W. Orr
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Elizabeth D. Rieger
Zoo Volunteer
Fred A. Rodriguez
School Board Member
Carroll Soo-Hoo
Zoo Benefactor
Stephen B. Spaulding
Zoological Society Treasurer
James J. Walsh Jr.
Citizens Advisory Committee on Wastewater Management
Connie O’Connor
President, Recreation & Park Commission

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

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

For security vote "Yes on A".

Michael Keys President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

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

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

American Institute of Architects/San Francisco Chapter

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

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

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

Vote “Yes on A”.

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

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition “A”.
Many city buildings were damaged in the October 17 earthquake. If these buildings are repaired and strengthened the Fire Department will be much safer when responding to future emergencies. Please help the Fire Department do its job safely and effectively by voting “Yes” on Proposition “A”.

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

We urgently request that you vote “Yes on A”.
The War Memorial complex of buildings, dedicated to San Francisco’s veterans, are one of our city’s treasures, irreplaceable architecturally and economically. They are central to our history and we owe it to ourselves to make sure they are made as fully earthquake-resistant as possible.
The October 17 earthquake was a warning which we must heed. Proposition “A” is a prudent and necessary response. It will protect our treasured buildings and, even more importantly, it will protect the lives of those who use them and the memories of those whose lives they commemorate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please, vote YES on Proposition A.

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

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

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

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

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

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

For the safety of City employees and county jail inmates, please vote YES on Proposition A.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Continued on next page)
however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

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

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

Section 7. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as “serials,” and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 12 per centum per annum, payable semianually, provided, that interest for the first year after the date of any of said bonds may be payable at or before the end of that year.

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

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

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

Section 10. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.
PROPOSITION B

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

YES 269
NO 272

Analysis
by City Attorney

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

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

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

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

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

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

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed special tax levy be approved, in my opinion, it would increase revenues for the San Francisco Unified School District, net of estimated senior citizen exemptions, by approximately $8 million per year for the first 6 years and $5.6 million per year for the next 14 years, based on the current assessment roll of the City and County. The approximately $127.2 million generated over a 20 year period by this special tax levy would be restricted for use by the District for the repair, restoration, replacement, seismic upgrading and capital maintenance of School District facilities.”

How “B” Got on the Ballot

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

The Board members voted as follows:


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

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

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

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

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

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

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition B
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California
February 13, 1990
(For Board Meeting, February 13, 1990)
REQUESTED ACTION:
WHEREAS, the Board of Education (the “Board”) of the San Francisco Unified School District (the “District”), did, on January 9, 1990, adopt its Resolution of Intention (the “Resolution”) to form Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District (the “Community Facilities District”), and levy a special tax therein, pursuant to Chapter 2.5 of Part I of Division 2 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 53311) of the California Government Code, commonly known as the “Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982,” as amended, (the “Act”); and
WHEREAS, a copy of the Resolution (which sets forth a description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, the name of the Community Facilities District and the types of facilities proposed to be financed by the District (the “Facilities”)), providing that, except where funds are otherwise available, a special tax sufficient to pay for all Facilities and the financing thereof (to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District) is proposed to be levied within the proposed Community Facilities District specifying the rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the proposed Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, and setting a hearing thereon, is on file with the Clerk of this Board and is incorporated herein by this reference; and
WHEREAS, notice of said hearing was duly published as required by law, as evidenced by the affidavit of publication on file with the Clerk of this Board; and
WHEREAS, on February 13, 1990 this Board held the noticed public hearing as required by law relative to the proposed formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and
WHEREAS, prior to the noticed public hearing a report (the “Report”) containing a description of the Facilities and an estimate of the cost of providing the Facilities, including the estimated fair and reasonable cost thereof, was filed with this Board as a part of the record of said hearing; and
WHEREAS, at the public hearing all persons desiring to be heard on all matters pertaining to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution, including all interested persons or taxpayers for or against the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent of the Community Facilities District, or the furnishing of specific types of public facilities, were heard and considered, and a full and fair hearing was held thereon; and
WHEREAS, at the public hearing evidence was presented to this Board on the matters before it, and this Board at the conclusion of the hearing was fully advised as to all matters relating to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and
WHEREAS, written protests against the establishment of the District, the furnishing of specified type or types of facilities within the Community Facilities District as listed in the Report, or the levying of the special tax have not been filed with the Clerk of this Board by fifty percent (50%) or more of the registered voters, or six registered voters, whichever is more, residing within the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District, or the owners of one-half (1/2) or more of the area of land in the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District and not exempt from this special tax;
NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District, in regular session assembled on February 13, 1990, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE, DETERMINE AND ORDER as follows:
Section 1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.
Section 2. Written protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, or the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are insufficient in number and in amount under the Act, and this Board hereby further orders and determines that all protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are hereby overruled.
Section 3. As proposed in the Resolution, a community facilities district is hereby established pursuant to the Act, designated “Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District.”
Section 4. The map and legal description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, filed with the Clerk of this Board on January 24, 1990, are hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the boundaries of the Community Facilities District.
Section 5. The Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District, set forth in Exhibit “B” hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, shall be the Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District.
Section 6. As provided in Exhibit “B”, it is the intention of this Board, subject to the approval of the qualified electors of the Community Facilities District, to levy a special tax sufficient to acquire, construct and improve the Facilities including administrative expenses to be incurred by the District and the Community Facilities District in connection therewith; said tax to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District.
The rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax, in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, is described in Exhibit “A” hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.
Section 7. The description of the proposed voting procedure, as set forth in the Resolution, is hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the voting procedure to be used in these proceedings.
Section 8. The special tax has not been excluded by majority protest pursuant to Section 53324 of the Act.
Section 9. The Facilities to be funded from the special tax are identified in Exhibit “B” hereto.
Section 10. In accordance with Section 53340.1 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, this Board shall designate the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District as the office, department or bureau which will be responsible for annually preparing the current roll of special tax levy obligations by assessor’s parcel number on nonexempt property within the District and which will be responsible for estimating future special tax levies pursuant to Section 53340.1 of the Act.
The name, address, and telephone number of the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District, and the person responsible for administering the District, is as follows:
Director of Fiscal Services
Fiscal Services Department
San Francisco Unified School District
135 Van Ness Avenue, Room 215
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 241-6480
Section 11. In accordance with Section 53328.3 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the

(Continued on next page)
consolidated election, the Board may levy the special tax within the territory of the District in the amount and for the purposes as specified in this resolution. The special tax may be levied only at the rate and may be apportioned only in the manner specified in this resolution, subject to the Act, except that the special tax may be levied at a lower rate.

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

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

EXHIBIT A
RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT BASIS OF SPECIAL TAX LEVY
The annual special tax shall be levied on each separate parcel within Community Facilities District No. 90-1, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco County, California (“CFD 90-1”) as shown on the San Francisco County Assessor’s records, subject to the maximum rates specified below, as established by the Board of Education (“Board”) of the San Francisco Unified School District (“District”).

DETERMINATION OF PARCELS SUBJECT TO SPECIAL TAX
The records of the County Assessor of San Francisco County shall be used to determine the parcels subject to the special tax. The basis for determining the parcels will be the Secured Property Tax Roll. The land use code contained in the Secured Property Tax Roll, in combination with records maintained by the Assessor of the number of dwelling units on each residential parcel in CFD 90-1, will be the basis for assigning the appropriate tax rate to each parcel. If the District determines that the records maintained by the Assessor are incorrect with respect to one or more parcels, the District will assign the appropriate land use code and dwelling unit count based on its review of the property. All special taxes shall be based on parcels established in the County Assessor’s records as of March 1 of each year and all land use categories shall be based on building permits and other relevant development approvals granted by the City and County of San Francisco or any successor jurisdiction as of June 1 of each year.

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

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

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

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

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

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX
The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:
1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:
1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $32.20 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

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

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

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

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

SENIOR CITIZEN EXEMPTION

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

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

EXHIBIT B

COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO.

90-1 — Description of Facilities to be financed:
(i) Repair, restoration, and/or replacement of District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), to the extent that (A) such repair, restoration, or replacement is outside the scope of work approved by federal and state agencies for assistance from such agencies; (B) costs incurred in such repair, restoration, or replacement are ineligible for federal or state assistance; or (C) insufficient federal or state funds are appropriated, obligated, or approved to pay for repair, restoration, or replacement which would otherwise be eligible for federal or state assistance. Pending receipt by the District of disaster assistance from federal and/or state agencies, the Community Facilities District may advance funds to the District to pay costs eligible for federal or state disaster assistance; provided that upon receipt by the District of federal or state disaster assistance relating to such costs, the District shall promptly reimburse the Community Facilities District for any such advances.
(ii) Seismic upgrading of children's centers and other District facilities.
(iii) Correction of fire safety violations of District facilities.
(iv) Deferred capital maintenance of District facilities. Incidental expenses, including the cost of planning and designing the Facilities and the cost of environmental evaluations thereof; all costs associated with the creation of the proposed Community Facilities District, the determination of the amount of and collection of taxes, the payment of taxes, and costs otherwise incurred in order to carry out the authorized purposes of the Community Facilities District; and any other expenses incidental to the construction, completion, and inspection of the Facilities and permitted under the Act.
BOUNDARIES OF SPECIAL TAX DISTRICT

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

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


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

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

BRUCE JAMISON
COUNTY RECORDER
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

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

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER, BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN MATEO, IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN, ON THE EXTENSION OF NORTHERN LINE OF T3S OF MOUNT DIABLO BASE, THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE PACIFIC COAST, TO THE POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE WESTERLY EXTENSION OF THE LOW-WATER LINE ON THE NORTHERN SIDE OF THE ENTRANCE TO SAN FRANCISCO BAY, BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MARIN AND NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE, EASTERNLY, THROUGH POINT RONITA AND POINT CALARDO, TO THE MOST SOUTHEASTERLY POINT OF ANGEL ISLAND, ALL ON THE LINE OF MARIN; THENCE, NORTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERN LINE OF MARIN, TO THE NORTHWEST POINT OF GOLDEN ROCK (ALSO KNOWN AS RED ROCK), BEING A COMMON CORNER OF MARIN, CONTRA COSTA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE, SOUTHWESTERLY, THROUGH POINT RONITA AND ONE-HALF STATUTE MILES TO A POINT ESTABLISHED AS THE CORNER COMMON TO CONTRA COSTA, ALAMEDA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, ON THE WESTERN LINE OF ALAMEDA COUNTY TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF T3S, R4W, M.D.B. & M., THENCE WESTERLY ON THE TOWNSHIP LINES AND AN EXTENSION THEREOF TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING. THE ISLANDS KNOWN AS THE FARRALONES (FARRALLONA) ARE A PART OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY.

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

KCA ENGINEERS, INC.
CONSULTING CIVIL ENGINEERS

JANUARY 1990
Equipment Lease Financing

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

YES 277
NO 278

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "C"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

By simply refinancing existing leases, the City could save over $500,000.
Additional money could be saved on any future leases.
Gives the City the option to pay cash for equipment or to finance it expeditiously at a low cost to the City.
Allows quicker replacement of inefficient and outdated equipment, which will reduce maintenance costs, decrease downtime, and increase productivity for equipment which has outlived its economic useful life.
Provides restrictions to insure prudent use of this financing mechanism.
Requires the Controller to certify that the lease is the least costly financing method.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition C
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition C

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

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

7.309 Voter Approval of Lease Financing
(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financing arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.
(b) For the purposes of this section, "lease financing" occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.
(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:
(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or
(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or
(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.

Remember to VOTE on Election Day, Tuesday June 5, 1990.
Your polling place is open from 7:00 in the morning to 8:00 in the evening.
Recycling is not only easier than you might think, it's a simple way you can do your part for environmental conservation—and feel good about it, too.

All you need is an ordinary brown paper bag.

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

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

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

And it really is the right thing to do.

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

San Francisco Recycling Program

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

YES 280
NO 281

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

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

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

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

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

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

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

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

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

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

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

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

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

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

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

Thereafter, annual diversions would approximate $1,000,000, plus inflation.
That’s over $1,000,000 per year which cannot be spent on police services, fire protection, libraries, and public health.

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

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

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

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

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

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

Out of a greater than two billion dollar annual budget, the city can afford a guaranteed million dollars to help keep our city beautiful, clean, and graffiti-free. Year in and year out, many neighborhood projects get jilled during the budget cycle.

Proposition D will provide a solid foundation for the revitalization of our neighborhoods, which no one can tamper with and that requires no new taxes.

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

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

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

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

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

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

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

YES ON PROPOSITION D creates a working partnership between our neighborhoods and city government;

YES ON PROPOSITION D means a more beautiful city and enhancement of your neighborhood and mine;

YES ON PROPOSITION D accomplishes this with NO NEW TAXES, allowing large employers to earmark up to 1% of their current payroll tax for beautification and graffiti cleanup;

YES ON PROPOSITION D pays for neighborhood-generated projects, giving residents a say in how these reserved funds are spent;

YES ON PROPOSITION D is the first step to guaranteeing more beautiful and attractive neighborhoods.

• Join your neighbors, business owners and environmentalists by voting YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Al Pross, Chair
COMMITTEE FOR BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBORHOODS

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

• Proposition D will provide over a million dollars a year from the business community to stop neighborhood decay (through a voluntary checkoff on their payroll or gross receipts tax bill).

• Proposition D will award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city.

• Proposition D will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting, and graffiti clean-up.

• Proposition D will fund an educational campaign to teach our youngsters a new respect for public and private property.

Let's protect our city's special livability. Let's foster civic pride. Let's invest in the long term health of San Francisco's residential neighborhoods. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Supervisor Jim Gonzales

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

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

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

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

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”

Why add more government to your taxes.

- $1 million per year to be funded from Payroll taxes which has a sunset clause to expire in 1990.
- Then who pays the tab? You do.
- If the police would assert their powers and nab the violators, instead of the City offering to pay to clean up their “works of art” this ordinance would not be necessary.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Marguerite Warren

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

PROPOSITION D

[Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund]

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

NOTE: All sections are new.

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

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

(a) Findings.
The proliferation of graffiti on public buildings and other public property has created a blight which offends both citizens of and visitors to San Francisco. The removal of such graffiti will enhance the beauty of the city in which we live and will encourage others to visit and to relocate here. Removal will thus both reflect and renew our civic pride and contribute to our economic viability. Providing a source of funds for the promotion of neighborhood beautification projects will support the efforts of local residents and businesses to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and the local economy, and assist in reducing the amount of graffiti in San Francisco.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROPOSITION F

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

YES 284
NO 285

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

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

How “F” Got on the Ballot

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

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

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

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WHAT IS PROP F?
PROPOSITION F IS A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WILL ESTABLISH A MINIMUM LEVEL OF FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS FOR SAN FRANCISCO. IT GIVES THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE FIRE CHIEF THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MANAGE THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITIZENS.
SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT BECAUSE IT WILL:
(1) GUARANTEE THAT THE PRESENT 41 FIRE STATIONS STAY OPEN
(2) GUARANTEE FULLY-STAFFED FIRE TRUCKS AT ALL TIMES
(3) GUARANTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BEFORE ANY FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED
(4) GUARANTEE THAT YOUR FIREBOAT WILL BE STAFFED WITH A FIREFIGHTING CREW OF TWO THE 7.1 EARTHQUAKE OF OCTOBER 17 WARNED US AGAIN — WE MUST BE PREPARED!
ITEM A — MAYOR AGNOS CUT THE FIRE DEPART-
MENT ON-DUTY STAFFING BY 19 PERSONS A DAY IN 1989.
PROP F RESTORES THOSE CUTS.
ITEM C — PROP F DOES NOT REQUIRE “GUARANTEED OVERTIME” AND, IN FACT, BY JULY 1992 NO OVERTIME WILL BE NEEDED FOR THE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS OF PROP F.
(Overtime is now caused by large numbers of vacant positions. New hiring will eliminate all vacancies and overtime by July 1992. Prop F will safeguard this full-staffing.)
PROP F IS A COMMON SENSE MEASURE TO GIVE ADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION TO ALL CITIZENS.
VOTE YES ON F!
SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F;
COMMITTEE FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

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

Our firefighters do a tough job! But we compensate them well! We need new equipment — not more overtime. Following the earthquake, a fire truck had to be taken from the fire museum to fight fires. Let's not waste money which could be used for new firefighting equipment.
San Francisco voters rejected a similar proposal in 1987 and it should be rejected again in 1990.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fact: Proposition F is not a fire safety issue. Virtually every major American city deploys five or fewer firefighters on fire trucks. A sixth firefighter is featherbedding, not firefighting.

More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire. That's enough people to raise ladders, ventilate rooftops and carry out lifesaving tasks.

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

FACT: Firefighters in San Francisco are currently paid $200 more per month than the average salaries of firefighters in the four largest California cities. But the other firefighters work 15 percent more hours than San Francisco.

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

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

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

FACT: PROP F does:

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

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

FACT: Assistant and Battalion Chiefs DO NOT have "chauffeurs." They DO have communications assistant.

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

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

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

FACT: PROP F IS A FIRE SAFETY ISSUE!
FACT: San Francisco firefighters ARE REQUIRED to work overtime because previous policies of politicians allowed large numbers of vacant positions to occur.

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

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

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

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

I STRONGLY SUPPORT PROP F!

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

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

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

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

PROP F MAKES SENSE FOR ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

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

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

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

VOTE YES ON F!

Bill Maher, Member
Board of Supervisors

I STRONGLY SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!

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

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

I STRONGLY SUPPORT IMPROVED FIRE PROTECTION IN SAN FRANCISCO!

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

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

We NEED Proposition F. It will:

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

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

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

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

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

WENDY NELDER, Member
Board of Supervisors

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

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

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

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

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

Join your friends and neighbors! VOTE YES ON F!

John L. Molinaro
Former member of the Board of Supervisors

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

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

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

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

Many seniors, low income families and handicapped people rely on the SFFD to help them. THE PERSONAL ATTENTION THAT THE SFFD PROVIDES CAN NEVER BE CONVERTED TO SELF-SERVICE OR AUTOMATED! Firefighters, not machines, put out fires, perform rescues and meet all the other emergency needs of our city. You need these firefighters! THE NEXT CALL MAY BE YOURS!

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

William F. Murray
Chief of Department, SFFD, Retired

VOTE YES ON PROP F!

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

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

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

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

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

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

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

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

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

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING YES ON F!

John Barbagelata

---

PENNY-POWER! LOOK —

HOW CAN YOU BUY SOMETHING PRICELESS FOR ONLY PENNIES A DAY?

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F:

FOR ONLY 2 CENTS PER DAY, YOU WILL:

• KEEP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIREHOUSE OPEN
• KEEP FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED
• KEEP YOUR FIREBOAT IN SERVICE AND STAFFED WITH FIREFIGHTERS
• GUARANTEE THAT NO FIREHOUSES OR FIRE COMPANIES WILL BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT
• REMOVE POLITICS FROM FIRE SAFETY
• THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL COST EACH OF SAN FRANCISCO’S 732,000 RESIDENTS JUST PENNIES A DAY:

YEAR 1 — COST $5.3 MILLION = 2 CENTS PER DAY!
YEAR 2 — COST $2.8 MILLION = 1 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 3 — COST $0.8 MILLION = 1/2 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 4 — NO ADDITIONAL COST!

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE POLICY YOU WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY.

DON'T MISS THE CHANCE!

VOTE YES ON F!

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

---

WE STRONGLY SUPPORT PROPOSITION F!

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

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

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

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

VOTE YES ON F!

Walter L. Johnson
San Francisco Labor Council

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

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

On October 17, we were lucky! It was just a warning.
THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY IS TOO LOW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS!

Let's all get behind Proposition F! It will assure stability in Department funding, guarantee adequate staffing for our houses and apparatus, and permit long-range planning and improvements. Our firefighters need your vote!

James A. Hood
Chairman
San Franciscans for Fire Safety

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

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

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

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

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

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

FRANK T. BLACKBURN
ASSISTANT FIRE CHIEF

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

Robt. E. Donohue
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)

Charles D. Cresci
Deputy Chief, SFFD (Retired)

Charles H. Lee
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

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

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

QUATELY STAFFED.

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

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

NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

DON'T BE MISLED BY MAYOR AGNOS!
PROP F IS A LIFE AND DEATH ISSUE!
FIRE, INSURANCE AND EARTHQUAKE EXPERTS
AGREE: SAN FRANCISCO FACES THE HIGHEST RISK OF
CONFLAGRATION OF ANY CITY IN THE UNITED STATES!
FIRE RISK IS HIGHER THAN IN 1906!
SAN FRANCISCO'S FIRE PROTECTION NEEDS ARE DIC-
TATED BY THE NATURE OF OUR CITY, with its:
• Blocks and blocks of adjoining wood frame buildings
• Steep hills
• Narrow streets
• Traffic congestion
• Network of overhead electrical, trolley and telephone lines
• Prevailing winds
• 500 high rise buildings
• High density residential areas
• Large population of seniors and low-income families
• High vulnerability to severe earthquake damage
• Isolation from outside help in time of disaster
SAN FRANCISCO IS IN TROUBLE BECAUSE THERE ARE
NOT ENOUGH FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY. Former
SF Fire Chief Emmet Condon in his book "Denial of Disaster":
"THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT IS BELOW
THE DAILY MANNING LEVEL THAT ANY EXPERIENCED
CHIEF OFFICER KNOWS IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE
ADEQUATE SERVICE TO THE CITY." Condon continues:
"I WOULD AGREE THAT THE HAZARD OF FIRE TO THE
CITY AFTER A SIMILAR DISASTER TODAY IS MUCH
GREATER THAN IN 1906." And,
"SYNTHETIC MATERIALS HAVE GREATLY IN-
CREASED THE FIRE RISK IN MODERN BUILDINGS AND
WILL MAGNIFY THE FIRE PROBLEM IN THE MULTIPLE
FIRES THAT WILL BREAK OUT AFTER A SERIOUS
EARTHQUAKE."
At least 400 of the city's 500 high rise buildings do not have
modern life-safety systems! HIGH RISE FIRES CAUSE A
HUGE DRAIN ON FIRE DEPARTMENT RESOURCES.
PROP F IS STRONGLY SUPPORTED BY INDIVIDUALS;
CITIZEN, BUSINESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS:
FIREFIGHTER EXPERTS, AND A BROAD SPECTRUM OF
KNOWLEDGEABLE CIVIC LEADERS.
There is no significant opposition to Prop F.
PROTECT YOURSELF, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR FRIENDS
— YOU HAVE A LOT TO LOSE! VOTE YES ON F!

GERRY LONG
Concerned Citizen

WHY VOTE YES ON F? WHY A CHARTER AMENDMENT?
City politicians have been consistently unresponsive to your fire
safety concerns. It is the duty of the City to provide its citizens with
adequate fire protection and earthquake preparedness. Instead,
Fire Department staffing has been cut to a dangerous level.
THE POLITICIANS SAY, "TRUST US!"
We can see that this has not worked, and a Charter provision is
necessary. YOUR EMERGENCY NEEDS ARE TOO VITAL TO
BE LEFT VULNERABLE TO POLITICAL GAMES.
You hear the sirens every day — BUT HAVE YOU COUNTED
THE FIREFIGHTERS? Fewer firefighters means greatly reduced
fighting capacity. FIRE DEPARTMENT STAFFING IS NOW
AT AN ALL-TIME LOW AND CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO
FALL FURTHER!
WE NEED A STRONG FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES
ON F!

John Flaherty
Battalion Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Past President, S.F. Fire Chiefs Assn.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

James P. Olson, President
San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

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

Expensive overtime can be largely eliminated by adding more firefighters.

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

The neighborhood service cuts need to be restored.

Vote YES on F.

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

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

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

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

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Buildley

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

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

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

Frederick F. Postel
Chief of Department

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Do not pay out more money just for overtime.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

James Jefferson
President, Fire Commission

Frank Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission

Henry Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Sharon Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Ted Souls
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

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

First, it would wrest management of the Fire Department away from the Fire Commission and the Chief, where management properly and historically belongs. Management of the Fire Department should remain accountable to the citizens of San Francisco, through its appointed Fire Commission. This principle is violated when rigid language is placed in the Charter.

Second, Proposition F would unnecessarily increase the Fire Department’s budget by approximately $4.9 million a year. The San Francisco Fire Department already has staffing levels on its fire engines and aerial ladder trucks that are equal to the best in California.

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

Let life and death decisions of fire protection in San Francisco remain in the control of the Fire Commission and the Chief. Let the buck stop where it has always stopped — with the Fire Commission and the Chief. And let San Francisco’s first-rate fire protection continue.

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

James D. Jefferson
President, Fire Commission

Frank A. Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission

Henry E. Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Sharon L. Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Ted N. Souls
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Vote No on Proposition F.

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

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

Employment of unnecessary personnel is called “featherbedding.” Proposition F is just that — at a cost of $6 million. San Francisco has the best fire protection services in the country. We already pay more per person for that service than any other city in California.

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

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

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

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

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

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

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

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

It’s a dangerous job.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mayor Art Agnos

Oakland had 95,000.

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

Susan J. Bierman
Agar Jaicks
Mauri Schwartz
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Sunset Democratic Club
Margaret Brodkin, Director Coleman Advocates for Children
Carole Migden, chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
NOTE: This entire section is new.
The Proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

D. DEFINITIONS — EQUIPMENT

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

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?

YES 288
NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
G

Former Supervisor Health Benefits

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

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

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

---

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

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

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

Cut bait.
Vote NO.

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

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

8.425 Persons Covered

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

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

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

Moved since you last voted? Then you must re-register. Phone 554-4375.
Fire Inspector and Engineer Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION H

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

YES 290
NO 292

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

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

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

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

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

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition H
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.506-2 Miscellaneous Safety Employees

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the board of supervisors or the community college board shall have the power to contract with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System of the State of California to provide that the probation officers, airport police officers, district attorney and public defender investigators, coroner investigators, juvenile court counselors, and institutional police, fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers who are not members of the Section 8.588 plans, shall be members of the public employees' retirement system, and the board of supervisors, the community college board and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such contract.

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

PROPOSITION I

Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?  

YES 293
NO 295

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Jim Gonzalez and Richard Hongisto.
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

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

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

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

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

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition I
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition I
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

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

Assemblyman Willie Brown Jr.  
Assemblyman John Burton  
Supervisor Wendy Nelder  
Supervisor Tom Hsieh  
Supervisor Doris Ward  
Supervisor Jim Gonzalez  
San Francisco Democratic Party  
Fred Rodriguez, President of the Board of Education  
United Educators of San Francisco, Joan-Marie Shelley  
Judy Dellamonica  
Joanne Miller, vice-president of the San Francisco Board of Education  
Thomas Ammiano  
Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council  
Larry Martin, Transport Workers of America  
Robert Barnes  
James Wachob  
Jose Medina  
Harry G. Britt, President of the Board of Supervisors

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I

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

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

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in Section 8.670 of the charter. "Charter" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/4</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/2</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-3/4</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-1/4</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed 75 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or Subsection (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of 65 years may elect, without right of reversion, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system, and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of Sec-

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

tion 8.514 of this charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $100 per month upon retirement after 30 years of service and after attaining the age of 60 years, and provided further that as to any member within 15 years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of 65, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall be not less than $100 per month, after all calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credited 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 reduced, shall be applied on full-time service and compensation in the calculations of retirement allowances.

Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least 10 years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in Subsection (g) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in Subsection (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds 40 percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were he a full-time member, to continue until attainment by him of age 60, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed 40 percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credited service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earnable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one year immediately preceding his retirement. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied as full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

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

If a member shall die, before retirement, (1) If his benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection (e):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 and with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least 10 years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed $1,000, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(j) Except as otherwise provided in Section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it 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.

(Continued on page 92)
PROPOSITION J
Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members? YES 296
NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisor Thomas Hsieh.
Let us make human rights a fundamental part of the fabric of San Francisco.

San Francisco is the birthplace of the United Nations and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, our Human Rights Commission is not even a part of our constitution — the Charter. Proposition J will make the Human Rights Commission a charter commission. Proposition J will take the position of the Human Rights Commission out of politics and ensures its place in the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition J
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition J
Human Rights Commission

PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department and a candidate for Municipal Court Judge I urge you to vote for Ballot Measure J.

The Human Rights Commission has been a positive voice for 25 years. Thousands of San Franciscans have directly benefited from the Commission’s efforts. Its mandate will be greatly strengthened by extending Charter status through this measure. Please join me and vote yes on J!

James Harrigan
For Municipal Court

---

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “J”

We have a Human Rights Commission NOW, appointed by the Mayor. A new one in the charter would have the same appointing officer.

We don't need a confirmation of said committee. It will not take it out of politics. No reason for this. Just another layer of government — for what. Vote no on “J”.

Marguerite Warren

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

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

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued from page 88)
County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system, an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.
8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in Subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
8.584-10 Limitation on Employment During Retirement
(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.584 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.
(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.
(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.
(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.584, he shall re-enter membership under Section 8.584 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.584. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.
(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for service or disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 60 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he held the position which he held at the time of his retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he held the position from which he was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
Seven Member Commissions

PROPOSITION K
Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?

YES 298
NO 299

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “K”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

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

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

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

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

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please vote NO on K!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

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

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is a textbook example of what's wrong with contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K demeans us because it lumps city residents into groups, rather than respecting their rights as individuals.

Proposition K divides us because it stresses what such interest groups (the polite euphemism is "communities") disagree about, rather than what all San Franciscans share in common.

Proposition K debases us because it is premised on a "quota system" for city boards and commissions. There shouldn't be "white seats" or "black seats", "gay seats" or "straight seats" on city commissions. There should be but two qualifications for service as a city commissioner: San Francisco residency and individual ability!

Vote NO on Proposition K!
San Francisco is indeed a polyglot and richly diverse community. City residents come from all corners of the country and the globe. Their political opinions range from radical to reactionary and all points in between.

It's impossible for each point of view, each ethnic group, each political persuasion, each neighborhood to be represented on city commissions. Increasing the membership on those bodies from five to seven persons is like buying a bigger umbrella in a hurricane. It won't make a bit of difference.

It is possible, however, for city commissioners from all walks of life to represent views and interests other than their own. It happens all the time in countless actions by city boards and agencies. And if we want to encourage consensus and better understanding among San Francisco's many "communities", we must resist attempts — such as Proposition K — to make the labels we all wear easier to read.

Three years ago, Mayor Agnos campaigned on the slogan, "One City, One Future". The supporters of Proposition K have failed to heed those words.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The opponents of Proposition K are clearly on the wrong page of the textbook of contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K values us because it gives city residents greater ability to be heard, individually and as a community.

Proposition K unites us because it reinforces what we all share in common: respect for democracy. If, as the opposition claims, the ability to have more access to representation is divisive, democratic ideals such as checks and balances must therefore also be divisive and undesirable.

Proposition K elevates us because it originates from that respect for democracy. This does not limit or allocate, but reasonably expands available seats on the commissions. Proposition K effectively dilutes the influence of special interests in favor of more broad-based views.

San Francisco is an extremely diverse city and that diversity should be reasonably represented. Democracy requires the opportunity for representation of all points of view. Good government demands that the number of appointed officials be limited so that debate can be functional. Proposition K addresses these two needs: increased citizen participation, and reasonable size to facilitate getting work done.

If you take the opposition's argument — that it is not meaningful to have representatives from different neighborhoods, ethnicities, political persuasions — to its logical extreme, you could have one member commissions achieving a consensus at the price of democracy.

Proposition K is good government, since it integrates the multiplicity of voices into a united future for the residents of San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition K!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

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

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

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

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

Mayor Art Agnos
Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Willie Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John L. Burton
State Senator Milton Marks
Fr. James Goode
Carole Migden
Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Robert Barnes
Political Action Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Catherine Baccari
Bob Dockendorff
Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Vote No on Proposition K.
Proposition K unnecessarily tinkers with our commission system for managing city departments.

Many of the most important city functions — police and fire services, libraries and health care — are governed by five-member city commissions. Proposition K would increase the size of these commissions to seven members. The Planning Commission would be expanded to nine members.

For what reason? The supporters say that the commissions cannot reflect our diverse community unless we allow the mayor to appoint more commissioners. They miss the point of the commission system.

Commissioners are not advisors or members of a community-wide study panel. They are managers. They set city policy, recommend hundreds of millions of dollars in spending, and hire and fire key departmental personnel.

Preserve our system of citizen management. Don’t make city commissions debating societies.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Are not seven Deputy Mayors at the rate of $94,000 a year a sufficient number of political plums for the Mayor? Does he really need eighteen more commissioners to achieve good government in San Francisco?

Do not give the Mayor additional tools to promote his re-election efforts. The San Francisco Republican Party urges voters to Vote No on Proposition K.

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

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

No sound arguments have been presented which support the need for Proposition K. Enlarging Boards and Commissions would increase city costs without improving productivity. Indeed, extra members may impede efficiency and result in protracted proceedings.

Don’t give the Mayor additional opportunities for patronage. Vote NO on Proposition K.

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

Brian Mavrogeorge
Paul Kavouksarian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulaney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence
Martin Keller

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

PROPOSITION K WILL ADD TO BUREAUCRACY

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

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

Present commissions serve a diverse San Francisco by appointment of individuals who reflect and possess sensitivity, respect for different backgrounds and points of view.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

Sharon Bretz
Susann L. Danielson
Jean Kalil
Victor Makras
Esther Marks
Beverly Prior

Larger commissions and larger support bureaucracy are not the answer to better representation. The answer is less political patronage and more appointments based on experience and knowledge. This proposal only makes government more cumbersome and less effective.

... Vote NO on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Proposition K is not about democracy. It is about patronage. It is about creating many new commission positions to hand out as political plums. To whom? For what? And why should the taxpayers be forced to pay for it?

No one, not even the author, Supervisor Ward, claims that it will improve the efficiency of the government, yet it will certainly add to the costs. The true costs will include trips, staff time, expenses, etc., with no discernable benefit to the public.

This measure will lead to longer meetings, more arguments, divisiveness and politics while providing less management oversight.

Proposition K is an insider’s game. They gain and the voters pay. It is a costly bad idea and should be soundly rejected by the voters.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Bill Maher

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”

If qualified commissioners were appointed who understood they represented ALL of San Francisco this charter amendment would not be necessary.

There are nine commissions listed for additional members — 18 more appointments. Just another avenue for political appointments.

Vote No on Proposition “K”.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

PART FOUR: POLICE DEPARTMENT
3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, police force, an office of citizen complaints and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of five seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year of 1993. The incumbents serving as members of the police commission up to the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission to seven members, shall continue to hold their respective positions, subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the police department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the police commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to exceed the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-2 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter, provided however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The police commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time charge the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

PART FIVE: FIRE DEPARTMENT
3.540 Fire Department

The fire department shall be under the management of a fire commission, consisting of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor; and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years of 1946, 1949, and 1950, respectively, two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The chief of department shall have power to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for fire-fighting purposes.

The commissioners shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the fire department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the fire commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve

such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to exceed the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-2 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual 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 positions of officers and employees of the fire department legally authorized shall continue, and the incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall continue as the officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments, and except as in this charter otherwise provided.

PART EIGHT: SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
3.570 Composition of Department; Commission

There is hereby established a social services department. This department shall consist of a social services commission of five seven members, a director of social services, and such employees and assistants as may be necessary to carry out the work and functions of said department.

The members of the social services commission shall be appointed thereto by the mayor and shall be selected for their respective positions on the basis of their interest in and understanding of the problems of public welfare. The members of said commission shall serve without compensation and no person shall be eligible to serve on said commission while holding a salaried public office, position or employment.

The term of office of the members of the said commission, subject to the provisions hereof relative to removal and the terms of the first mem-
The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3.590 Commission; Composition
A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o’clock, on the 8th day of January, 1922, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of two other commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936. The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992. and On the expiration of these and successive terms, the mayor shall appoint their successors for four years. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS
3.650 Board Composition
The mayor shall appoint five seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $5,000 $7,000 per year. One such term shall expire at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1993, 1994 and 1995, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1996, and two terms at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January 1996, and upon these and successive expirations the mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART NINE: PORT COMMISSION
3.580 Commission; Composition
The San Francisco Port Commission shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, their appointment being subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors. Each of said members shall serve for a term of four years. Vacancies on the commission shall be filled by the mayor for the unexpired portion of the term. Initial appointive members of the commission shall consist of the incumbent members of the San Francisco Port Authority, who shall serve as commissioners for a term corresponding to the unexpired portion of their tenure as members of the port authority. Subject to amendment of state law to authorize an increase in membership, the port commission shall consist of seven members. The two additional members shall be appointed by the mayor after the eighth day of January, 1992. The initial term of office not to exceed four years shall be fixed by the mayor to insure that the term of office for a majority of the commission shall not expire in the same year. In addition, the director of finance and secretary of agriculture and services, or their designated representatives, shall be ex-officio members of the commission. Persons appointed to the port commission shall be subject to recall, suspension and removal in the same manner as an elected official.

The board of permit appeals shall have and exercise the following powers: (a) To hear and determine appeals where it is alleged there is error or abuse of discretion in any order, requirement, decision or determination made by the zoning administrator in the enforcement of the provisions of any ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors creating zoning districts or regulating the use of property in the city and county.

(b) To hear and determine appeals from the rulings, decisions and determinations of the zoning administrator granting or denying applications for variances from any rule, regulation, restriction or requirement of the zoning or setback ordinances, or any section thereof. Upon the hearing of such appeals said board may affirm, change, or modify the ruling, decision or determination appealed from, or, in lieu thereof, make such other additional determination as it shall deem proper in the premises, subject to the same limitations as are placed upon the zoning administrator by this charter or by ordinance.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SEVENTEEN: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings
There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county.

The civil service commission shall consist of five seven members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the 1st day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and, provided further, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall be as follows; one shall expire on June 30, 1996 and one on June 30, 1998, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. No less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: “I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a result of political patronage and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration.”

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this

(Continued on page 128)
Commissioner Residency Requirement

PROPOSITION L

Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Candidates for elective office and members of charter boards and commissions must be San Francisco residents and electors. For other boards, commissions and advisory bodies, the law creating them may set residency requirements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L is a charter amendment that would require the members of all boards, commissions and advisory bodies to be San Francisco residents and electors.

This rule would not apply where a non-charter board, commission or advisory body requires a person with specific qualifications, and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found. Also, this rule would not apply to the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Fine Arts Museums, the Asian Arts Commission, the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission and the elected members of the San Francisco Retirement Board and Health Service Board.

Proposition L would delete the current requirement that candidates and members of charter boards and commissions be residents and electors for a certain length of time before assuming office, which courts have found unconstitutional.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “L”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh and Bill Maher.

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

This charter amendment provides that all individuals serving on city boards and commissions and committees with few exceptions, must be citizens of voting age of San Francisco.

Members of boards and commissions and committees often have policy making and regulatory responsibilities. Clearly, San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco. With a population of 750,000 residents, surely we have enough qualified and talented San Franciscans who can get the job done.

This charter amendment offers the appointing officer with some flexibility. If a qualified candidate for a public post requiring specialized skills cannot be found in our city, then, following such a declaration, the appointing officer may search elsewhere.

Let's open up more opportunities for our residents to serve San Francisco. VOTE YES FOR THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERSHIP ON CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I was mistaken in one of my objections to Proposition L. Some years ago, a court decision invalidated the voter-adopted Charter requirement that a person be a San Francisco resident for five years before appointment to a city commission. I disagree strongly with that decision, for the reasons cited in my ballot argument appearing on the opposite page. The inoperative language remained in our Charter, however, and Proposition L disingenuously removes it — like pruning a dead branch from a tree.

But, there are still plenty of reasons to vote against Proposition L.

1) Proposition L eliminates the requirement that a commissioner be an "elector" of San Francisco (a voter, meaning also a U.S. citizen) for at least one year. This Charter provision has not been altered by a court, but Proposition L would strike it from the books. A person could move into town, register to vote, and be appointed that day to a city post.

2) Proposition L exempts three city commissions — Health System, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board — from any residency requirement whatsoever.

3) Proposition L would allow non-residents to serve on any board or commission created by the Board of Supervisors. In fact, Proposition L could even be interpreted to allow the appointment of non-citizens to such posts!

Don't be misled or confused. If you want San Franciscans to make decisions about San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition L!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

If you want San Francisco residents to serve on all city commissions established by the charter, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you think San Franciscans should serve on boards and committees created by the Board of Supervisors, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you favor city residents serving on the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees, vote NO on Proposition L.

The Board of Supervisors says "San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco." I agree completely. Trouble is, Proposition L weakens the existing residency requirement in our City Charter.

Charter Section 8.100 states that no person "shall be appointed as a member of any board or commission unless he shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years." Proposition L eliminates the five-year residency requirement! Proposition L also exempts from any residency requirement whatsoever members of the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees.

The idea behind the five-year residency rule is that city commissioners should have first-hand knowledge and personal experience of San Francisco's people and neighborhoods, its problems and possibilities. City commissioners should not just rely on staff reports and statistical abstracts. Proposition L would destroy this sensible safeguard. Instead, a person could move into town and be appointed, that day, to a city post!

Finally, Proposition L purports to extend the Charter's residency rules to advisory boards and committees established by the Board of Supervisors. But the residency requirement can be waived for a person "with specific experience, skills, or qualifications". That's a loophole big enough to drive a truck through!

San Franciscans should make decisions about San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition L.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for most advisory panels of the City.

Under Proposition L, panel members MUST be residents of San Francisco.

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for membership on the Health System Board, Retirement Board and War Memorial Board.

Under Proposition L, there is no change. Membership on the Health System Board and Retirement Board is by DIRECT ELECTION of city employees. The Health Fund and Retirement Fund are operated by and for city workers. Because employees are not required to live in the city, there are serious constitutional problems with denying a worker the right to be a candidate for trustee of a fund controlled by employees.

The way things are now, the courts have thrown out San Francisco's five-year residency requirement. Reports the City Attorney:

"In the years since Charter Section 8.100 (residency rule) was originally adopted, the California courts have struck down all durational residency requirements applicable to candidates for elective or appointive office."

Most Supervisors like the durational requirement. But even Supervisors cannot overrule the Supreme Court.

The bottom line: Proposition L does not cover everything. Just most things. It's time San Franciscans were making the decisions about San Francisco. Proposition L is a major start in the right direction.

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S FUTURE. YES ON PROPOSITION L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

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

San Franciscans deserve to be represented by commissioners who live within San Francisco, not by employees filling in for their ex-officio bosses. Vote for San Francisco commissions made of San Francisco voters.

... Vote Yes on Proposition L!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Don’t clutter the Charter with unnecessary provisions. Vote No on Proposition L.

Proposition L would require almost all commissions and advisory board members to be city residents. That makes sense — so much sense that, for most commissions, it is already the law.

This is one more example of a needless Charter amendment. If the Board of Supervisors wants to require members of any advisory body to be city residents, they can pass an ordinance to accomplish it.

Adding an unnecessary provision to a Charter that is already too long and complicated is not the answer.

Vote No on Proposition L.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.100 Qualifications

(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she has been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for at least one year immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retirement system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.680, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.

Notwithstanding this requirement, in the case of boards, commissions or advisory bodies established by legislative act, the residency requirement may be waived by the appointing officer, or entity upon a finding that the board, commission or body requires the appointment of a person with specific experience, skills or qualifications and after exercising due diligence, an eligible and willing appointee residing within the city and county could not be located.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.
REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease. Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals. It's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be TOXIC FREE 554-4333

HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR YOUR HOME'S TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday 8am to 4pm. 554-4333
PROPOSITION M

Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by the Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?  

YES 302  
NO 304  

Analysis  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter requires some City boards and commissions, such as the Police and Fire Commissions, to have at least one woman member. However, the charter does not have a general policy on balancing the number of men and women on City boards and commissions.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a charter amendment that would create a City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex. This charter amendment does not apply to the Commission on the Status of Women.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex.

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

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "M"  
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Bill Maher and Wendy Nelder.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The 1990s are here — but you would never know it by the few women serving on City boards and commissions. In fact, of ten major commissions — Police, Fire, Airports, Ports, Public Utilities, Parking Authority, Social Services, City Planning, Elections, Housing Authority — women hold just 18 percent of the seats. And only one woman serves as a president of these commissions.

Women do not fare much better on other key commissions. For instance, women hold just two seats on the seven-member Recreation and Park Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission. Three women serve on the eleven-member Small Business Advisory Commission.

Despite the enormous influence and regulatory controls most commissions have over the lives of all citizens, women’s voices and leadership on city panels do not equal their numbers in society.

These gloomy statistics aside, women have begun to make gains during the past two years. Women are now being regularly considered and appointed to boards and commissions. But, clearly, much more needs to be done.

Proposition M will emblazon into the Charter a policy goal of gender equality on all boards and commissions. This amendment, authored by Supervisor Richard Hongisto, is a simple measure of justice.

Only the Commission on the Status of Women is excluded from the provisions of this charter amendment, since its sole purpose is to serve as an advocacy forum for women.

Increasingly, communities and groups are instituting gender parity provisions in their constitutions with much success. For instance, the Democratic Party has dramatically brought about near gender equality of delegates to its national and state conventions.

Let’s start the 1990s off with a renewed commitment to fairness and equality.

VOTE YES ON THE GENDER PARITY AMENDMENT.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition M
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition M
Commission Gender Composition

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M moves San Francisco into the 1990s. It is stunning to review the composition of our city boards and commissions and see just how few women are serving. Women comprise 18 percent of the seats on ten major commissions. This is an untold tragedy. Women have been making gains in recent time. We can do even better.

Proposition M is about fairness and equality. Iowa enacted a law in 1987 to require greater gender balance on all boards, commissions, committees, and councils.

Vote Yes for Gender Justice. Yes on Proposition M.

SF Chapter, National Organization for Women
Legal Advocates for Women
San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Creating political leadership opportunities for women will strengthen the public policy decision-making process.

Vote YES on M.

As a predominately lesbian and gay Republican volunteer organization we believe it is a travesty that after fifteen years of three liberal Democrat mayors only 38% of the city’s Commissioners are women. This negligence has prompted the need to enact gender parity. We support Proposition M.

In the future, the provisions of Proposition M should be amended to apply to the Commission on the Status of Women. Women and men must actively dialogue so that our city begins to address the concerns of all.

Judiciary Project/California
TJ Anthony
Mary C. Dunlap
Ruth Picon, President, Latino Democratic Club
Helen Grieco, Director, SF NOW
Laura Campbell
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Agar Jaicks, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Greg Day, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Jean K. Harris
Geraldine Johnson
Joyce Newsstat, Chair, Lesbian Caucus, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
James Harrigan

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

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw
Paul Kavouksarian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence

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

Requirement that any commission be comprised of a certain number of persons of any gender is as inappropriate as requiring a certain number of persons who have red hair or blue eyes. Please vote to maintain the mayoral prerogative to appoint the best San Franciscans for the job.

... Vote NO on Proposition M!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Vote No on Proposition M.
Like Proposition L, but only more so, Proposition M does not belong in the City Charter.
The power to make appointments to boards and commissions rests with the Mayor. Proposition M would write into the Charter a non-binding policy statement urging the Mayor to fill not more than 50% plus one of any commission with members of the same sex.
The City Attorney advised the Board of Supervisors that the Constitution prohibits the city from adopting a quota for male and female appointments. Instead, the Board of Supervisors proposes to clutter up the Charter with a non-binding, legally unenforceable policy statement.
If the Board of Supervisors wants to send a message to the Mayor it should be done by resolution, not costly and unnecessary Charter amendments.
Vote No on Proposition M.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “M”
There is nothing in the charter NOW that prevents the Mayor or Board of Supervisors to appoint more women to achieve gender parity now.

Why now does it have to be written in concrete. Vote NO on “M”.

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION M

NOTE: Entire section is new.
3.503 Composition of Boards and Commissions.
It is the policy of the city and county, which shall be considered a goal when filling vacancies on boards or commissions appointed by the mayor, or otherwise provided by this charter, except for the Commission on the Status of Women, to achieve gender parity on these boards and commissions by limiting to a simple majority of board and commission membership the number of members who are of the same sex.

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 24.
MISSING SOMETHING IN YOUR LIFE?

If your life seems to be missing that special warmth that comes from having a pet, come and see us at the new San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department. We have a wide variety of dogs, cats and other animals available for adoption.

A waggly tail, a sweet meow or a gentle squeak - it'll make you glad to come home at night.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PROPOSITION N

Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?

YES 305
NO 307

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter does not limit the number of consecutive terms a person may serve on the Board of Supervisors. A full term on the Board of Supervisors is four years.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a charter amendment. Under Proposition N, no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors. After two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, a person must wait four years before serving again. Any person appointed to the Board of Supervisors to complete more than half a four-year term would be considered to have served one full term. A member of the Board of Supervisors who resigned with less than half a four-year term remaining would be considered to have served a full term. This charter amendment would go into effect July 1, 1990. Each Supervisor holding office on that date would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when his or her current term ends.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the charter so that no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors and you want to prohibit persons who served two consecutive four-year terms from serving on the Board of Supervisors again until four years after their second consecutive term in office.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to limit Supervisors to serving two consecutive terms.

Controller's Statement on "N"

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

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

How "N" Got on the Ballot

On January 25, 1990, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition N to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,151* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 45,408 of the signatures submitted were valid, 5,257 more than the required number of signatures.

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

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is a non-partisan, reasonable, fair and democratic measure to reform our government and improve the present city-wide system for electing supervisors. Neighborhood, civic leaders, current and former elected officials, community activists, business owners, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, unionists, and minorities all support Proposition N.

Limiting politicians’ consecutive terms is not radical or extreme. In fact, it helps to prevent political corruption and power grabbing. More than 150 cities, towns and counties in the United States have laws limiting politicians terms. Governors in 30 states can only serve two terms. San Mateo county limits supervisors terms and for more than 30 years San Francisco’s mayors have been limited to two consecutive terms.

Proposition N is a very modest and reasonable proposal.

Proposition N does not recall or force any current member of the board from office. Proposition N allows supervisors whose terms expire in 1991 to serve until January 1995 if they are reelected. Supervisors whose terms end in 1993 may serve until 1997 if reelected. Former supervisors may run for office again after 4 years.

The current system favors incumbent politicians and denies experienced newcomers a fair chance to serve. Since 1973, only 3 newcomers have been elected to the city-wide board. 5 supervisors have already served 10 years. By 1995 most board members will have been in office 14 years or more.

We know that a lake or pond will stagnate unless its waters are replenished from time to time. So too will an elected body grow stale without a regular infusion of fresh faces and new ideas.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Richard Bodisco
Chairman, San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Steve Jeong
Elizaboth E. Liu
Harold Hoogasian
Joseph L. Powell
Raymond Chalker
Robert A. Reveles
Robert C. Sanchez
Joel Ventresca
Barry Lastra
Daniel Willsan

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N backers have misrepresented the facts to get you to vote for N. Since just 1982 three non-incumbent supervisors have been independently elected to the Board. Proposition N is not true reform — it only tinkers with the citywide election process. It is not democratic — it takes power away from the people. It is not a solution — it’s an additional problem.

Supervisors are elected to carry out the will of the people. When they fail to serve, they are unelected — by vote of the people. Appointed department heads, who are not supposed to have their own political agendas, are balanced only by the Mayor’s and the Board’s overseeing eyes.

With the Mayor already limited to two terms, the Board must not consist only of rookies and lame ducks, or department heads can consolidate their power and bide their time, waiting until watchdog Supervisors are automatically thrown from office. Proposition N threatens accountability and increases the chances for bureaucratic corruption.

Uninformed actions are foolish actions — closely examine the facts, and you’ll agree that blindly forcing change is a bad plan. If Proposition N passes, nothing can stop department heads from installing power bases immune to voter inspection. Voters have the right to choose — this measure permanently limits that right.

PROTECT YOUR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Two years ago, San Francisco voted on Proposition N, a recall of the Board of Supervisors thinly disguised as a 'good government' initiative. San Franciscans saw through this scheme, and sent the measure down to defeat.

Last year, the same group attempted to offer a similar proposal to the voters, but failed to collect enough signatures to qualify it for the ballot.

Now they’re at it again.

They say that Supervisors have lost touch with the people of San Francisco, and should automatically be thrown from office after they’ve served two terms — but by bringing up this rejected issue again and again, they’re proving that THEY are the ones who are out of touch.

San Francisco doesn’t need a two-term limit. When supervisors stop working for the people, they stop getting elected. If Board members are prematurely removed, more power falls into the hands of civil servants and department heads, who are unaccountable to the voters. These unelected officials who already hold great power must be balanced by supervisors free to do their jobs, or citizens lose their representation.

The diversity of our City is one of our greatest strengths. San Franciscans have always individually evaluated our city’s varied issues, judging each on its specific merits. The Board of Supervisors is similarly diverse, and should also be evaluated selectively. Citizens should use the election process to tell their representatives when they’re not doing their jobs — not by acting blindly and installing an arbitrary time limit. San Franciscans are smart enough to tell the difference between voting an incompetent out of office and firing a valuable employee without cause.

Proposition N denies San Franciscans the right to vote for legislators of their choice, and that’s not fair.

Vote NO on Proposition N.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Let’s talk about what WE want City Hall to do for US, not the politicians.

Politicians will tell you anything to advance their political careers.

They won’t tell you the TRUTH about the Two Term Limit.

The politicians say we failed to collect enough signatures last year to qualify for the ballot.

But here’s what their appointee, the city’s Chief Administrative Officer says:

“Last year’s Proposition removal was forced by an error, one which we admitted, apologized for and tried to repair . . .”

(Letter to Two Term Limit — Chairman — Richard Bodisco, dated February 7, 1990.)

We need new leadership in City Hall.

We have some hard and serious problems to solve in San Francisco and we can’t solve them with political rhetoric and name calling.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N removes experienced supervisors from the Board.

FACT:

Proposition N insures that San Francisco will always have 5 or 6 supervisors with seniority and experience on the Board.

Proposition N also gives experienced and concerned citizens an opportunity to serve without needing to become professional career politicians.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N will take away your right to vote for a legislator of your choice.

FACT:

Proposition N gives you more choices because it removes the current system which favors incumbent politicians.

The politicians have spoken too long for themselves.

It is time City Hall spoke for us.

Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Submitted by San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Richard Bodisco

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

This citizen’s initiative is a good government reform measure which will guarantee change, encourage competition, improve the chances of electing new political leadership, and curtail the influence of special interests.

Vote YES on N.

SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

... Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

The longer supervisors remain in office the more likely they become captives of special interests who bankroll their costly campaigns.

Entrenched incumbent politicians often end up working against the public interest, rather than for it.

Only two supervisors have been defeated at the polls since the end of 1980.

New faces, new ideas, new leaders, and new directions are needed at City Hall.

Vote YES on N.

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

The Two-Term Limit is an idea whose time has come!

The United States Constitution limits the President to two terms in office. Similarly, the San Francisco Charter limits our Mayor to two terms.

Incumbent San Francisco Supervisors, however, continue to win re-elections year after year. This has made many of them less accountable to the voters.

Eight years is enough! Let’s bring new people, new ideas, and new energy to our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Citizens for a Better San Francisco

It works for executive offices, let’s put a limit on the terms of service for our supervisors. As Thomas Jefferson called it, “rotation in office”. Let’s have some healthy competition for these positions, let’s take advantage of the many experienced people around who are willing to serve. Let’s vote YES on Proposition N for reasonable reform.

John and Carol Maerzke

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will ensure that we have a Board of Supervisors of concerned citizens, not career politicians. For almost forty years, San Francisco has limited its Mayor to eight years in office. Many cities around the Bay Area, such as San Jose, Richmond, Mountain View and Redwood City, limit terms in office for their city councils. Yet we have had supervisors serve up to 16 years in office. Why? Because by raising large sums of money and using the power of incumbency, supervisors face little chance of defeat when running for re-election.

Proposition N will not remove any member of the Board of Supervisors from office. It is a fair proposal that allows each current supervisor to run for one more four year term. But in the future, each supervisor will be limited to eight years in office.

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will give the city fresh leadership on the Board of Supervisors. It will open up the city’s political processes, reversing the trend in recent years towards full-time professional politicians. Most importantly, it will mean that our elected representatives put the city’s needs and interests ahead of their desire for re-election.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

I’m supporting Proposition N because of my concern about the status of women and children in San Francisco.

As a long time supporter and treasurer of a shelter for battered women in the City, I have had the opportunity to closely observe how our City government works. I think there are more important things than politics.

San Francisco needs leaders in government who will show more compassion and concern about peoples’ lives as opposed to their reelection campaigns.

I don’t feel that every member of the Board of Supervisors is bad, but the two term limit will improve the current system and help our Supervisors do a better job for us.

That is why I am voting YES on Proposition N.

Millie Favetti

Over the past 20 years women have made enormous gains in electoral politics. The situation is far, far from ideal but some positive changes have taken place. Therefore, we think it is important to encourage and support the entry of women into elective politics.

We’re supporting Proposition N because it ensures that more women will have the opportunity to assume leadership roles in City government. The two year experiment with district elections produced more women supervisors than at any other time in San Francisco’s history.

The gains women have made could be easily lost under the current city-wide system. Proposition N will prevent the clock from being turned back because it allows newcomers a fair chance to compete without always having to run against entrenched incumbents.

Proposition N is equitable and fair to everyone.

Join us and vote YES on Proposition N.

Helen Dawson
Miriam Smith

As a small business owner and long time resident of San Francisco, I’m supporting Proposition N because it makes good sense for our City.

Limiting Supervisors’ terms will create a Board of Supervisors more accountable to the needs of San Franciscans. Under the current city-wide system, to many Supervisors see service on the Board as a career.

They worry more about keeping their seats than about doing the job they were elected to do. As a result, politics is all too often put ahead of the City welfare.

Let’s get politics out of City Hall.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Zdenka Bodisco
Mike Salarno
Harold Hoogasian
Small Business Owners

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

We’re supporting the Two Term Limit because San Francisco needs new political leadership. The Two Term Limit will open the “Door of Opportunity” for new candidates to serve on the Board of Supervisors.

The Two Term Limit will allow a new generation of civic leaders to represent our City. It is a fair and democratic way to reform the current system and to restore citizens’ confidence in City Hall.

San Francisco’s government should reflect the diversity of the people who live here. This is the meaning of a Democratic and free system. The Two Term Limit insures that new people with new ideas will have a fair chance to serve the City.

Don’t be fooled by arguments of professional, career politicians. The Two Term Limit is good for our community and it is good for San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Steve M. Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu

WHY DIDN’T WE GET TO VOTE ON THE TWO-TERM LIMIT LAST YEAR?
Because Louise Renne found a legal loophole to get the measure thrown off the ballot after the Registrar of Voters had certified that it qualified for submission to the electorate.

Never mind that when Renne violated a number of election laws several years ago she got everyone to overlook the “technicality.”

But what do you expect?

This is the same Louise Renne who sued the Olympic Club because it had no female members conveniently “overlooking” the fact that her husband Paul belongs to the all-white, all-male San Francisco Golf Club.

Say “No” to Renne’s legal machinations!

Vote “Yes” on “N.”

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director

Aleza Smith
Democratic Committeemember

Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

WHAT ARE THEY AFRAID OF?

Why are the Supervisors and their contributors fighting the two-term limit so hard?

Why did City officials use a legal loophole to get this same measure thrown off the ballot last fall?

Are they afraid they won’t be able to give away another city street worth $9 million to the Rockefellers for free like they did in 1987?

Are they afraid that the people might vote to turn them out?

Clean up City Hall! Yes on N!

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic Senate Candidate

Aleza Smith
Democratic Committeemember

Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The Two-Term Limit is a reform whose time has come!
At the Federal, State, and Local levels, political reformers agree that the powers of incumbency virtually preclude incumbents from being defeated at the polls, and that term limitation is the only way to ensure turnover in legislative bodies. Even Attorney General John Van de Kamp has proposed a twelve-year limit for State legislators.

Since the return to City-wide elections in 1980, only two incumbent Supervisors have been defeated at the polls. They were replaced by Wendy Nelder and Angela Alioto — the daughters of a former Police Chief and Mayor, respectively. Because of this trend, Supervisors have become burned-out, complacent, less accountable to the voters, and more beholden to the special interests who contributed to their re-election campaigns.

Proposition N would limit San Francisco supervisors to two consecutive terms of office, just like the mayor. It’s a modest reform that deserves your vote.

Proposition N would not force any incumbent out of office. All current supervisors could run for one more term after their present term expires. And after four years, they could run again and hold office for two more terms.

The President of the United States has been limited to two consecutive terms of office since 1951. The Mayor of San Francisco has been limited to two consecutive terms since 1953. San Mateo County has a term limit for its board of supervisors. Proposition N is not a new or radical idea; it’s an overdue reform for a stagnant system.

The founders of our city charter envisioned supervisors as part-time citizen legislators, not full-time professional politicians. Proposition N respects and revives that tradition. A bit of fresh air never hurt anybody — even two-term supervisors!

Please vote YES on Proposition N.

Senator Quentin Kopp

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

The current system of electing supervisors in San Francisco badly needs reform. But Proposition N is not the answer. The Board of Supervisors is not accountable to the people, largely because of the pernicious influence of large monetary contributions. A two-term limit would only exacerbate the problem. All supervisors would either be rookies or lame ducks, resulting in a tremendous shift of power to the bureaucracy, without lessening the powerful influence of money in campaigns.

What San Francisco needs is real campaign reform — limiting the ability of supervisors to vote on the pet projects of their major contributors, and district election of supervisors. Both would greatly reduce the enormous sums of money needed to run for office citywide.

Proposition N is a false promise of reform. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N!

Dennis Antonore
Robert Barnes
Ron Braithwaite
Supervisor Harry Britt
Gordon Chin
Brother Kelly Cullen
Catherine Dodd R.N.
Noah Griffin

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaics
Geraldine M. Johnson
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leslie Katz
Tony Kilroy

Myra G. Kopp
Steven M. Krefting
William J. Brandy Moore
Jim Morales
Connie O’Connor
Ruth Picon
Mauri Schwartz
Yori Wada

Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead
Harold T. Yee
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943 and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and a public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, 11 members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected to a term of four years, from the commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the eighth day of January, 1981, shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on said date and the 11 persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said eighth day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms.

Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the eighth day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 shall be elected, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the eighth day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor, or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

The effective date of this section as amended is July 1, 1990. All supervisors holding office on that date shall be deemed to have served one full four year term upon the expiration of their then current terms of office.
Hypodermic Syringes

PROPOSITION O
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?

YES 309
NO 310

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law regulates the sale, distribution and use of hypodermic syringes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

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

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

"Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted it would not affect the cost of government."

How "O" Got on the Ballot
On September 15, 1989 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,173 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,774 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.
Hypodermic Syringes

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

The connection between AIDS and unclean needles is unchallenged. Virtually every authority on the subject agrees that sharing needles increases the chances of contracting AIDS. San Francisco has an estimated 13,000 IV drug users, each of whom is at risk of contracting AIDS and spreading it to their sexual partners or their unborn children. Tens of thousands of people are being directly threatened with contracting AIDS because it is illegal to obtain clean, safe needles.

Some groups are trading clean needles with addicts for their dirty ones. This removes contaminated needles from circulation and can dramatically cut the infection rate among drug users and their partners. But these groups face up to a six months in jail and a $1,000 fine. One member of this group, who lost her mother to AIDS, contracted through a dirty needle, said, "I lost a parent to this because this bureaucracy sits around and talks while lots of people are dying." Dr. John Newmeyer of the Haight Ashbury Free Medical Clinics said, "People are dying because of our institution’s resistance to AIDS risk reduction methods."

In an attempt to stop this disease from being spread to drug users and their partners AIDS prevention workers are risking legal persecution. Jerry DeLong, who works with substance abusers and is a member of the Mayor’s Narcotic’s Task Force, said "...with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives." But in a sane, free society it shouldn’t be necessary to break the law to save lives.

The only way this deadly policy can be changed is for the state legislature to change the law. These State laws should be repealed.

Pamela Willard Pickens
Secretary San Francisco Libertarian Party

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

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

Dr. John Watters of the Urban Health Study says that, "The middle class have access to clean needles." Poor people can't get clean needles, because they are illegal. Black and Latino IV drug users have a more difficult time finding clean needles and are thus more likely to be infected with AIDS. Because minorities are more likely to be infected with AIDS a higher proportion of their sexual partners or unborn children are being infected. AIDS is likely to become the leading cause of death in young Blacks and Latinos if things continue as they have. Legal clean needles will help save their lives.

Christina Groth

The San Francisco Department of Health estimates that there are 13,000 IV drug users in the city. If clean needles remain unavailable to them the AIDS infection rate can easily reach over 60%. If these 60% infect just two other people either through shared needles or sex, the total number of infected people can reach 23,400. San Francisco can’t afford the financial burden it is under today from AIDS cases. Prevention through clean and legal needles can save us millions of tax dollars without costing us a cent. Legal needles make financial sense.

Isaac Klein

The San Francisco Chronicle has reported on the use of needles for IV drug use in Scotland. The newspaper said that in Edinburgh police launched a crackdown on the availability of clean needles. Within 18 months of the crackdown 50% of all IV drug users were infected with AIDS. Soon their sexual partners and unborn babies were infected with the disease. But 30 miles away in Glasgow the police took no action against the availability of clean needles and only 4 to 7 percent of needle users were infected. Dr. Roy Robertson, Edinburgh’s leading authority on AIDS said, “Making needles available to addicts is not the only answer to the problem of AIDS among drug users but certainly, it has to be part of the solution.”

VOTE YES!

George Meyer

WHAT IS CANADA DOING RIGHT?

In Canada, fewer than 1% of AIDS cases are from needles!
In the United States, about 50% of new cases now involve needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners and babies, (up from about 20-30% in the beginning of the epidemic).

What is Canada doing right?

The AIDS epidemic has hit here many times worse than there.
Why?
In Canada, drug-users can buy sterile needles in drugstores.

GRASSROOTS

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

SURGEON GENERAL KOOP ON CLEAN NEEDLES
"One of the strongest advocates of making needles legal is Surgeon General Koop who addressed that issue last November (1987): "I'm asked about clean needles everyplace I go. I've always said the same thing. If clean needles will do anything to contain a part of the epidemic, we should not have any foolish inhibitions about so doing." (S.F. Sentinel 1/22/88)
Wm. Schwartzman, M.D.

Clean needles cause no diseases.
Legal needles are clean needles.
Vote Yes.

William Schwartzman, MD

Does this initiative "condone drugs"?
If you vote Yes, that could be interpreted as condoning drugs. But if you vote No, that could equally well be interpreted as condoning the spread of AIDS (and hepatitis, and many other diseases).

The present state law is like the "death penalty" — not just for drug abusers, but also their spouses, their babies, transfusion recipients and others. Who can "condone that"?

GRASSROOTS

The AIDS epidemic was caused by a combination of germs, working together to collapse the immune system.
N.Y.'s health department has concluded that the HIV epidemic already existed among New York addicts in the 1970's. That epidemic existed only because New York has laws against addicts buying clean needles.

If we keep these deadly laws, no one can predict what future epidemics might result.

GRASSROOTS

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES ENCOURAGES STERILE NEEDLES
The National Academy of Sciences the country's most prestigious scientific organization in 1986, issued a major study titled "Confronting AIDS". Many lives could have been saved if California had promptly implemented the conclusion drawn by America's leading scientists:
"IT IS TIME TO BEGIN EXPERIMENTING WITH PUBLIC POLICIES TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF STERILE NEEDLES AND SYRINGES BY REMOVING LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS TO THEIR POSSESSION AND USE."

Wm. Schwartzman, MD
Wm. Steinsmith, MD

The issue is not "free needles".
Some of us believe that mass giveaways of clean needles is best. Others of us believe it would be enough if doctors and pharmacies were allowed to sell needles, as with diabetes.
Legal needles are as cheap as ballpoint pens, so cheap that price would be no barrier.
This initiative takes no position on "free needles" programs, only for legalization — a prerequisite for either approach.

GRASSROOTS

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

Under present California law, even doctors aren’t allowed to provide needles except for approved purposes. So far “stopping AIDS” is not an approved purpose.

Under “legalization”, needles are a medical question, not a police question. A doctor’s prescription could still be required, as with diabetes. Whatever controls are adopted, needles will be **better controlled under legalization** than they are now.

*William Steinsmih, M.D.*

---

Dr. Don Francis, an epidemiologist with the Centers for Disease Control said, “We can’t overstate the threat of AIDS among addicts in the minority population in the inner city.” Dr. Francis says that there is no evidence that legal, clean needles increase the use of drugs. The only thing stopping clean needles is the law. It’s time for Sacramento to repeal the law and save lives.

*Will Wohler*

---

According to the *New York Times* a new, rare virus known as HTLV-II is spreading through the IV drug community because of needle sharing. Spread in the same manner as AIDS, this virus “could cause leukemia or other serious diseases and may exact a rising toll in future years.” Surveys have found that 20% of addicts in New Orleans were infected and in San Francisco a preliminary survey of blood donors showed this new disease has a higher rate of incidence than the AIDS virus. Because it can take as long as 20 years to develop no one can know for sure how many people have been infected. Clean, legal needles will stop the transmission of this disease. VOTE YES!

*John Whisman*

---

Clean needles save the lives of innocent victims of AIDS. No one gets AIDS because people share needles is an addict. Some are small babies. The Centers for Disease Control says 314 babies were born in 1988 with AIDS because their mothers used infected needles. Dr. James Buehler of the CDC said “We need to do what we can to prevent the sharing of dirty needles. Sharing dirty equipment is the worst problem.” In California it is illegal to obtain clean needles so addicts share. Because they share, babies are born with AIDS. Save lives. Legalize needles. **VOTE YES!**

*Mark Pickens*

---

Illegal needles, which force IV drug users to share unclean needles, is now the cause of over one-third of all AIDS cases in the United States according to the federal government’s Centers for Disease Control. In 1988, 10,747 people contracted AIDS because of sharing unclean needles. Some of these people never used needles themselves. 226 were men who had sex with women who used needles, 623 were women who had sex with men who used unclean needles and 314 were unborn babies. Over 1,000 people who don’t use drugs were infected because clean needles are illegal. **VOTE YES FOR LEGAL, CLEAN NEEDLES!**

*Pamela Williard Pickens*

---

Proposition O was endorsed by the Central Committee of the Democratic Party of San Francisco on March 21, 1990. **VOTE YES!**

*John Whisman*
Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Clean, legal needles will save lives. Jerry DeJong of the Mayor’s Narcotics Task Force said, “The bottom line is that this is not a moral or legal issue. Unfortunately with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives.” Something is very wrong when its illegal to save lives; and that wrong must be corrected. Tell Sacramento that we want to legalize saving lives. We need clean, legal needles now!

Ron Dorsey

Illegal needles are the primary means of spreading AIDS to minority communities. Most of the IV drug users and their partners who have been infected with AIDS are Black or Latino. Most of the babies born with AIDS because of needle sharing by their mothers are also Black and Latino. Blacks and Latinos are now more likely than ever before to become infected with AIDS because clean needles are illegal. Legal, clean needles will slow down the infection rate and decrease the number of deaths in minority communities. Illegal needles hurt Blacks and Latinos more than they hurt others. Support legal needles.

Jim Peron

Prof. Ethan Nadelman, in the Washington Post, reported that “The governments of England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, the Netherlands and several other countries have actively attempted to limit the spread of AIDS by removing restrictions on the sale of syringes . . . .” Dr. Nadelman notes that there is growing evidence that legal needles do not increase the use of drugs but they do save lives.

George O’Brien

A former prosecutor of high-level drug dealers, Ben Clark, said in The Daily Recorder, a law newspaper, that legal restrictions on clean needles “have had the disastrous effect of forcing drug users to share syringes. Over half the addicts in New York State are infected with AIDS, and the rate of infection among intravenous drug users in Illinois is growing dramatically.”

While some people may say addicts deserve to die, Clark notes, “. . . the issue is not simply whether society should sit back and watch addicts kill themselves off: AIDS transmitted by needles does not stay within the druggie population. Unborn children of AIDS-infected female users may become infected. The sex partners of persons with AIDS are exposed to the disease. Needle-sharing prostitutes interact with the drug-free heterosexual community on a daily basis.” Clark says that clean, legal needles have never been proven to increase drug use but they do save lives. VOTE YES!

Sam Grove

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

There is no scientific evidence that unlimited and uncontrolled availability of hypodermic syringes/needles will stop the spread of AIDS. Proposition "O" would open the floodgates to the purchase and distribution of hypodermic syringes, without prescription, in drug stores, supermarkets and in the streets without medical supervision under the guise of stopping the spread of AIDS. Addicts will continue to commit crimes to pay for the dope since possession and sale of drugs, such as crack cocaine and heroin, will still be illegal.

Latest statistics show that over 80 percent of inmates in our already overcrowded jails are there for illegal drug offenses.

Who will protect the public against the careless disposition of these used needles by addicts?

Black communities in San Francisco are under siege from the sale of illegal drugs and the crime this produces. Approval of Proposition "O" by the voters permitting use of unprescribed legal needles and illegal drugs could leave the City open to millions of dollars in lawsuits for unsupervised use of a medical procedure by intravenous drug addicts from death and other causes.

WE URGE A "NO" VOTE ON PROPOSITION "O". It should not be City policy to support the removal of all restrictions in the distribution, sale and use of hypodermic syringes.

Rev. Amos Brown
Hon. Naomi Gray
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Senator Quentin Kopp
Dr. Raye Richardson
Lulann McGriff
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Melvin Miles

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION 0

We, the people of the City and County of San Francisco, California, call upon the California State Legislature to eliminate all sanctions, criminal, regulatory, or civil, on the manufacture, use, sale or other distribution of hypodermic syringes. We do this to reduce the spread of AIDS and other diseases.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION K (Continued from page 100)

An airports commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on September 1, 1996. On the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

All rights, claims, actions, orders, obligations, proceedings and contracts relating to the airport department under the public utilities commission existing prior to the effective date of these amendments shall not be affected by the adoption thereof, and shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the airports commission.

This amendment shall be operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY-TWO: PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION
3.698 Commission — Composition

A parking and traffic commission and the department of parking and traffic are hereby established. The parking and traffic commission shall consist of five seven members. If not in conflict with state law, members of the parking and traffic commission shall serve ex-officio as members of the parking authority.

The term of each member shall be for four years; provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided further, that terms of the two commissioners created by the amendment of June, 1990 shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 5th day of December, 1992; and on the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

Any person may serve concurrently as a member of the San Francisco parking authority and the parking and traffic commission.
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IS GOING TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON ELECTION DAY A PROBLEM?

If you are unable to go to your polling place to vote on Election Day (Tuesday, June 5, 1990), you may vote by absentee ballot in one of two ways:

1. **Vote at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.** Starting on May 7 through June 5, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., you can vote in Room 158 at City Hall.

2. **Vote by mail.** Complete the application for an absentee ballot on the back cover. Tear or cut off the back cover, fold it in half with the address of the Registrar of Voters on the outside, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated, and mail the form.

Voters who have specified disabilities may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Please refer to page 24.
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PRECINCTS APPLICABLE:
1300's, 1500's,
2100's, 2700's

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside

(415) 554-4375

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION

Must be received by the Registrar of Voters
no later than May 29, 1990

June 5, 1990 Consolidated Primary Election

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FIRST NAME

MIDDLE INITIAL

LAST NAME

DATE OF BIRTH

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX OR MAIL DROP ADDRESS)

NUMBER AND STREET

CITY

ZIP CODE

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (if different from above)

P.O. BOX OR STREET

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

I HAVE NOT AND WILL NOT APPLY FOR AN ABSENTEE BALLOT BY ANY OTHER MEANS.

X

SIGNATURE (DO NOT PRINT)

DATE

DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER

EVENING PHONE NUMBER

I understand that voters with specified disabilities may qualify as Permanent Absent Voters. See page 24.

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
PRIMARY '90
Consolidated Primary Election Tuesday June 5, 1990

VOTE!

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

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot
Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

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

Name __________________________________________

Address ________________________________________ Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required) ____________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:

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

Second choice locations (if any) ______________________

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

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

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

A 第一步
如遇錯誤，請向員警換取新選票。

B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

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

C 第一步
請將手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

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

D 第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

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

E 第三步
請把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

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

F 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備供投票人應用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOBERNADOR  眷長</th>
<th>选一人 Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARK CALNEY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. FRANK WONG</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES PINEDA JR.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANKLIN R. GERATY</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYDON BYRNE</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANNE FEINSTEIN</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES A. MAHON III</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICEGOBERNADOR 副州長</th>
<th>选一人 Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. MC CARTHY</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>March Fong Eu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Mervin Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Gray Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Wesley Sanders, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vote for One**
### PROCURADOR GENERAL
**Attorney General**

**ARLO SMITH**
District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco
Fiscal del Distrito de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco

**IRA REINER**
District Attorney of Los Angeles County
Fiscal del Distrito del Condado de Los Angeles

### COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS
**Insurance Commissioner**

**MICHAEL BLANCO**
Living Trust Attorney
Abogado Especialista en Fideicomisos

**LARRY MURPHY**
Certified Insurance Consultant
Consultor Titulado de Seguros

**WALTER A. ZELMAN**
Director, Consumers' Organization
Director, Organización de Consumidores

**CONWAY COLLIS**
Member, State Board of Equalization
Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Compensación

**BILL PRESS**
Consumer Advocacy Commentator
Comentarista en Defensa del Consumidor

**JOHN GARAMENDI**
California State Senator
Senador Estatal de California

**RAY BOURHIS**
Insurance Consumers Attorney
Abogado de Seguros para los Consumidores

---

 этап 1990年6月5日

PARTIDO DEMOCRATA
**ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS**
5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

ESTADO

STATE

DEMOCRATIC PARTY
**PRIMARY ELECTION**
JUNE 5, 1990
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PARTIDO DEMOCRATA</strong></th>
<th><strong>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN</strong></td>
<td><strong>United States Representative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member, State Board of Equalization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH G. COLMAN</td>
<td>80 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIL G. POLLACK</td>
<td>82 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS JOHN PAPAN</td>
<td>83 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD TABASH</td>
<td>85 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAD SHERMAN</td>
<td>86 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BALDWIN</td>
<td>88 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DINAMITOS</strong></th>
<th><strong>Elección Primaria del Partido Demócrata</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membra, State Assembly</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senador Estatal</strong></td>
<td><strong>State Senator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES R. WACHOB</td>
<td>96 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td>98 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Democratic Party</strong></th>
<th><strong>Primary Election June 5, 1990</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>Member of the State Assembly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN L. BURTON</td>
<td>102 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Incumbent/Titular del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRIAN BERMUDEZ, JR.</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo 现任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT J. BOILEAU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIMIKO BURTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE RACHEL KATZ</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo 现任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVEN KREFTING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIA MARTINEZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNIE O'CONNOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRIT LEVI</td>
<td>RN, MPCC 注册护士</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVE NEUBERGER</td>
<td>Union Representative, SEIU / Representante Sindical, SEIU 工会代表</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGER CARDENAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWRENCE WONG</td>
<td>Financial Consultant / Consultor Financiero 财务顾问</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICIA WANG</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo 现任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMEON WHITE</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo 现任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA A. PLUMMER</td>
<td>Parent / Community Activist / Madre / Activista Comunitario 家长 / 社区活动家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTH PICON</td>
<td>Senior Program Director / Directora de Programas para Ancianos 老年计划主任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICK HAUPTMAN</td>
<td>Commissioner / Community Leader / Comisionado / Líder Comunitario 委员 / 社区领袖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAURI SCHWARTZ</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent / Titular del Cargo Nombrado 现任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>William J. O'Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departamento #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court</td>
<td>Ellen Chaitin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>Julie Tang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departamento #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court</td>
<td>James Harrigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aseo</td>
<td>Jerome A. de Filippo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asesor</td>
<td>Lillian K. Sing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defender</td>
<td>Ronald G. Kershaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Richard D. Honigsto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defender</td>
<td>Paul Schwenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Jeff Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

107 HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

YES 185
NO 187

108 PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

YES 189
NO 190

109 GOVERNOR'S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor's time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 192
NO 193

110 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

YES 195
NO 197

111 THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

YES 200
NO 203
| N 51, N 52 & N 53 | 13-1N |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE</strong></th>
<th><strong>初選 1990年 6月 5日</strong></th>
<th><strong>省提案提交選民投票</strong></th>
<th><strong>超黨派投票</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, Elecciones Primarias Consolidadas, 5 de Junio de 1990</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposiciones A Ser Sometidas Al Voto de Los Electores — Estatal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1990年房屋無家可歸者公投法案</strong></td>
<td><strong>1990年房屋無家可歸者公投法案</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDA Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1990年房屋無家可歸者公投法案</strong></td>
<td><strong>1990年房屋無家可歸者公投法案</strong></td>
<td><strong>1990年房屋無家可歸者公投法案</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>185 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td><strong>188 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td><strong>186 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td><strong>187 NO 反對</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>189 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td><strong>190 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td><strong>191 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td><strong>192 SI 贊成</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>193 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td><strong>194 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td><strong>195 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td><strong>196 SI 贊成</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>197 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td><strong>198 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td><strong>199 SI 贊成</strong></td>
<td><strong>200 SI 贊成</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>201 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td><strong>202 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td><strong>203 NO 反對</strong></td>
<td><strong>204 NO 反對</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDA Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990.**

Esta acta dispone el empréstito de bonos de $150,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para un progreso de vivienda que incluye: (1) refugio de emergencia y alojamiento temporal para familias en necesidad; (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos que ingresan al mismo, incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que llenan las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapacitados y trabajadores del campo; (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya existentes y, (4) ayuda a comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

1990年房屋無家可歸者公投法案。此法案提供發行公債 $150,000,000 資助的房屋計畫包括以下：(1)緊急避難及臨時住所設立；(2)新蓋租賃房舍補貼家庭及個人；(3)改善原有住屋及租賃房舍之修補；(4)協助購屋。此法案之目的在於振興經濟及社會安定。

1990年房屋無家可歸者公投法案。此法案提供發行公債 $150,000,000 資助的房屋計畫包括以下：(1)緊急避難及臨時住所設立；(2)新蓋租賃房舍補貼家庭及個人；(3)改善原有住屋及租賃房舍之修補；(4)協助購屋。此法案之目的在於振興經濟及社會安定。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES. ÉTICA. Establece leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales electos. Ordena que las sesiones legislativas sean públicas. Impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que derivarán de los salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigencia la medida.  

211 SI 赞成  
213 NO 反对  


215 SI 赞成  
217 NO 反对  

ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redefine y expande la definición de "asesinato del orden público" que impone pena por asesinato. Impacto fiscal: Gastos estatales desconocidos como resultado de que se expa la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.  

218 SI 赞成  
220 NO 反对  

DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estadutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectúa significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondría en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatal y locales, pero podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.  

222 SI 赞成  
224 NO 反对  

TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza la emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).  

226 SI 赞成  
228 NO 反对  

PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir ámbitos. Prohíbe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $16 millones provenientes de la sobretasa al cigarrillo y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.  

230 SI 赞成  
232 NO 反对  

SPONSORS A LA REFORMA ELECTORAL — ESTADAL  

212 NO 反对  

SPONSORS A LA REFORMA ELECTORAL — ESTADAL  

112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  

共计每年物業管理的費用是一百萬元，
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Legislate. Reapportionment, Ethics, Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Reapportionment by Commission. Initiative Constitutional Amendment, Statute. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 School Facilities Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 51, N 52 &amp; N 53</td>
<td>17-1N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE**

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

**PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL**

| 236 SI 贊成 | **LEGLISATURA, REDISTRIBUCION, ÉTICA, EMMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICITATIVA.** Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y aprobaron de los votantes. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa. Impuesto Fiscal: Los ahorros de la redistribución en los gastos por redistribución podrían ser compensados en parte de los partidos por el voto de los votantes. Los costos por las disposiciones para él son probablemente menores. |
| 238 NO 反對 | |

| 240 SI 贊成 | **RE DISTRIBUCION FOR COMISION, EMMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICITATIVA.** Establece la redistribución de distritos y la candidatura de las elecciones en 1992 para todos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. Dicho cargo a la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían para disminuir los ahorros. |
| 242 NO 反對 | |

| 243 SI 贊成 | **ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en los prisiones existentes y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción. |
| 245 NO 反對 | |

| 248 SI 贊成 | **ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Lectura “Hastings,” la Academia Naval Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobados por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1° de julio de 1990 Inclusivo. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita a: la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, al establecimiento de medidas de seguridad, contra incendios y mejoras para la salud y seguridad. |
| 250 NO 反對 | |

| 254 SI 贊成 | **ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACION DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, acondicionamiento y prueba de sistemas, reparación, remodelación y reubicación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos. |
| 256 NO 反對 | |

| 258 SI 贊成 | **ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990.** Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejoras de escuelas públicas. |
| 259 NO 反對 | |

**118 119 120 121 122 123**
**CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td><strong>PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990.</strong> To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.</td>
<td>YES 263</td>
<td>NO 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particular relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?</strong></td>
<td>YES 269</td>
<td>NO 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?</strong></td>
<td>YES 277</td>
<td>NO 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?</strong></td>
<td>YES 280</td>
<td>NO 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td><strong>WITHDRAWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?</strong></td>
<td>YES 284</td>
<td>NO 285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para contrar una deuda en bonos de $332,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reconstrucción de edificios que son propiedad de la Ciudad de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto, la disminución del asbesto, el hecho de proporcionar el acceso para las personas incapacitadas; siempre y cuando no se contrate más de $65,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $332,400,000 se verifique a través de la cantidad real recibida en conexiones del FEM o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros por terremoto.

263 SI 賛成

265 NO 反對

269 SI 賛成

272 NO 反對

277 SI 賛成

278 NO 反對

280 SI 賛成

281 NO 反對

ELIMINADA

284 SI 賛成

285 NO 反對

1990年公共安全改善公債。發行公債$332,400,000，用於購買、興建或改修舊金山市及其所屬的物業，包括用於建筑物的維修、減輕和改進舊金山市的風險，只要每年在財政年度內發行公債的數額不超過$65,000,000。並且與FEMA(聯邦緊急救援署)所同意的救援金額足夠使使用該救援金額維修及改進公共安全設施及所得的補助金總額減低至$322,400,000的數額。

A

B

C

D

E

F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290</td>
<td>NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293</td>
<td>NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298</td>
<td>NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305</td>
<td>NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309</td>
<td>NO 310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

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

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

288 SI
¿Tendrá el Concejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?

289 NO

290 SI
¿Tendrá el Concejo de Supervisores la autoridad de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (SERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los investigadores de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del SERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?

291 NO

292 SI
¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?

293 NO

294 SI
¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?

295 NO

296 SI
¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permisos de cinco a seis miembros?

297 NO

298 SI
¿Será un requisito que los miembros de las comisiones y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que se envíen declaraciones a los miembros de otra comisión, comisiones y cargos asumidos de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertas comisiones enumeradas, o en los casos en que requiera una persona con experiencia, capacidad o habilidades especiales y que no pueda encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que cumpla con estas condiciones?

299 NO

300 SI
¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuestos por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión acerca del Estado de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?

301 NO

302 SI
¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos periodos consecutivos de cuatros años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 3 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?

303 NO

304 SI

305 SI
¿Será la políti ca de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?

306 NO

307 SI

308 NO

309 SI

310 NO

N 51, N 52 & N 53

21-IN
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — If you do not wish to go to your polling place to vote, you may vote by mail or by going to the Registrar’s Office in City Hall in person. This is called absentee voting.

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


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE - OFFICE 1S</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNOR</td>
<td>(Check Ballot for the number of candidates to vote for)</td>
<td>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE - OFFICE 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT. GOVERNOR</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE - OFFICE 3</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARY OF STATE</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROLLER</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURER</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE COMMISSIONER</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, BOARD OF EQUALIZATION</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>STATE SUPT. OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE - OFFICE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE - OFFICE 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCAL PROPOSITIONS

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

STATE PROPOSITIONS

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

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

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

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

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

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

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

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

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

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

ELECTION DAY:

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

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

PARKING — If your polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided that this will not impede the flow of traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large print instructions on how to vote and magnifying sheets to enlarge the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows for seated voting.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip tool and pen to be used in punching the ballot and signing in.

APPLICATION TO BE A PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

The physically disabled may apply to be permanent absentee voters. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, you will automatically receive an absentee ballot every election until you move or re-register.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the form below and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158, City Hall, San Francisco, 94102. Each time you move or re-register to vote, you must apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases you do not need to re-apply.

I hereby apply for "Permanent Absentee Voter" status in San Francisco by reason of:

____ Lost use of one or more limbs. ______ Lost use of both hands.
____ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g. cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair).
____ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease.
____ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities.
____ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.
____ PLEASE SEE EXPLANATORY LETTER ATTACHED.

Name ____________________________________________

FIRST MIDDLE LAST

# ___________________ ___________________ ___________________

STREET STREET STREET

# ___________________ ___________________ ___________________

CITY ZIP CODE

Residence Address

Mailing Address

(if different than residence address given above)

I declare under penalty of Perjury that the above is true and correct:

Date ___________________ Signature __________

(Return only this page; do not return the whole book)
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens over 18 years old who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 8, 1990.

Q — I moved before May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 8 and June 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — If you are registered as a member of a political party you may choose a candidate for:
Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Member-State Board of Equalization (District 2), Member-State Assembly, State Senator if you live in Senate District 8, United States Representative, and members of the County Central Committee.
Non-partisan offices are:
Superintendent of Public Instruction, Superior Court Judge, Municipal Court Judge, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 5, 1990. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let us know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help you.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don’t know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any test?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to my polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 5 by:
• going to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall from May 7 through June 5, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday; or
• mailing in a request for an absentee ballot. You may send in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. The application must be received by the Registrar of Voters before May 29, 1990.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include:
• your home address
• the address to which you want the ballot mailed
• your printed name and your signature.
Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSessor
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is paid $98,670 a year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is paid $102,882 a year.
The Public Defender represents the following persons unable to pay for their own lawyer: 1) persons accused of crimes, 2) juveniles in legal actions, and 3) persons in mental health hearings.
Candidates for Assessor

PAUL E. SCHWENERG

My address is 16 Ord Court, Apt. #4
My occupation is Deputy Assessor
My age is 53
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan, Mission High School graduate, and San Francisco State University graduate. I have been a Deputy Assessor for San Francisco for the past 22 years. I have been awarded the SRPA, Senior Real Property Designation, which is one of the highest awards for professional appraisers. My 22 years of experience will enable me to effectively represent homeowners' and renters' concerns before State Legislative Committees. I will analyze property values to make sure business pays its fair share and I will oversee the operations of the Assessor's office in an experienced and professional manner.

Paul E. Schwenger

The sponsors for Paul E. Schwenger are:

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: With 28 years of public service, I am the only candidate with real management experience.
As Sheriff of San Francisco, I managed 399 employees; as Police Chief, 2,500; as New York Prison Commissioner, 13,000.
While this would be the largest managerial responsibility faced by the other candidates, it would be my smallest.
I want to be your assessor so I can make it a model agency. I know government and real estate. I am dedicated to public service and to lower taxes for you.
Mayor Agnos agrees I am the rational choice.
I would appreciate your vote.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Assessor

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Attorney/Supervisor
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have absolutely no ownership or income interests in real property which create any conflict of interest as Assessor.

As attorney for 25 years, Supervisor for three terms, and past President of the Board, I have a proven record of unique, practical accomplishments.

Just as I've fought for reduced local government spending, I'll work for new statewide lower assessment formulas with the same energy that created the nationally copied No-Smoking Ordinance; the Police Fingerprint Computer which reduced our crime rate; laws allowing earthquake victims to quickly replace damaged buildings.

My goal is to achieve fair, reduced property assessments.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred S. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Chief of Police.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St. #20D, Attorney-Legislator.
Nancy Pelosi, 2640 Broadway, Member of Congress.
John Burton, 712 Vermont, Assemblyman.
Jim Gonzalez, 642 Edinburgh, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th Street, Community College Board.
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired City Treasurer.
Sam Duca, 16 Wawona St., Assessor.
John J. Lo Schiavo, 650 Parker Avenue, President - USF.
David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., University Professor, UCSF.
Sophie Hoffman, 2825 Lake St., Chairman, Salvation Army, Advisory Bd.
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave., #4, Teachers' Union President.
Collin P. Quock, 140 Casitas Avenue, Physician.
Richard Rodriguez, 37 Brentwood Ave., Vice President Teamsters.
Sam Jordan, 4006 3rd St., Caterer.
Alfred D. Trigueiro, 1956 Stockton St., Police Officers Association Official.
Lawrence B. Martin, 401 Garfield Street, International Representative, Transport Workers Union.
John Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist.
Louis G. Spadia, 1177 California St. #315, President, Bay Area Sports Hall of Fame.
Mary Frances Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Businesswoman.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Assistant to Speaker.
John J. Moylan, 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader.

RONALD G. KERSHAW

My address is 3533 21st Street
My occupation is Real Estate Portfolio Manager
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are: B.S. Accounting, Brigham Young University 1975
MBA Real Estate, Golden Gate University 1986
Eleven years experience in all aspects of property management, appraisals, renovation and property sales
Currently responsible for supervising a real estate portfolio of $150,000,000
Past President SF Chapter, Institute of Internal Auditors
Currently, President, Log Cabin Club of San Francisco
San Francisco homeowner and resident since 1975.
San Francisco needs a fiscal conservative who is the only qualified candidate to become the City's new Assessor.

Ronald G. Kershaw

The sponsors for Ronald G. Kershaw are:


Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender represents people in trouble who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. The responsibility must be performed ethically, competently, and efficiently. During three terms in office, with the help of a superb staff of men and women, that duty has been fulfilled with compassion, dignity, and with the highest professional standards of the American legal system.

In the next term, I pledge to continue to carry out the special trust of this office: to guarantee that everyone in this City has the full benefit of our Constitution and is treated with fairness and with justice.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #3

ALEX SALDAMANDO

My address is 700 Arkansas Street
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My age is 47

My qualifications for office are: In my 11 years presiding as a Municipal Court Judge, I have worked to protect the citizens of San Francisco. I have delivered justice swiftly and firmly, in a fair and impartial manner. As a Superior Court Judge, I would bring the same approach to felony criminal cases and complex civil disputes. I am currently President of the California Judges Foundation. My background includes experience as a prosecutor and a public interest lawyer. A graduate of the University of California (Berkeley) and Hastings College of Law, I live with my wife and two children on Potrero Hill.

My sponsors include: Judge Ira Brown, Jr.; Judge John Dearman; Judge Isabella Grant; Judge Ed Stern; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Lillian Sing; Former Judge Charles Renfrew; Mayor Art Agnos; Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein; Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi; Assemblyman Willie Brown; Assemblyman John Burton; Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Harry Britt; Supervisor Jim Gonzalez; Supervisor Terence Hallinan; Supervisor Willie Kennedy; School Board Member Rosario Anaya; School Board Member Libby Denebeim; School Board Member Fred Rodriguez; Commissioner Paul Melbostad; Larry Mazzola, President, Local 38; Thelma Shelley, Director, Performing Arts Center; Benny Yee; Stan Smith, Building Trades Council; and Police Commissioner John Keker.

J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY

My address is 340 Magellan
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a Municipal Court Judge since 1974, native Californian, resident San Francisco since 1937; attended local schools, N.D.V., St. Ignatius, USF and USF School of Law; married Patricia M. Berti, admitted State Bar 1960, devoted thirty years to public service; adjunct Professor of Law, USF; participant, member and/or lecturer for many organizations — Salesian Boys Club, 44 years — Municipal Court Speakers Bureau — California Judges Association — California Center for Judicial Education and Research — San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project; Supervising Judge, Preliminary Courts, Presiding Judge, Assistant Presiding Judge, Court Administrative Committee member eight years; honored by: San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Irish-Israeli-Italian Society, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, Lawyers Club, USF School of Law and USF Law Society for outstanding community service.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #5

KAY TSENIN

My address is 637 Steiner Street
My occupation is Attorney and Counselor at Law
My age is 43 years
My qualifications for office are: B.A., San Francisco State University (Dean’s List), graduate, University of San Francisco School of Law. Attorney for sixteen years specializing in civil litigation. Pro-Tem Municipal Court Judge in San Francisco for five years.

Born in China, moved to San Francisco as a child, graduate of George Washington High School.

Broad Community service includes founding of environmental law societies while in law school, Vice President for Legal Affairs for California National Organization for Women (NOW), Board Member for the Russian American Credit Union and San Francisco Trial Lawyers and Board Advisor for the Legal Advocates for Women. Vice-President, Alamo Square Neighborhood Association.

Strong commitment to equal justice for all without prejudice or bias. The following San Franciscans support me because they feel that the Superior Court needs a judge with my background, legal expertise and perspective on the law:
Sheriff Mike Hennessey, Supervisor Harry Britt, Dr. Leland Yee, Attorney Paul Melbostad, Jean Harris, Calvin Welch, Attorney Sue Hestor, Attorney Mary C. Dunlap, Roberto Esteves, Bob Ross, Matthew Rothschild, Pat Norman, Jonathan Bulkley, Susan P. Kennedy, Adrian Bermudez, Lawrence Brinkin, John H. Cushman, Attorney Anne Kirukshekin, Eugene Kirukshekin, N. Arden Danekas, Laura E. McBride, Donna Yutzy, Gale Armstrong.

Kay Tsenin

CARLOS BEA

My address is 2727 Pierce Street
My occupation is Judge Superior Court #5
My qualifications for office are: I am a Superior Court Judge in San Francisco and author of articles in several professional journals, such as California Trial Lawyers and Defense Research Institute’s. Am recognized by the State Bar for pro bono work with members of the Hispanic Community. Have served two terms as a member of the Board of Visitors, Stanford Law School. Was a panelist and lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar. Was an adjunct professor, Hastings College of Law and Stanford Law School. I graduated from Stanford Law School and have been an attorney in San Francisco since 1959.

Sponsors include: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Ollie Marie-Victoire, all the judges of the Superior Court, Angela Alioto, Ernest Chuck Ayala, Willie Brown, Jr., John Burton, Jim Gonzalez, Quentin Kopp, H. Jesse Amelle, James Herman, Mary Noel Pepys, Robert McDonnell, G. Joseph Bertain, Edward McFetridge, Zeppelin Wong, Paul Renne, Leo Murphy, Jr., Gina Moscone, James Brosnahan, Barbara Caulfield, Robert Morales, Paul Haerle, Michael Hardeman, Howard Nemirovski, Edwin Heafey, Jr., Larry Mazzola, Vincent Friia, Putnam Livermore, William Coblentz.

Carlos Bea

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DONNA HITCHENS

My address is 468 30th Street
My occupation is attorney
My age is 42 years
My qualifications for office are: Over the past thirteen years, I have represented clients in San Francisco courts, taught law to San Francisco students and served on the Boards of Directors of private and public agencies designed to further the cause of justice in our city.

My experience as a mediator, counselor and advocate demonstrates my willingness to pursue alternative dispute resolutions. Judicial leadership and integrity are standards that the community should demand. My record attests to my ability to meet those standards.

• J.D. UC Berkeley 1977
• Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates, a public interest firm specializing in sex discrimination cases. 1978 – 1984
• Co-founder, Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom
• Staff Counsel, ACLU. 1984 – 85
• Partner, Hitchens & Brenner. Small Business, non-profit corporations, civil rights and family law. Presently
• Former chair, San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women.
• Member, Board of Directors, Pacific Primary PreSchool.

SUPPORT: Assemblymember John Burton; Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisors Nancy Walker, Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, and Terence Hallinan; Judge Lillian Sing, Judge Mary Morgan, and Judge Herbert Donaldson; Commissioners Jim Jefferson, Adrian Bermudez, Jr., James Morales, Paul Melbostad, Richard Grosboll, and Leni Marin; Hon. Libby Denebeim; Hon. Leland Yee; Carol Migden; Will Leong; Catherine Dodd, R.N.; Jeff Mori, and Mauri Schwartz

Donna Hitchens

JEROME T. BENSON

My address is 187 Robinhood Drive
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the Superior Court
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are:
• 23 years public service in the courtroom protecting victims, litigants and the community.
• 7 years as Chief of the Criminal Division in the District Attorney’s Office including:
  • 65 felony jury trial prosecutions for murder, rape, child abuse, drugs, white-collar fraud.
• Stanford Law School graduate 1964.
• Chairman, State Bar of California Subcommittee on Jury Instructions (Criminal).

Member, Project Safer California.
Fair and equal application of the law without regard to race, sex, or economic status.
I am a native San Franciscan and homeowner living with my wife and two daughters near Miraloma Park.
My judicial office is dedicated to fair rulings, hard work, human sensitivity, and legal equality.

CITYWIDE SUPPORT:
State Senator Quentin Kopp; Justice Harry Low; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Public Defender Jeff Brown; Sheriff Michael Hennessey; Former Chief of Police Alfred Nelder.

SUPERVISORS:
Angela Alioto, Tom Hsieh, Wendy Nelder;

JUDGES:
John Ertola, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Ina Gyemant, Paul Alvarado, Isabella Grant;

LABOR:
Mike Hardeman, Stan Smith, Kevin Ryan;

ATTORNEYS AND COMMUNITY:
William Coblenz; Harold Dobbs; Charles Breyer; Airport Commission President Morris Bernstein; Wayne Friday; Benny Yee; Louis Giraudo; Doris Thomas; Christopher Bowman; Haddie Redd; Elizabeth Aguilar-Tarchi; Ron Huberman;

Jerome T. Benson

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

JAMES HARRIGAN

My address is 494 Mangels St.
My occupation is Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department.
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I live in Glen Park with my wife, Serena Lee, and our three children.
I received my law degree with academic awards and Law Review distinction in 1975 from Golden Gate University, San Francisco.
I have completed more than 80 jury and court trials in Municipal and Superior Court, representing thousands of citizens and victims of crime in civil and criminal cases in private practice, as a public defender, and as Legal Counsel to the Sheriff.
My expertise includes: employment law, labor relations, criminal, landlord/tenant, and constitutional law. As Counsel to the Sheriff, I resolve the legal affairs of a major law enforcement agency. My work brings me before the civil and criminal justice system each day.

"James Harrigan is by far the best qualified candidate. No other candidate has his broad range of experience: public service and private practice; law enforcement and defense law; extensive courtroom experience and administrative expertise. I strongly urge your vote for James Harrigan."

— Sheriff Michael Hennessey

I have not listed my sponsors. I firmly believe the voter's decision should be based on one's qualifications and experience—not on political connections.
I pledge equal application of the law. I ask for your support.
Thank you.

James Harrigan

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Ave.
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My qualifications for office are: What I am in life, I owe to my family and to an excellent education: M.A., counseling, Stanford University; B.A., psychology, University of San Francisco; Juris Doctorate, Hastings College of Law. I began practicing law in 1982 and have been an assistant district attorney since 1983: with experience in criminal prosecution and family law enforcing child support. I have served 10 years on the College Board; my colleagues elected me president three terms because of my firm but fair judgment. My duties include equitably settling conflicts, grievances and contracts. In my years of public service, compassion, integrity and common sense have always guided my decisions; and as a judge that will continue to be the case.
My supporters:
Justice Harry Low
Judges: Isabella Grant, Lenard Louie, David Garcia, Larry Kay, Mary Morgan, Bill Mallen, Herbert Donaldson.
District Attorney: Arlo Smith
Public Defender: Jeff Brown
Senators: Milton Marks, Quentin Kopp
Attorneys: Charlie Clifford, Harriet Ross, William Coblenz, Cedric Chao, Roberta Achtenberg
BART Director: Mike Bernick
Commissioners: Rosario Anaya, Tim Wolfred, Chuck Ayala, Naomi Gray.
Supervisors: Thomas Hsieh, Angela Alioto
Walter Johnson; Alex Esclamado; Reverend Amos Brown;
Carole Migden;
UC Regent Yori Wada.

Julie Tang
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

ELLEN CHAITIN
My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I'm honored that MAYOR ART AGNOS and 8 PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION — who know my courtroom experience and qualifications in civil and criminal law — endorse me.

As a lawyer in private practice 18 years, mother of 2 children, married 19 years, I care about the strength and integrity of San Francisco's courts.

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred community trust — not a consolation prize for a restless politician. A lawyer lacking courtroom experience is unqualified to be judge.

In HUNDREDS of court appearances and trials, as chair of the Bar Association Criminal Justice Advisory Council, as a San Francisco Delinquency Prevention Commissioner, and as a Hastings Law School teacher, I have demonstrated a longstanding commitment to professional excellence.

Community and law enforcement leaders who acknowledge my legal service and endorse me:

SPEAKER Willie Brown
SUPERVISORS Nancy Walker, Bill Maher, Harry Britt, Terence Hallinan
JUDGES Dorothy vonBeroldingen, John Dearman, Edward Stern
COURT COMMISSIONER George Colbert
SENATOR Milton Marks
SCHOOL BOARD JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Libby Denebeim, Myra Kopf
POLICE COMMISSIONER John Keeler
FIRE COMMISSIONER Sharon Bretz
SHERIFF LIEUTENANT Connie O'Connor
POLICE OFFICERS VICE PRESIDENT Paul Chignell
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY Charles Wood
BUSINESSMAN Mel Swig
PUC COMMISSIONER Rodel Rodis

Ellen Chaitin

WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR
My address is 3615 Buchanan St. #206
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I am the most qualified candidate for this office. I have had judicial experience, serving as Municipal Court judge pro tem for over five years, and have been commended by the Presiding Judge for the quality of my service. I have been a journeyman lawyer for 15 years, with both criminal and civil experience, and have done over 30 jury trials.

With Amnesty International and Church representatives, I have been an International Trial Observer.

I have been a Board Member of the Elizabeth Frye Center and the Irish Forum, and a volunteer on the Bar Association’s free legal services panel.


William J. O'Connor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #3

LILLIAN K. SING

My address is San Francisco Municipal Court,
400 Van Ness Ave.
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the San Francisco
Municipal Court
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: I am an incumbent judge, and
have been a judge since 1981. I am the first Asian-American
woman judge in the history of Northern California. In 1988, I
was awarded Trial Judge of the Year by San Francisco Trial
Lawyers Association, one of the highest awards a Bar Associa-
tion can bestow. Last year, I was unanimously elected as Munici-
pal Court's Presiding Judge. As Presiding Judge, I implemented
the Pro Tem Judge Program, drastically reduced backlog in
civil/criminal cases, brought Trial Court Funding to San Fran-
cisco, spearheaded San Francisco's first judicial forum "Access
to Justice" attended by 680 people. I served as a faculty member
with the California Center for Judicial Education/Research
which trains all new judges in California and am a faculty judge
with the National Institute for Trial Advocacy which trains trial
lawyers. In 1988 I lectured throughout China on the U.S.
Legal/Judicial System.

Join San Francisco judges led by Presiding Judges Choppelas,
and Marie-Victoire, Mayor Art Agnos, President Harry Britt,
and the entire 11 Board of Supervisors, Assembly Speaker Willie
Brown, Assemblyman John Burton, Senator Milton Marks, For-
mer Police Chiefs Nelder/Cahill, DA Arlo Smith, PD Jeff
Brown, Sheriff Michael Hennessey and retain me as judge.

Lillian K. Sing

JEROME A. DEFILIPPO

My address is 1534 38th Avenue
My occupation is Attorney at Law
My qualifications for office are: A third generation San Fran-
ciscan. I have practiced law in The City since 1973, served as
the Legal Officer of the San Francisco Police Department and a
Deputy City Attorney. I am committed to the impartial appli-
cation of our laws in all judicial proceedings. Having served twenty
years as a Police Officer attaining the position of Lieutenant, I
am well aware of the frustrations each of us feel by the impact
of crime in our City. If elected, I am committed to the imposition
of the maximum sentence allowed by law for persons convicted
of violent crimes or narcotic sales.
Partial list of sponsors follows:

Ann Alberigi, Catherine Archbold, Alfred Arnaud, Martin
Bastiani, Chief Thomas Cahill, Ann Carrick, Peter Cimarelli,
Hon. Antone Cincotta, Clement Collins, Jean DeFilippo, Cantor
Martin Feldman, Nancy Feldman, H. Welton Flynn, John
Fracchia, Carol Fujioka, John Gallagher, Judith Gallen, Kath-
leen Gee, Dr. William Gee, Susanna Lee, Margaret Leong,
Maureen Mahoney, Carmelita Mathais, Phyliss Moylan, James
Pagano, Renzo Panelli, Timothy J. Riordan, Rollin Schroth, Joan
Swendsen, Spiron Tentes, Paul Vigo, Rita Young

Jerome A. DeFilippo

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

354-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against these measures. All arguments, “official” and paid, are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None of them has been checked for accuracy by this office or any other city official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Official Arguments”

There is one “official” argument for and one against each measure, and they are published at no cost. “Official” arguments are selected by the Registrar of Voters in accordance with the priorities set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code as summarized below:

For:
1. Person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee supporting the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Against:
1. For a referendum, person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee against the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Rebuttals

Authors of official arguments may each prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. As with official and paid arguments, rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Each rebuttal follows immediately after its corresponding official argument.

Paid Arguments

All paid arguments are accepted for publication upon (1) deposit of an amount equal to $50 plus $1.50 per word, (2) submission of a petition containing valid signatures of registered voters in lieu of the printing fee at the rate of two signatures for each dollar of the fee, or (3) a combination of a printing fee and signatures which together equal the number of signatures and/or amount of money required to qualify the argument for publication.

For each measure, paid arguments follow after the official arguments and rebuttals. All paid arguments supporting a measure are printed together followed by all paid arguments against that same measure. Paid arguments within each group (e.g. all paid arguments in favor of Proposition Z) are not printed in any particular order. Rather they are arranged so that each page is fully utilized.

There is one ballot measure for which paid arguments were not accepted. The School Facilities Safety Special Tax measure is being proposed under state law; only one argument for, one argument against, and respective rebuttals for this measure are allowed.

Again, arguments and rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked by this office or any other city official or agency.
PROPOSITION A

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City buildings were damaged by the October 17, 1989 earthquake and many may not survive another strong earthquake. Many City buildings contain asbestos and many are not accessible to disabled persons. Many City buildings do not meet current health, safety and building codes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $332,400,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This total would be reduced by the amount of grants the City receives from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the State of California for earthquake repair and hazard reduction. No more than $65,000,000 of bonds could be sold in any fiscal year.

This money would be used to pay for safety improvements to some City buildings, including repairing earthquake damage, making the buildings better able to survive earthquakes, removing or reducing the danger of asbestos in these buildings, making them more accessible to the disabled and bringing them up to current codes.

The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds for not more than $332,400,000 to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue bonds to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

Controller’s Statement on “A”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

“Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that the approximate costs would be as follows:

| Bond Redemtion | $332,400,000 |
| Bond Interest | $244,314,000 |
| Debt Service Requirement | $576,714,000 |

The bond authorization limits the issuance of bonds to no more than $65 million per year. Assuming a single sale on a 20 year basis at current interest rates with no reduction for possible FEMA or State funding, annual debt service on each $65 million increment would amount to $5,638,750, which amount is equivalent to one and forty-eight hundredths cents ($0.0148) in the current tax rate.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”
On February 26, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
Public Safety Improvement Bonds

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A the earthquake repair and protection measure.

Proposition A provides $332.4 million to repair earthquake damaged city buildings and to seismically reinforce many of them so that they would not sustain as much damage (or worse) during a future earthquake. This improves public safety while it also protects the investment we are making in repairs.

Your "Yes on A" vote will provide for:

- Repairs of earthquake damage, asbestos removal and handicapped accessibility work in over 200 earthquake damaged city buildings.
- Seismic strengthening of the Civic Center complex including City Hall, the Veterans Building, Opera House, Department of Public Health and Civic Auditorium.
- Seismic strengthening for the Palace of Fine Arts/Exploratorium, nine additional branch libraries, two additional police stations, two jails and the services building at San Francisco General Hospital.
- Replacement of the broken and earthquake damaged water and sewer lines at the Zoo.
- Proposition A represents a prudent investment which would protect many irreplaceable public buildings from major damage or collapse in a future earthquake.

In order to keep property taxes from rising more than 2-3¢ per $100 of assessed value, Proposition A will not allow more than $65 million in bonds to be sold in any one year. It further requires that any Federal or State earthquake relief money we receive to repair these buildings reduce the amount of bonds sold. This assures that local taxpayers will not be required to pay for repairs that can be made using Federal/State emergency relief assistance.

Vote Yes on Proposition A to protect city buildings and increase public safety in a next major earthquake.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition A
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition A

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Public Safety Improvement Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

When future earthquakes strike, our libraries need to be safe. Proposition A will provide funds to help earthquake proof our library system. 

Vote YES on A.

This bond issue will help to ensure the seismic safety of the Palace of Fine Arts, home of the Exploratorium which is visited by over 600,000 people a year. Prop A represents a prudent investment to improve public safety and protect irreplaceable public buildings. We urge all citizens to vote “Yes” on Proposition A.

Replacement of the earthquake-damaged, underground, 50-year-old water, gas and sewer lines at the San Francisco Zoo is critically needed for the safety and well-being of the animals. It will significantly improve public services to the 1.2 million children and adults who visit annually. The Zoological Society will endeavor to raise funds to renovate and build new above-ground facilities to supplement the $26 million included in the bond issue for the Zoo. Help make the Zoo a true sanctuary.

David E. Anderson
Zoo Director

Phil Arnold
Assistant General Manager
Recreation & Park

William Brewster Ely IV
Headmaster, Town School

Mary Burns
General Manager
Recreation & Park

Margaret K. Burks
Executive Director, Zoological Society

Jack W. Castor
Animal Keeper Shop Steward,
Local 858

Todd Cecil
Children’s Zoo Keeper

Sherri Chiesa
President, Local 2

Robert Todd Cockburn
Executive Director, Clean Water Program

Rosemary Davidson
Urban School

Dolores A. Donovan
Animal Control & Welfare Commission

Keith G. Eickman
Recreation & Park Commissioner

Roy Eisenhardt
Director, California Academy of Sciences

Becky Evans
Conservation Activist

Norman Gershenz
Director, Ecosystem Survival Plan

Arthur J. Goedewaagen
Board Member, SPEAK

John E. Hafernik Jr.
Professor Biology, SFSU

Roger Hoppes
Director, Children’s Zoo

Michael Housh
Assistant to the Mayor

David J. Howe
Animal Keeper

Mark Hurley
Animal Control & Welfare Commission

Norma J. Kristovich
Zoo Docent Council

Connie Lurie
Vice Chairman, Zoological Society Board

Michael Mellor, President
Friends of the San Francisco Public Library

Exploratorium
F. Van Kasper, Chairman
William K. Coblenz, Vice Chairman
C. Richard Kramlich, Vice Chairman
G. Steven Burrill, Treasurer

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Zoological Society Board

Frances May McAteer
Recreation & Park Commissioner

Amy Meyer
People for GGNRA

Andrew Nash
President, San Francisco Tomorrow

Trent W. Orr
Recreation & Park Commissioner

Elizabeth D. Rieger
Zoo Volunteer

Fred A. Rodriguez
School Board Member

Carroll Soo-Hoo
Zoo Benefactor

Stephen V. R. Spaulding
Zoological Society Treasurer

James J. Walsh Jr.
Citizens Advisory Committee on Wastewater Management

Connie O’Connor
President, Recreation & Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We must rebuild and repair our infrastructure. The October 17 quake was a warning. More resources going to earthquake preparedness programs today will save lives in the future. Vote YES on A.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

We urge everyone to vote Yes on Proposition A. The people of San Francisco have a $3.5 billion investment in public buildings. This bond issue will be used to fund repairs to many of our facilities damaged in last October’s earthquake, including City Hall, General Hospital, neighborhood libraries, police stations and cultural buildings. It will also provide monies necessary to make life-safety improvements to other city buildings.

Your Yes Vote on Proposition A will protect lives and property in the event of another major earthquake at a very small cost to businesses and homeowners. Because bonds to finance repairs will be sold over 6 - 10 years, replacing older bond issues as they are paid-off, the result will be an almost unchanged tax rate. In fact, the City’s independent budget analyst found that the tax bill for an average homeowner will increase by less than $5.00 a month.

Proposition A is a small price to pay to preserve our investment in the city’s valuable public facilities. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

We ask that you join with us in Voting YES ON PROP. “A”. Your “Yes on A” vote will provide funds to protect the two remaining Police Stations which are not yet earthquake safe or provided for in previous bond issues.

In an emergency we can do our jobs only if our own police facilities are earthquake resistant and if we can get to those places in the City which most need our services. That is why it is important to us that as many City buildings as possible are made earthquake resistant. The less damage and street obstruction that results from a future earthquake, the better we can get to these parts of the City where we are most needed. The safer public buildings in the City are made, the better we will be able to serve the rest of the City if we ever have to face a major earthquake emergency.

For security vote “Yes on A”.

Michael Keys President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

The damage done by the October 17th earthquake to San Francisco’s most important public buildings is considerable. To correct that damage and prepare for the future vitality of our City demands the kind of response represented by Proposition A. This proposition carefully earmarks funds to upgrade buildings such as City Hall, the War Memorial Opera House, and the Department of Public Health offices which are treasures that can never be replaced or reproduced. They not only need to be repaired, but strengthened structurally and improved, to meet today’s building codes. The Federal Government will pick up some of the damage, but much more will be needed if these vital components of our City’s daily life are to be improved and made ready for the next major quake.

Proposition A requests a large sum, but this is a time when we as a City have to agree to such a request. We strongly urge your support of Proposition A.

American Institute of Architects/San Francisco Chapter

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We ask you to join us in voting “Yes on A”.

The primary purpose of Prop “A” is to protect lives and public buildings from the effects of the next earthquake. As San Franciscans we all share the responsibility of having to do all we can to avoid the loss of life, the suffering and the huge costs which another, perhaps stronger or longer quake would bring. Thus we see Proposition “A” as a necessary, prudent investment in all our future.

We have a special reason to support “Prop A” and to ask you to vote YES ON “A” as well. That special reason is the fact that 20 of the buildings which will be repaired or strengthened against future earthquakes if Prop “A” passes will also be made fully accessible to the disabled. We want our City’s buildings to be repaired, to be made safe and to be made accessible to all San Franciscans.

Vote “Yes on A”.

Kathy Uhl, Executive Director,
Independent Living Resource Center
Michael L. Comini, Executive Director,
Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition “A”.

Many city buildings were damaged in the October 17 earthquake. If these buildings are repaired and strengthened the Fire Department will be much safer when responding to future emergencies.

Please help the Fire Department do its job safely and effectively by voting “Yes” on Proposition “A”.

James D. Jefferson, President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn, Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Brez, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Souls, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Frederick F. Postel, Chief of Department

We urgently request that you vote “Yes on A”.

The War Memorial complex of buildings, dedicated to San Francisco’s veterans, are one of our city’s treasures, irreplaceable architecturally and economically. They are central to our history and we owe it to ourselves to make sure they are made as fully earthquake-resistant as possible.

The October 17 earthquake was a warning which we must heed. Proposition “A” is a prudent and necessary response. It will protect our treasured buildings and, even more importantly, it will protect the lives of those who use them and the memories of those whose lives they commemorate.

Harold F. Jackson, Chairman, American Legion War Memorial Commission
Claude M. Jarman, Jr., Vice-President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Mark Ryser, Executive Director, Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage

Save lives.
Support earthquake safety.
Vote YES on Propositions A and B.
Also vote YES on Proposition N. Limit San Francisco Supervisors to two four-year terms.

Terence Faulkner
Republican State Assembly Candidate
San Francisco Republican Party Chairman (1987-89)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for your safety. Let us learn from the October 17th earthquake. 15 seconds of moderate shaking resulted in the need for $32 million in repairs to city buildings in the Civic Center alone. We need to be better prepared. We need to reduce known safety hazards.

Please, vote YES on Proposition A.

Ken Dowlin, City Librarian
Steve Coulter, Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson, Library Commissioner
Lonni Chin, Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil, Library Commissioner
Dennis Normandy, Library Commissioner
Roselyne Swig, Library Commissioner

Help the City of San Francisco and the Zoo rebuild. The animals will benefit, too! Vote YES on A.

Susanne Barthell,  
Zoo Advisory Committee member,  
Zoo Volunteer
Sophie Papageorge,  
Zoologist
Jorge L. Garcia, D.V.M.,  
Zoo Medicine Specialist
John J. Alcaraz,  
Retired Zookeeper
Roni Joan Howard,  
Educator

David J. Howe  
Animalkeeper
Terrence J. Moyles  
Linda Caratti  
Animalkeeper
Anthony Sharp  
Animalkeeper
Martin E. Dias  
A.K.A. Big Bison, Animalkeeper
Jack W. Castor  
Lion House, Animalkeeper
Sandra Keller  
Director, Citizens for a Better Zoo

Proposition A will help restore structural safety to the San Francisco County Jails in San Bruno, which were built in 1934 and are badly in need of repair. This is the oldest operating jail in California and sits near the San Andreas fault.

For the safety of City employees and county jail inmates, please vote YES on Proposition A.

Michael Hennessey  
San Francisco County Sheriff
Deputy Albert Waters, President  
San Francisco Deputy Sheriff’s Association

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION A
This bond issue is iffy. It should have been presented to the voters as two separate bond issues.
One for $75 million — earthquake repairs to be partly refunded by F.E.M.A. for our present estimated damages. Another for $257.4 million to take care of our needed capital improvements so neglected by this and past administrations.
Vote NO and get one issue back on the November ballot.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1990, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TOwit: PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, TO PAY FOR THE COST OF PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION, ASBESTOS ABATEMENT, PROVIDING ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED, ALL RELATED TO PUBLIC SAFETY Property, TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING RELATED ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT FOR THE FOREGOING PURPOSE; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT NO MORE THAN $65,000,000 OF SAID BONDED INDEBTEDNESS SHALL BE INCURRED IN ANY SINGLE FISCAL YEAR AND PROVIDED, FURTHER, THAT THE AUTHORIZATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $332,400,000 WILL BE REDUCED BY THE AMOUNT OF THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEDERAL OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND THE CONTROLLER TO MONITOR THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEDERAL OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION AND TO TAKE ANY APPROPRIATE ACTION SO THAT THE BONDS ISSUED WILL NOT DUPLICATE FEDERAL OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; FINDING THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF THE ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREON; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 5th day of June, 1990, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the herein-after described municipal improvements in the amount and for the purposes stated:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, to pay for the cost of public safety improvements to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled, all related to public safety to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including related acquisition, construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purpose; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, Resolution No. 88-90, $332,400,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses therefore or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in said resolution are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. Authorizing and directing the Chief Administrative Officer and the Controller to monitor the issuance of the bonds and the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction and to take any appropriate action so that the bonds issued will not duplicate FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 4. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 5. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 5, 1990, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 31, 1990.

Section 6. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided,

(Continued on next page)
however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special election, each voter to vote for any said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 7. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 12 per centum per annum, payable semiannually, provided, that interest for the first year after the date of any of said bonds may be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 8. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 9. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 10. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.
PROPOSITION B

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269
NO 272

Analysis
by City Attorney

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City’s public schools. Some School District buildings were damaged by the earthquake. Some District buildings do not meet present earthquake and fire standards.

The State Mello-Roos law allows the Board of Education to submit to the voters a measure authorizing a special property tax to pay for repairs and other improvements to school buildings.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize a special property tax to pay for costs of repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety. Some of the money would also be used for deferred capital maintenance. The repairs and maintenance would be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis. Since no money would be borrowed, there would be no interest costs to pay.

The tax would last for 20 years. The tax on single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels could be no more than $46 for each of the first six years and no more than $32.20 for each of the last 14 years. The tax on other types of parcels could be no more than $23 for each dwelling unit for each of the first six years and $16.10 for each dwelling unit for each of the last 14 years. Dwelling units occupied by persons 65 years of age or older would be eligible for an exemption from this tax. The measure would also set an annual appropriations limit of $12 million.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to authorize this property tax to pay for repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety and you want to authorize this annual appropriations limit.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to authorize this tax.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed special tax levy be approved, in my opinion, it would increase revenues for the San Francisco Unified School District, net of estimated senior citizen exemptions, by approximately $8 million per year for the first 6 years and $5.6 million per year for the next 14 years, based on the current assessment roll of the City and County. The approximately $127.2 million generated over a 20 year period by this special tax levy would be restricted for use by the District for the repair, restoration, replacement, seismic upgrading and capital maintenance of School District facilities.”

How “B” Got on the Ballot

On February 13, the Board of Education voted 5-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Board members voted as follows:


NO: Leland Yee.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When the earthquake struck last fall, our school buildings suffered. Sustaining major damage and at special risk in the future are our buildings that were not earthquake proofed in the 1970’s. In that category are our child care centers serving our youngest students. Also, in the fall of 1988 the City Fire Marshall inspected our schools and reported that the majority of our school buildings do not meet fire safety standards. Our 63,000 students and the community groups that meet at our schools in the evenings and on weekends must have buildings that can withstand earthquakes, and meet fire safety standards.

Proposition B will authorize a tax to provide for repairing earthquake damage at 131 sites including the reconstruction of John O’Connell High School, seismic improvement of nine Children’s Centers, correction of fire code and safety violations at 97 sites and seismic improvement of John Swett, Jean Parker and Bessie Carmichael Elementary Schools and Parkside Curriculum Center. In addition, there will be funds for deferred capital maintenance.

Two years ago the citizens of this City voted to support major repairs for our school buildings. Now we must protect that investment by repairing the present earthquake damage and seeing that all our schools can withstand future earthquakes, be as safe as possible in case of fire and be well maintained into the next century.

Civic organizations who have joined in supporting Proposition B include: San Francisco League of Women Voters, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SF/PTA, Parents’ Lobby, San Francisco Labor Council, United Educators of San Francisco, and Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth.

Submitted by Superintendent Ramon C. Cortines, San Francisco Unified School District, and Fred Rodriguez, President, Board of Education.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California
February 13, 1990

(For Board Meeting February 13, 1990)


RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS, the Board of Education (the "Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "District"), did, on January 9, 1990, adopt its Resolution of Intention (the "Resolution") to form Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "Community Facilities District"), and levy a special tax therein, pursuant to Chapter 2.5 of Part I of Division 2 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 33311) of the California Government Code, commonly known as the "Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982," as amended, (the "Act"); and

WHEREAS, a copy of the Resolution (which sets forth a description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, the name of the Community Facilities District and the types of facilities proposed to be financed by the District (the "Facilities")), providing that, except where otherwise available, a special tax sufficient to pay for all Facilities and the financing thereof (to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District) is proposed to be levied within the proposed Community Facilities District specifying the rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the proposed Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, and setting a hearing thereon, is on file with the Clerk of this Board and is incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, notice of said hearing was duly published as required by law, as evidenced by the affidavit of publication on file with the Clerk of this Board; and

WHEREAS, on February 13, 1990 this Board held the noticed public hearing as required by law relative to the proposed formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, prior to the noticed public hearing a report (the "Report") containing a description of the Facilities and an estimate of the cost of providing the Facilities, including the estimated fair and reasonable cost thereof, was filed with this Board as a part of the record of said hearing; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing all persons desiring to be heard on all matters pertaining to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution, including all interested persons or tax payers for or against the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent of the Community Facilities District, or the furnishing of specific types of public facilities, were heard and considered, and a full and fair hearing was held thereon; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing evidence was presented to this Board on the matters before it, and this Board at the conclusion of the hearing was fully advised as to all matters relating to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, written protests against the establishment of the District, the furnishing of specified types or types of facilities within the Community Facilities District as listed in the Report, or the levying of the special tax have not been filed with the Clerk of this Board by fifty percent (50%) or more of the registered voters, or six registered voters, whichever is more, residing within the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District, or the owners of one-half (1/2) or more of the area of land in the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District and not exempt from this special tax;

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District, in regular session assembled on February 13, 1990, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE, DETERMINE AND ORDER as follows:

Section 1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.

Section 2. Written protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, or the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are insufficient in number and in amount under the Act, and this Board hereby further orders and determines that all protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are hereby overruled.

Section 3. As proposed in the Resolution, a community facilities district is hereby established pursuant to the Act, designated "Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District."

Section 4. The map and legal description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, filed with the Clerk of this Board on January 24, 1990, are hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the boundaries of the Community Facilities District.

Section 5. The Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District, set forth in Exhibit "B" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, shall be the Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District.

Section 6. As provided in Exhibit "B," it is the intention of this Board, subject to the approval of the qualified electors of the Community Facilities District, to levy a special tax sufficient to acquire, construct and improve the Facilities including administrative expenses to be incurred by the District and the Community Facilities District in connection therewith; said tax to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District.

The rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax, in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, is described in Exhibit "A" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.

Section 7. The description of the proposed voting procedure, as set forth in the Resolution, is hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the voting procedure to be used in these proceedings.

Section 8. The special tax has not been precluded by majority protest pursuant to Section 53324 of the Act.

Section 9. The Facilities to be funded from the special tax are identified in Exhibit "B" hereto.

Section 10. In accordance with Section 53340.1 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 herof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, this Board shall designate the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District as the office, department or bureau which will be responsible for annually preparing the current roll of special tax levy obligations by assessor's parcel number on nonexempt property within the District and which will be responsible for estimating future special tax levies pursuant to Section 53340.1 of the Act.

The name, address, and telephone number of the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District, and the person responsible for administering the District, is as follows:

Director of Fiscal Services
Fiscal Services Department
San Francisco Unified School District
135 Van Ness Avenue, Room 215
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 241-6480

Section 11. In accordance with Section 53328.3 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the

(Continued on next page)
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consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriation limit in connection therewith for the District, are cast in favor thereof, the Clerk of this Board shall record the notice of special tax lien provided for in Section 31145.5 of the Streets and Highways Code. Upon recordation of the notice of special tax lien pursuant to Section 31145.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, a continuing lien to secure each levy of the special tax shall attach to all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District, and this lien shall continue in force and effect until the special tax obligation is permanently satisfied and the lien cancelled in accordance with law or until collection of the tax by this Board ceases.

Section 12. A boundary map of the Community Facilities District has been recorded pursuant to Sections 3111 and 3113 of the Streets and Highways Code at Book 39, Page 182-183 in the Book of Maps of Assessment and Community Facilities Districts in the Office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 13. All prior proceedings taken with respect to the establishment of the District were valid and in conformity with the requirements of the Act.

Section 14. In accordance with Section 53325.7 of the Act, the annual appropriations limit of the District, as defined by subdivision (b) of Section 8 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution, is hereby preliminarily established in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year, and said annual appropriations limit shall be submitted to the voters of the District as hereafter provided. The provision establishing said appropriations limit shall become effective if approved by the qualified electors voting thereon and shall be adjusted in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 53325.7 of the Act.

Section 15. The Board hereby calls an election and submits the question of levying the special tax, and the establishment of the annual appropriations limit for the District in connection therewith, to the qualified electors within the District, at an election to be held on Tuesday, June 5, 1990, all in accordance with and subject to the Act, the terms of which shall be applicable to such election.

Section 16. The Board hereby further directs that the election at which the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith is submitted to the qualified electors within the District shall be conducted in one ballot proposition, all as provided by the Act; and the Board further directs that notice of the consolidated election on the combined proposition of authorizing the levy of the special tax and of establishing an appropriations limit be published as required by law.

Section 17. If two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax are cast in favor of levying the tax, as determined by this Board after the canvass of the returns of such consolidated election, the Board may levy the special tax within the territory of the District in the amount and for the purposes as specified in levying the special tax may be levied only at the rate and may be apportioned only in the manner specified in this resolution, subject to the Act, except that the special tax may be levied at a lower rate.

Section 18. The Clerk of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution, a certified map of the boundaries of the Community Facilities District, a sufficient description to allow the election officials to determine the boundaries of the District, and the assessor’s parcel numbers for the land within the District to the Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco within three business days after the adoption of this resolution.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 13th day of February, 1990.

President of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District

ATTTEST:

Clerk of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District

Recommended by:

Ramona C. Cortines
Superintendent of Schools

EXHIBIT A

RATE AND METHOD OF APPOINTMENT BASIS OF SPECIAL TAX LEVY

The annual special tax shall be levied on each separate parcel within Community Facilities District No. 90-1, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco County, California ("CFF 90-1") as shown on the San Francisco County Assessor’s records, subject to the maximum rates specified below, as established by the Board of Education ("Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District ("District").

DETERMINATION OF PARCELS SUBJECT TO SPECIAL TAX

The records of the County Assessor of San Francisco County shall be used to determine the parcels subject to the special tax. The basis for determining the parcels will be the Secured Property Tax Roll. The land use code contained in the Secured Property Tax Roll, in combination with records maintained by the Assessor of the number of dwelling units on each residential parcel in CFF 90-1, will be the basis for assigning the appropriate tax rate to each parcel. If the District determines that the records maintained by the Assessor are incorrect with respect to one or more parcels, the District will assign the appropriate tax rate to each parcel based on its review of the property. All special taxes shall be based on parcels established in the County Assessor’s records as of March 1 of each year and all land use categories shall be based on building permits and other relevant development approvals granted by the City and County of San Francisco or any successor jurisdiction as of June 1 of each year.

Using the records of the County Assessor, the District shall prepare a list of the parcels subject to the tax. The District shall establish the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below:

1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which, supported publicly-owned and non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that leasehold/possessor interests shall be taxed.

2. From the parcels remaining identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor's data, and the District's review of building permits issued, and other changes in development status:
   a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
   b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
   c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
   d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

   Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on that parcel will be classified based on the uses that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

   The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFF 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.

2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFF 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $32.20 per parcel.

2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CFF 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CFF 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the deter-
### TEXT OF PROPOSITION B (Continued)

...mation of the parcels subject to the tax and their special tax assignments.

**SENIOR CITIZEN EXEMPTION**

A property owner may apply for a Senior Citizen Exemption which would provide an exemption from the special tax for the applicable tax year on dwelling units occupied by senior citizens, if the following conditions are met:

1. The applicant must show evidence that the dwelling unit is owned or rented by a citizen who is at least 65 years of age.

2. The applicant must show evidence of ownership of the property subject to the Exemption.

3. The Senior Citizen Exemption must be applied for annually.

4. If the applicant is a landlord, then he or she must certify that the entire tax exemption will be reflected only in the rent for the exempted dwelling unit(s).

#### EXHIBIT B

COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO.

90-1 — Description of Facilities to be financed:

(i) Repair, restoration, and/or replacement of District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), to the extent that (A) such repair, restoration, or replacement is outside the scope of work approved by federal and state agencies for assistance from such agencies; (B) costs incurred in such repair, restoration, or replacement are ineligible for federal or state assistance; or (C) insufficient federal or state funds are appropriated, obligated, or approved to pay for repair, restoration, or replacement which would otherwise be eligible for federal or state assistance. Pending receipt by the District of disaster assistance from federal and/or state agencies, the Community Facilities District may advance funds to the District to pay costs eligible for federal or state disaster assistance; provided that upon receipt by the District of federal or state disaster assistance relating to such costs, the District shall promptly reimburse the Community Facilities District for any such advances.

(ii) Seismic upgrading of children's centers and other District facilities.

(iii) Correction of fire safety violations of District facilities.

(iv) Deferred capital maintenance of District facilities. Incidental expenses, including the cost of planning and designing the Facilities and the cost of environmental evaluations thereof; all costs associated with the creation of the proposed Community Facilities District, the determination of the amount of and collection of taxes, the payment of taxes, and costs otherwise incurred in order to carry out the authorized purposes of the Community Facilities District; and any other expenses incidental to the construction, completion, and inspection of the Facilities and permitted under the Act.
BOUNDARIES OF SPECIAL TAX DISTRICT

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THIS Day of ____________.

RAMON C. CORTINAS, CLERK
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE MAP SHOWING PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, WAS APPROVED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AT A REGULAR MEETING THEREOF, HELD ON THE 9TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1990, BY ITS RESOLUTION NO. 90-01.

RAMON C. CORTINAS, CLERK
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

FILED THIS ____________ DAY OF ____________, 1990, AT THE HOUR OF ____________ M. IN BOOK _______ OF MAPS OF ASSESSMENT AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICTS AT PAGE _______ IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER IN THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

BRUCE JAMESON
COUNTY RECORDER
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO STATE OF CALIFORNIA

KCA ENGINEERS, INC.
CONSULTING CIVIL ENGINEERS
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### Equipment Lease Financing

**PROPOSITION C**

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277  
NO 278

---

### Analysis

**by Ballot Simplification Committee**

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The City obtains computers, telephone systems and other equipment by paying for it all at once or by leasing it until it is paid for, which is called "lease financing." The City may not enter into long-term leases for financing equipment unless (1) the voters approve it, or (2) the lease requires the Board of Supervisors to approve the payments each year. When the Board of Supervisors must approve the lease payments each year, interest rates are higher than when the lease payments are not subject to annual approval. Also, interest rates charged by for-profit companies are generally higher than interest rates charged by non-profit corporations.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition C is a charter amendment. Under Proposition C, the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval, could authorize the lease financing of equipment without the lease payments being subject to annual approval. A non-profit corporation would be created to buy the equipment and would issue tax-exempt debt to pay for it. The City would lease the equipment from the non-profit until it was paid for. The total principal of the debt issued by the non-profit corporation could not be more than $20 million in the first year. This limit on the outstanding principal would increase five percent each year. The Board could approve this type of lease financing only if the Controller certified that the interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

---

### Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application, costs could be increased or decreased in presently indeterminate but probably not substantial amounts."

### How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.
Proposition C would allow the City to lease finance needed equipment at the lowest possible interest rates. The City would establish a non-profit corporation, which would buy equipment approved by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors and lease it to City departments.

The charter currently requires the voters to approve lease financing if done through non-profit corporations. Financing through a non-profit is the less expensive method because interest rates are tax-exempt. The City has had to occasionally use the more expensive method because it is not always possible to delay purchasing critical equipment until an election is held.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.
Saves the City money by allowing current and future leases for equipment to be financed at lower interest rates (currently 6% to 7%) than must now be used with private corporations (ranging 9% to 16%).

By simply refinancing existing leases, the City could save over $500,000.
Additional money could be saved on any future leases.
Gives the City the option to pay cash for equipment or to finance it expeditiously at a low cost to the City.
Allows quicker replacement of inefficient and outdated equipment, which will reduce maintenance costs, decrease downtime, and increase productivity for equipment which has outlived its economic useful life.
Provides restrictions to insure prudent use of this financing mechanism.
Requires the Controller to certify that the lease is the least costly financing method.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition C
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition C

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
7.309 Voter Approval of Lease Financing

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purposes of this section, “lease financing” occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.

---

Remember to VOTE on Election Day, Tuesday June 5, 1990.
Your polling place is open from 7:00 in the morning to 8:00 in the evening.
Recycling is not only easier than you might think, it’s a simple way you can do your part for environmental conservation—and feel good about it, too.

All you need is an ordinary brown paper bag.

Each time you set up your kitchen garbage, place an extra brown bag or two out for recycling. Then every day just drop your newspaper into a recycling bag—a week’s worth of papers fits perfectly (and your newspapers will stop piling up on the floor!).

When you’re finished with an aluminum soda or beer can simply pop it in a separate bag. The same goes for bottles: just put them in a bag, labels and all. Then when you’re on the way to the supermarket or heading out for the day, drop off the bags at a Recycling Center near you. Or, you can tie your newspaper with string and the garbage company will collect it free of charge.

That’s it. When you think about it, isn’t recycling almost as easy as not recycling?

And it really is the right thing to do.

For a free Recycling Guide and a list of Recycling Centers near you, call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL
554-6193
PROPOSITION D
Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no special City fund to pay for neighborhood beautification projects or graffiti clean-up. Money can be spent for this purpose only when the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors approve it in the City's budget.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is an ordinance that would create a "Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund" ("the Fund") to pay for cleaning up graffiti on public buildings and beautifying the neighborhood.

The Chief Administrative Officer would manage the Fund. Businesses could pay up to one percent of their payroll or business taxes into the Fund. Grants or money donated for graffiti clean-up would be deposited in the Fund. The goal of the ordinance is to produce for the Fund $1,000,000 each year, adjusted annually for inflation. The Controller would change the percentage of taxes businesses could pay into the Fund to produce $1,000,000 in the fund each fiscal year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this fund.

Controller's Statement on "D"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, General Fund revenues could decrease by as much as $1.4 million in fiscal 1990 and as much as $1 million per year, adjusted for inflation, thereafter."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D asks the voters to make the revitalization of our neighborhoods and the wiping out of graffiti a top city priority without raising taxes.

Proposition D will permit those employers currently eligible in San Francisco to earmark up to 1% of their payroll or gross receipts tax bills to establish The Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

The fund will be used to award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city. The Budget Analyst has estimated that approximately one million dollars would be available every year.

Proposition D creates a unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers to keep our city attractive. It will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting and graffiti clean-up.

Also, Proposition D will fund public information and education campaigns to combat litter, and instill in our youth the old-fashioned virtue of respect for public and private property.

The fund created by Proposition D will be administered by the Chief Administrative Officer with public input from environmental organizations and neighborhood committees.

Proposition D was authored by Supervisor Jim Gonzales and has been submitted to the voters with the support of the Sierra Club, San Francisco Beautiful, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

According to their ballot argument, the Board of Supervisors wants to create a "unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers" to reduce graffiti. What's stopping them from doing that now?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

The supervisors also say they want to provide "seed money" for planting trees and improving street lighting. Well, why haven't they placed items in the city budget to do so?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

In their rebuttal argument, the supervisors claim that "many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle." Whose fault is that, if not their own?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

Finally, the supervisors have the temerity to state: "With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark" funds for graffiti. What would be "fair" is if San Francisco businesses paid lower taxes. But no one should be "earmarking" tax dollars except elected representatives of the people!

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

There's no question that graffiti is a serious problem demanding serious solutions. But what good is it to divert $1,000,000 a year from other city programs? That's robbing Peter to pay Paul! It's bad government!

Why do we need Proposition D? We don't.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

I know something about graffiti.
I wrote the city ordinances prohibiting the sale of spray paint and large, felt-tip pens to minors. I also authored the state law to allow police officers greater latitude in arresting juveniles who deface public transit vehicles. This year, I’m pursuing a bill to revoke for one year the driver’s license of any person convicted of graffiti vandalism.

Proposition D is not about graffiti or “neighborhood beautification”. It’s about diverting millions from the city’s General Fund. It’s about depriving existing city programs of critically needed revenue. Proposition D is a financial shell game. Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Proposition D would allow any city business to designate up to 1% of its payroll tax check for deposit in a special fund. According to the supervisors’ Budget Analyst, Proposition D could divert up to $1,440,260 from the General Fund in the program’s first year.

Thereafter, annual diversions would approximate $1,000,000, plus inflation.

That’s over $1,000,000 per year which cannot be spent on police services, fire protection, libraries, and public health.

As you can plainly see from my legislative record, I’m no soft touch when it comes to graffiti prevention and clean-up. But Proposition D is the wrong approach. “Special funds” and “segregated accounts” have no place in our city budget.

Graffiti programs deserve adequate city funding, and the Board of Supervisors and Mayor should move promptly to appropriate such funds in the next regular budgetary cycle.

The voters, meanwhile, should move promptly to reject Proposition D on June 5th!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We need a city plan that invests in the quality of our neighborhoods. Now. It's obvious laws banning the sale of spray paint and felt pens have done nothing to stop the sprawl of graffiti or create a climate of cooperation between city officials and neighborhood groups to find real solutions.

Proposition D is about beautifying our neighborhoods consistently. Proposition D is about wiping out graffiti permanently. With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark a mere one-hundredth to be poured back into the neighborhoods.

Out of a greater than two billion dollar annual budget, the city can afford a guaranteed million dollars to help keep our city beautiful, clean, and graffiti-free. Year in and year out, many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle. Proposition D will provide a solid foundation for the revitalization of our neighborhoods, which no one can tamper with and that requires no new taxes.

Over the last few years, individual Supervisors have spent many weekends planting trees and removing graffiti with neighborhood groups. Working with groups such as SF ALIVE, San Francisco Conservation Corps, 24th Street Revitalization Committee and the West Portal Merchants Association to make our neighborhoods shine has taught us one thing... neighborhood environmentalists and city departments working together as partners will be a winning combination for San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

When City Hall and neighborhood organizations work together, problems can be solved. Vote YES on D.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

There is a reason that the San Francisco Beautiful, the Sierra Club and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, along with dozens of neighborhood groups support placing PROPOSITION D on the ballot.

San Franciscans are united in wanting to preserve and enhance our city’s attractiveness and keep San Francisco one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

Our Supervisors put PROPOSITION D on the ballot for your approval because they realize that a more attractive city starts with people like you and me and our neighbors who truly care about San Francisco.

YES ON PROPOSITION D creates a working partnership between our neighborhoods and city government;

YES ON PROPOSITION D means a more beautiful city and enhancement of your neighborhood and mine;

YES ON PROPOSITION D accomplishes this with NO NEW TAXES, allowing large employers to earmark up to 1% of their current payroll tax for beautification and graffiti cleanup;

YES ON PROPOSITION D pays for neighborhood-generated projects, giving residents a say in how these reserved funds are spent;

YES ON PROPOSITION D is the first step to guaranteeing more beautiful and attractive neighborhoods.

Join your neighbors, business owners and environmentalists by voting YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Al Pross, Chair
COMMITTEE FOR BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBORHOODS

The quality of life in our neighborhoods will truly become a top city priority with the passage of Proposition D.

• Proposition D will provide over a million dollars a year from the business community to stop neighborhood decay (through a voluntary checkoff on their payroll or gross receipts tax bill).

• Proposition D will award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city.

• Proposition D will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting, and graffiti clean-up.

• Proposition D will fund an educational campaign to teach our youngsters a new respect for public and private property.

Let’s protect our city’s special livability. Let’s foster civic pride. Let’s invest in the long term health of San Francisco’s residential neighborhoods. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION D.

 Supervisor Jim Gonzales

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Graffiti is a blight on the beauty of San Francisco. We strongly encourage the continued generosity of grants and donations to eradicate this problem. However, during the current deficit-ridden period, it is irresponsible for the City to direct at least $1,000,000 a year from the General Fund for this purpose.

The San Francisco Republican Party urges you to vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley
William E. Grayson

Anna M. Guth
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"
Why add more government to your taxes.
$1 million per year to be funded from Payroll taxes which has a sunset clause to expire in 1990.
Then who pays the tab? You do.
If the police would assert their powers and nab the violators, instead of the City offering to pay to clean up their "works of art" this ordinance would not be necessary.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION D

[Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund]

AN ORDINANCE, ADDING SECTIONS 10.98 AND 10.98-1 TO THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO ESTABLISH A NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND AND SPECIFYING THE PURPOSES THEREFOR AND AMENDING PART III, SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, BY ADDING ARTICLE 12B-1 THERETO, TO PROVIDE THAT ANY BUSINESS WHICH OWES A PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX OR BUSINESS TAX MAY ELECT TO DESIGNATE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE TAX FOR DEPOSIT IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND.

NOTE: All sections are new.

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Sections 10.98 and 10.98-1 thereto, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.98. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: FINDINGS AND INTENT.

(a) Findings.
The proliferation of graffiti on public buildings and other public property has created a blight which offends both citizens of and visitors to San Francisco. The removal of such graffiti will enhance the beauty of the city in which we live and will encourage others to visit and to relocate here. Removal will thus both reflect and renew our civic pride and contribute to our economic viability. Providing a source of funds for the promotion of neighborhood beautification projects will support the efforts of local residents and businesses to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and the local economy, and assist in reducing the amount of graffiti in San Francisco.

(b) Statement of Intent.
The Board of Supervisors wishes to address the above concerns by establishing a neighborhood beautification and graffiti clean-up fund which will promote neighborhood beautification projects, including projects designed to improve the environmental quality of neighborhoods, and finance the clean-up of graffiti on public property.

SEC. 10.98-1. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: ESTABLISHMENT; ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS; DUTIES.

(a) Establishment of Fund. There is hereby established a special fund for the purpose of receiving all donations of money which may be collected by the City and County of San Francisco for the purposes enumerated in Section 10.98(b). Monies deposited in the fund shall only be expended for the purposes enumerated therein, provided that such expenditures shall include reimbursement to City and County departments for expenses incurred in the administration of the fund. The special fund shall be known and designated as the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

(b) Acceptance of Gifts. All donations of money which may be offered to the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund are hereby accepted for such purposes. Any gifts, grants, gifts and bequests from private sources for this purpose shall be deposited into said special fund.

(c) Duties of the Chief Administrative Officer.
1. The Chief Administrative Officer, or his or her designee, shall be responsible for the administration of the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund, and shall have all such authority as may be reasonably necessary to carry out those responsibilities.
2. The Chief Administrative Officer shall promulgate such rules and regulations as he or she may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Section and Section 10.98. Before issuing or amending any rules and regulations, the Chief Administrative Officer shall provide a thirty (30) day public comment period by publishing notice in an official newspaper of general circulation in the City of the intent to issue or amend the rules and regulations. The rules and regulations shall be approved by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. Such rules and regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the qualifications of applicants and factors to be considered in the award of grants to fund programs to help remove graffiti and promote neighborhood beautification projects, including preference for the following projects: youth programs and innovation projects that are neighborhood generated, and projects designed to benefit areas of San Francisco that are economically disadvantaged.
3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall submit a semi-annual report to the Board of Supervisors setting forth an accounting of the amounts disbursed and the uses for which said funds were made.

(d) Budgetary and Fiscal Provisions of the Charter. The monies in this fund are subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter and may be expended only when authorized by appropriation ordinance of the Board of Supervisors.

(e) Interest. Interest earned from the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund shall become part of the principal thereof, and shall not be expended for any purpose other than that for which said fund is established.

(f) Accumulation of Monies in Fund. The balance remaining in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Charter Section 6.306 and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said fund for the purposes recited herein.

Section 2. Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code is hereby amended by adding Article 12B-1 thereto, to read as follows:

ART. 12B-1
NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND TAX

OPTION.

SEC. 1030. Initial Option. Commencing in tax year 1990, any business, as defined in Section 1002.1 of this Code, that is subject to the Payroll Expense Tax or the Business Tax may elect to designate up to one cent (1%) of its tax liability for deposit in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

SEC. 1031. Amount of Fund Annually. It is the intent of the voters of the City and County of San Francisco that one million dollars ($1,000,000.00), derived from tax proceeds designated by the taxpayers pursuant to Section 1031, shall be deposited annually into the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund. The Controller shall annually adjust this figure for inflation to reflect changes in the most recently available U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose Metropolitan Area, or its successor index.

SEC. 1032. Subsequent Option. For each tax year after 1990, the Controller shall determine the amount of fund revenues actually generated in the prior year, including the interest thereon and the balance, if any, remaining at the close of the tax year. On the basis of the prior year's experience of taxpayer contributions and total revenues generated by the payroll expense and business taxes, the Controller shall calculate a percentage ceiling of total tax liability which taxpayers may designate for deposit in the fund following the tax year. The Controller shall set the percentage ceiling so that the revenues produced thereby are most likely to generate a total of one million dollars (adjusted for inflation) in the fund for the forthcoming tax year. The Controller shall transmit his or her calculation to the Board of Supervisors, which shall adopt a new tax designation ceiling, if necessary, in advance of the tax year to enable the Tax Collector to perform his or her collection duties.

SEC. 1033. Severability. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective. In addition, the voters declare their intention that should any portion of this initiative ordinance or all of it be declared invalid in whole or in part, such invalidity shall have no effect upon the continued validity of the Payroll Expense Tax and Business Tax.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PROPOSITION F
Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 284
NO 285

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Fire Commission has the authority to decide the number and staffing of fire companies and the number and location of fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors may change the number of firefighters. The Fire Commission may close or move fire stations or reduce the number of fire companies if it decides they are no longer needed. A fire company typically consists of a fire engine or other emergency vehicle and the firefighters needed to operate it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would specify a minimum number of fire stations and fire companies and minimum levels of staffing for those fire companies. Proposition F would increase the number of firefighters assigned to some types of fire companies. This means that the number of firefighters on duty at all times would increase from 297 to 322. Where necessary, Proposition F's minimum level of staffing would be met by firefighters working overtime. Overtime pay for firefighters is one and one-half times their normal salary.

Proposition F would limit the power of the Fire Commission, Mayor and Board of Supervisors to set the number of fire stations and staffing levels.

Before closing any fire station or reducing the number of fire companies or units required by Proposition F, the measure would require (1) a recommendation by the Fire Chief; (2) approval by the Fire Commission, after public hearings; (3) approval by the Board of Supervisors; and (4) approval by the voters.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current salary rates and staffing levels of the Fire Department, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $4.9 million per year."

How “F” Got on the Ballot

On March 2, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition F to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,485* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 21 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 56,364 of the signatures submitted were valid, 15,879 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WHAT IS PROP F?

PROPOSITION F IS A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WILL ESTABLISH A MINIMUM LEVEL OF FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS FOR SAN FRANCISCO. IT GIVES THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE FIRE CHIEF THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MANAGE THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITIZENS.

SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT BECAUSE IT WILL:

(1) GUARANTEE THAT THE PRESENT 41 FIRE STATIONS STAY OPEN
(2) GUARANTEE FULLY-STAFFED FIRE TRUCKS AT ALL TIMES
(3) GUARANTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BEFORE ANY FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED
(4) GUARANTEE THAT YOUR FIREBOAT WILL BE STAFFED WITH A FIREFIGHTING CREW OF TWO

THE 7.1 QUAKE OF OCTOBER 17 WARNED US AGAIN — WE MUST BE PREPARED!

ITEM A — MAYOR AGNOS CUT THE FIRE DEPARTMENT ON-DUTY STAFFING BY 19 PERSONS A DAY IN 1989.

PROP F RESTORES THOSE CUTS.


ITEM C — PROP F DOES NOT REQUIRE “GUARANTEED OVERTIME” AND, IN FACT, BY JULY 1992 NO OVERTIME WILL BE NEEDED FOR THE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS OF PROP F.

(Overtime is now caused by large numbers of vacant positions. New hiring will eliminate all vacancies and overtime by July 1992. Prop F will safeguard this full-staffing.)

PROP F IS A COMMON SENSE MEASURE TO GIVE ADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION TO ALL CITIZENS.

VOTE YES ON F!

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F;

COMMITTEE FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS

JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN

JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

It is clear that Proposition F is not a Fire Safety Issue.

It is clearly an issue to guarantee overtime.

1. This Mayor and Board of Supervisors have never closed a single fire station and have no intention to close firehouses.

2. Most major cities in America considers five firefighters per truck to be fully-staffed. More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire.

3. Proposition F will not restore cuts in firefighters. We are mandated by law to provide 90 new firefighters this year. Proposition F only guarantees overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day, $3.5 million per year.

Our firefighters do a tough job! But we compensate them well!

We need new equipment — not more overtime. Following the earthquake, a fire truck had to be taken from the fire museum to fight fires. Let’s not waste money which could be used for new firefighting equipment.

San Francisco voters rejected a similar proposal in 1987 and it should be rejected again in 1990.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will waste millions of your tax dollars. Just look at the facts.

Fact: Proposition F does not hire new firefighters. The Federal Consent Decree already sets hiring standards — 90 new firefighters will be hired this year without Prop. F.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that Assistant Chiefs and Battalion Chiefs will continue to have chauffeurs.

Fact: Proposition F is not needed to save fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors have no intention of closing any fire stations.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that 18 current firefighters will get daily time-and-a-half overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day . . . or more than $3.5 million extra per year.

Fact: Proposition F is not a fire safety issue. Virtually every major American city deploys five or fewer firefighters on fire trucks. A sixth firefighter is featherbedding, not firefighting.

More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire. That's enough people to raise ladders, ventilate rooftops and carry out lifesaving tasks.

FACT: Our firefighters do a tough job. But they are well compensated already and do not need additional guaranteed overtime . . . especially when there are so many other pressing needs in San Francisco.

FACT: Firefighters in San Francisco are currently paid $300 more per month than the average salaries of firefighters in the four largest California cities. But the other firefighters work 15 percent more hours than San Francisco.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters already receive 23 percent more vacation, sick and holiday leave than other city workers. A recent study by the Controller shows that increased overtime results in increased sick leave and disability.

Study the facts and you'll agree. Proposition F is nothing more than $7 million per year in unnecessary guaranteed overtime.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

FACT: PROP F does:

- Guarantee that the 90 new firefighters cannot later be eliminated by politicians.
- Require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people before cutbacks can be made to the minimum staffing.
FACT: The Mayor DID cut back Fire Department staffing in August 1989 from 315 to 296.
FACT: Assistant and Battalion Chiefs DO NOT have "chauffeurs." They DO have an operations and communications assistant.
FACT: Prop F IS needed to guarantee public review and input before any fire station can be closed.
FACT: SIX fire stations have been closed by the Mayor's office since 1972 without any public review.
FACT: Prop F DOES guarantee that the 19 on-duty firefighters cut by the Mayor in 1989 will be restored. When sufficient new firefighters are hired, NO OVERTIME will be required.

FACT: PROP F IS A FIRE SAFETY ISSUE!
FACT: San Francisco firefighters ARE REQUIRED to work overtime because previous policies of politicians allowed large numbers of vacant positions to occur.
FACT: San Francisco firefighters DO NOT get a paid health plan for dependents, nor do they get longevity pay or other benefits enjoyed by firefighters in the four largest California cities.
FACT: ALL city employees, including firefighters, receive EXACTLY THE SAME vacation, sick and holiday leave. This is a city Charter requirement.

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON
PROPOSITION F
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I STRONGLY SUPPORT PROP F!

Prop F will benefit all the people of San Francisco. Over 71,000 voters from every part of the City signed the petition to put Prop F on the ballot. They expressed enthusiastic support for a stronger Fire Department.

The City is becoming increasingly built-up, causing greater congestion. This means that fire hazards are increasing and adequate fire protection will be even more important to us than ever.

The October 17th earthquake was an urgent reminder of how fragile our city is and how important our Fire Department is to all of us.

When you, the people, call for help, whether it is for a medical emergency, a rescue, or fire, the firefighters come.

PROP F MAKES SENSE FOR ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

It allows you to participate in fire safety decisions that affect your neighborhood.

Our neighborhoods are the “heart” of San Francisco. OUR FAMILIES, HOMES, CHURCHES, FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS NEED SATISFACTORY FIRE PROTECTION.

PROP F WILL MAKE SAN FRANCISCO A SAFER PLACE TO LIVE IN.

VOTE YES ON F!

Bill Maher, Member
Board of Supervisors

I STRONGLY SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!

They provide vital services to our citizens. Last year, our firefighters answered a record-breaking 58,000 alarms and saved thousands of lives. The greatest number of calls came from the Tenderloin, the Inner Mission, the Fillmore, Civic Center/Hayes Valley, Hunters Point and Visitation Valley. I WANT TO BE SURE YOU GET THE HELP YOU NEED — WHEN YOU NEED IT!

Over the past 20 years, unlike other city departments, Fire Department staffing has been slashed by 40%! THREE FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT AGREE THAT THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY ARE TOO FEW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS! THEY AGREE THAT NO MORE FIREFHOUSES SHOULB BE CLOSED.

We NEED Proposition F. It will:
- Put firefighters back on the ladder trucks
- Put firefighters back on our fireboat
- Bring daily staffing up to an adequate level
- Guarantee that any proposed closings of fire companies will be subject to a public review and vote by the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people
- Guarantee the SFFD the funding it needs

THE COST OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT IS ONLY 2 CENTS A DAY FOR EACH OF US! That 2 cents could easily save a life — maybe yours, or that of a loved one. PROP. F WILL BENEFIT ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

I STRONGLY SUPPORT IMPROVED FIRE PROTECTION IN SAN FRANCISCO!

I SHARE THE CONCERNS OF THE 71,000 VOTERS WHO PUT THIS PROPOSITION ON THE BALLOT. Fire Department daily staffing has been forced so low that our safety is threatened. WE MUST KEEP OUR FIREFHOUSES OPEN AND FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED.

In addition to fighting fires, our firefighters perform many services for our elderly, disabled and low income families that no one else does. FIREFIGHTERS RESPONDED TO OVER 58,000 EMERGENCIES LAST YEAR, INCLUDING 26,000 MEDICAL CALLS.

We depend on our firefighters to protect our families, homes, and businesses. Our narrow streets, steep hills and rows of wood frame buildings make firefighting very difficult. SAN FRANCISCO HAS SPECIAL FIREFIGHTING AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL NEEDS! We are different from other California cities with their wide streets, flat terrain and detached buildings!

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING FOR PROPOSITION F. THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL BENEFIT ALL OUR CITIZENS.

WENDY NELDER, Member
Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

STOP REDUCTIONS IN CITY FIRE PROTECTION! VOTE YES ON F!

Over 71,000 San Francisco voters from every neighborhood, ethnic group and economic level joined to put PROPOSITION F on this ballot. They are concerned because politicians have reduced daily staffing to a dangerous all-time low while emergency calls reached an all-time high of 58,000 last year. People want their neighborhood firehouses to stay open and their fire engines, aerial ladder trucks and fireboat fully staffed to meet their emergency needs. They want a Charter amendment to take politics out of fire safety decisions.

Remember October 17! We learned that we need a strong Fire Department to fight fires, perform rescues and coordinate civilian volunteers. When both bridges are down, we need a strong SFFD!

THIS IS A COMMON SENSE PROPOSITION — IT IS SUPPORTED BY 3 FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT!

Join your friends and neighbors! VOTE YES ON F!

John L. Molinari
Former member of the Board of Supervisors

ONLY YOU CAN STOP FURTHER DANGEROUS CUTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

Over the years, the San Francisco Fire Department has assisted hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans in time of great personal need. The people understand how important the SFFD is in their lives, and OVER 71,000 OF THEM SIGNED THE PETITION TO PLACE PROPOSITION F ON THE BALLOT. The citizens want to be heard!

SFFD EMERGENCY RESPONSES ARE INCREASING DRAMATICALLY EVERY YEAR! Fiscal year totals have gone from 28,000 in 1970 to over 58,000 in 1989, while politicians have slashed daily on-duty staffing from 482, when I was Fire Chief, to today's all-time low of 296. Department resources are being stretched thinner and thinner despite greater and greater needs. THIS DANGEROUS TREND MUST BE STOPPED!

The Department must be able to meet the complex and highly varied needs of today’s San Francisco. These include fighting structural fires, providing medical assistance, performing cliff and water rescues, responding to BART and MUNI fires and accidents, controlling hazardous materials emergencies, assisting victims of industrial accidents, and responding to many other emergency needs.

Many seniors, low income families and handicapped people rely on the SFFD to help them. THE PERSONAL ATTENTION THAT THE SFFD PROVIDES CAN NEVER BE CONVERTED TO SELF-SERVICE OR AUTOMATED! Firefighters, not machines, put out fires, perform rescues and meet all the other emergency needs of our city. You need these firefighters! THE NEXT CALL HELP MAY BE YOURS!

The need for Fire Department services crosses all social, ethnic and economic strata. We can all get behind this quality of life issue. Proposition F will strengthen your Fire Department and take politics out of fire safety.

William F. Murray
Chief of Department, SFFD, Retired

VOTE YES ON PROP F!

It takes teamwork to put out a fire. Without it, lives and property can be lost. Without it, firefighters can pay a hard price, for their lives, when in danger, may depend on having a buddy to lend a hand or go for help. As much a part of their job as hose, ladders, and water is that firefighters work in pairs when possible. It can be critical where dense smoke obscures vision or — as so many San Francisco neighborhoods well know — when trying to maneuver on a steeply pitched roof.

Current staffing of aerial ladder trucks leaves one firefighter without a buddy, the team short one vital hand. Proposition F will restore the balance that a fire — and time-tested system needs.

It also will mean two firefighters ready to move out with the fireboat when it has a job to do. Because they weren’t readily available, the fireboat was delayed in pumping bay water to put out the disastrous Marina fire after last October’s earthquake.

That’s why I’m voting “Yes” on Prop F and am urging all San Franciscans to do the same.

Edward J. Phipps
Chief of Department, SFFD (Retired)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I OWE MY LIFE TO THE QUICK AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS STATIONED AT MY LOCAL FIREHOUSE

Over 26,000 San Franciscans received emergency medical assistance last year by the SFFD. Many lives were saved because firefighters were on the scene in 3 minutes or less. The neighborhood firehouse is an essential part of San Francisco's complex fire protection system.

The October 17th earthquake and the great Marina fire showed us how vital it is to have our Fire Department maintained at an adequate level. There were no firefighters on board the Fireboat Phoenix when it arrived in the Marina, and for over 1 1/2 hours firefighting and search and rescue operations were hindered by a lack of firefighters, as well as by a lack of water. UNDERSTAFFING CAN CAUSE FIRE DEATHS.

Proposition F will answer these critical needs by restoring funds for adequate staffing of fire companies, including the fireboat, and it will require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission and Board of Supervisors before any further cutbacks in fire protection can be made.

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING YES ON F!

John Barbagelata

---

PENNY-POWER! LOOK —
HOW CAN YOU BUY SOMETHING PRICELESS FOR ONLY PENNIES A DAY?
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F!
FOR ONLY 2 CENTS PER DAY, YOU WILL:
• KEEP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIREHOUSE OPEN
• KEEP FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED
• KEEP YOUR FIREBOAT IN SERVICE AND STAFFED WITH FIREFIGHTERS
• GUARANTEE THAT NO FIREHOUSES OR FIRE COMPANIES WILL BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT
• REMOVE POLITICS FROM FIRE SAFETY
THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL COST EACH OF SAN FRANCISCO'S 732,000 RESIDENTS JUST PENNIES A DAY:
YEAR 1 — COST $5.3 MILLION = 2 CENTS PER DAY!
YEAR 2 — COST $2.8 MILLION = 1 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 3 — COST $0.8 MILLION = 1/2 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 4 — NO ADDITIONAL COST!
THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE POLICY YOU WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY.
DON'T MISS THE CHANCE!
VOTE YES ON F!

W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

---

WE STRONGLY SUPPORT PROPOSITION F!

No one worries more about costs than working people. For their hard-earned dollars, breadwinners demand value in return.

Value is what Proposition F is all about. It restores adequate staffing of engine and ladder truck companies, staffs the fireboat, and assures that you and I will have a voice in any proposed closing of a fire company or firehouse.

Proposition F is an insurance policy that is clearly a benefit to all San Franciscans. And, there is no question that the benefits greatly exceed the cost — to each of us, just 2 cents a day for the first year, 1 cent a day for the second year, and no cost thereafter.

Without adequate fire protection, San Francisco has too much to lose.

VOTE YES ON F!

Walter L. Johnson
San Francisco Labor Council
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
THEY PROVIDE ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL SERVICES FOR OUR CITIZENS, AND NO ONE ELSE CAN DO THEIR JOB! We have 500 high rise buildings, BART and MUNI tunnels, and large business, school and hospital complexes where firefighting requires many firefighters.

On October 17, we were lucky! It was just a warning.
THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY IS TOO LOW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR

VOTE YES ON F!
SAN FRANCISCO IS A FRAGILE CITY. OVER 90% OF ALL STRUCTURES ARE OF WOOD FRAME CONSTRUCTION. YOUR HOMES ARE BUILT IN SOLID BLOCKS OF WOODEN BUILDINGS. THIS SITUATION PRESENTS THE POSSIBILITY OF A DISASTEROUS FIRE OR CONFLAGRATION OCCURRING, ESPECIALLY FOLLOWING AN EARTHQUAKE.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS THE LIFELINE FOR ALL OF US WHO LIVE IN THIS CITY. THE EARTHQUAKE ON OCTOBER 17TH AND THE GREAT FIRE IN THE MARINA SHOW HOW IMPORTANT THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS TO SAN FRANCISCO.

POLITICIANS ARE USING SHRILL RHETORIC AND OTHER OFFENSIVE TACTICS IN AN ATTEMPT TO MISLEAD THE PUBLIC AS TO WHAT THE REAL MEANING OF PROP F IS. DO NOT BE MISLED! PROP F PROVIDES THREE MAIN POINTS:

- ESTABLISHES THE PRESENT 41 NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS AS A MINIMUM STANDARD
- PUTS A FIREFIGHTING CREW ON THE FIREBOAT
- REQUIRES PUBLIC HEARINGS AND APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION, THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE CITIZENS BEFORE A FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED.

THESE ARE COMMON SENSE MEASURES THAT PROVIDE A MINIMUM LEVEL OF PUBLIC SAFETY FOR OUR FAMILIES AND CITY.

PLEASE JOIN ME, AND THE 70,000 OTHER SAN FRANCISCANS WHO SIGNED THE PETITIONS TO PUT PROP F ON THE BALLOT, AND VOTE YES ON "F!"

FRANK T. BLACKBURN
ASSISTANT FIRE CHIEF

DISASTER NEEDS!
Let’s all get behind Proposition F! It will assure stability in Department funding, guarantee adequate staffing for our firehouses and apparatus, and permit long-range planning and improvements. Our firefighters need your vote!

James A. Hood
Chairman
San Franciscans for Fire Safety

VOTE YES ON F!
Fire protection is vital for our families and businesses.
Prop F will stabilize protection and prevent further cuts in the Fire Department.
Protect our city. Vote Yes on F.

Robert E. Donohue
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)

Charles D. Cresci
Deputy Chief, SFFD (Retired)

Charles H. Lee
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T TAKE YOUR FIREFIGHTERS FOR GRANTED!
San Francisco firefighters answered a record 58,000 calls for help last year. Of these, 26,000 were for medical emergencies. Heart attacks, auto accidents, building collapses, childbirths were just a few. BUT EVERY YEAR THERE ARE FEWER AND FEWER FIREFIGHTERS TO HELP YOU! In 1970 there were 482 firefighters on duty each day— in 1990 there are only 296! Six firehouses and 12 fire companies have been closed.

FIRE SAFETY DECISIONS MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE HANDS OF POLITICIANS! Only a Charter amendment will assure that your Fire Department is adequately staffed to meet San Francisco's special needs—now and in the future. FOR JUST 2 CENTS A DAY, WE CAN KEEP OUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS OPEN AND OUR FIRE APPARATUS ADEQUATELY STAFFED.

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE WE WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON'T MISS THE CHANCE! VOTE YES ON F!

Walter G. Jebe
John J. Figone
Caesar A. Churchwell
Alessandro Baccari
Virgil Caselli
Marsha Garland
Tom Creedon
Ed Farrah
Michael Salerno

NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS
Pride, trust, reliance. They're all wrapped up in a San Francisco institution. The neighborhood fire station turns out to be more— it's a rock, an anchor, a point of reference in people's lives.

City residents have said so loud and clear in endorsing Proposition F. Besides setting a minimum number of firefighters to be on duty each day, the June ballot measure guarantees a public hearing in the area concerned and a vote of the people, if needed, before any fire station may be closed.

Seventy thousand people petitioned to put F on the ballot. Their reasons all had a common core. It's not the fire station but OUR fire station, they said—a place to expect and get help in a fire or medical emergency, a place the local community can turn to and rely on if the earth shakes, buildings fall, and other resources break down.

Neighborhoods and fire stations. The one requires the other, San Franciscans say.

John W. Flaherty
Mark L. Kaplan
Robert L. Barisone
Elvera Jane Barisone
William A. Roberts Jr.
Maureen Porter
William Porter Jr.
Homer G. Miles
Dorothy L. Miles
Peter C. Gardner
Joan M. Gardner
John Daly
Lucia R. Flaherty
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T BE MISLED BY MAYOR AGNOS!
PROP F IS A LIFE AND DEATH ISSUE!

FIRE, INSURANCE AND EARTHQUAKE EXPERTS AGREE: SAN FRANCISCO FACES THE HIGHEST RISK OF CONFLAGRATION OF ANY CITY IN THE UNITED STATES!
FIRE RISK IS HIGHER THAN IN 1906!
SAN FRANCISCO'S FIRE PROTECTION NEEDS ARE DICTATED BY THE NATURE OF OUR CITY, with its:
• Blocks and blocks of adjoining wood frame buildings
• Steep hills
• Narrow streets
• Traffic congestion
• Network of overhead electrical, trolley and telephone lines
• Prevailing winds
• 500 high rise buildings
• High density residential areas
• Large population of seniors and low-income families
• High vulnerability to severe earthquake damage
• Isolation from outside help in time of disaster

SAN FRANCISCO IS IN TROUBLE BECAUSE THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY. Former SF Fire Chief Emmet Condon in his book "Denial of Disaster": "THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT IS BELOW THE DAILY MANNING LEVEL THAT ANY EXPERIENCED CHIEF OFFICER KNOWS IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SERVICE TO THE CITY." Condon continues:
"I WOULD AGREE THAT THE HAZARD OF FIRE TO THE CITY AFTER A SIMILAR DISASTER TODAY IS MUCH GREATER THAN IN 1906." And,
"SYNTHETIC MATERIALS HAVE GREATLY INCREASED THE FIRE RISK IN MODERN BUILDINGS AND WILL MAGNIFY THE FIRE PROBLEM IN THE MULTIPLE FIRES THAT WILL BREAK OUT AFTER A SERIOUS EARTHQUAKE."
At least 400 of the city’s 500 high rise buildings do not have modern life-safety systems! HIGH RISE FIRES CAUSE A HUGE DRAIN ON FIRE DEPARTMENT RESOURCES.

PROP F IS STRONGLY SUPPORTED BY INDIVIDUALS; CITIZEN, BUSINESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS; FIRE SAFETY EXPERTS, AND A BROAD SPECTRUM OF KNOWLEDGEABLE CIVIC LEADERS.

There is no significant opposition to Prop F.

PROTECT YOURSELF, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR FRIENDS — YOU HAVE A LOT TO LOSE! VOTE YES ON F!

GERRY LONG
Concerned Citizen

WHY VOTE YES ON F? WHY A CHARTER AMENDMENT?
City politicians have been consistently unresponsive to your fire safety concerns. It is the duty of the City to provide its citizens with adequate fire protection and earthquake preparedness. Instead, Fire Department staffing has been cut to a dangerous level.

THE POLITICIANS SAY, "TRUST US!"
We can see that this has not worked, and a Charter provision is necessary. YOUR EMERGENCY NEEDS ARE TOO VITAL TO BE LEFT VULNERABLE TO POLITICAL GAMES.
You hear the sirens every day — BUT HAVE YOU COUNTED THE FIREFIGHTERS? Fewer firefighters means greatly reduced firefighting capacity. FIRE DEPARTMENT STAFFING IS NOW AT AN ALL-TIME LOW AND CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO FALL FURTHER!
WE NEED A STRONG FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

John Flaherty
Battalion Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Past President, S.F. Fire Chiefs Assn.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

HIGH RISE BUILDINGS AND BART AND MUNI UNDERGROUND FACILITIES MAKE SPECIAL FIRE PROTECTION DEMANDS

Today, San Francisco has over 500 high rise buildings. Fires in these buildings require many firefighters because equipment must be carried by hand to the fire—often up many flights of stairs.

In 1988 in Los Angeles, a fire on three floors of a high rise building required 383 firefighters to bring it under control. In San Francisco, our entire on-duty force would be required, leaving the rest of the city completely unprotected. Mutual aid from neighboring communities would be totally inadequate to cover our needs.

BART and MUNI underground facilities present special fire and rescue problems. Large numbers of firefighters are required to fight these fires and perform rescue and evacuation operations.

In July 1989, Mayor Agnos forced reductions in truck company staffing—the key players in rescue and ventilation operations. Now these aerial ladder teams can no longer function properly.

Building ventilation is delayed, greatly increasing the risk of deadly backdrafts.

The Department's daily staffing has fallen to 296 firefighters, the lowest in history, while fire, medical and other emergencies are higher than ever. Proposition F will bring SFFD staffing up to 320. This is critically needed to meet these ever-increasing demands.

In the past, some Fire Chiefs have thought that you could safely relocate or close a firehouse, but I now recognize that this is dangerous. The SFFD can now get to most emergencies within 3 minutes, but if we close a firehouse we lose that prompt response. With our rows of wood buildings, our large population of elderly citizens, we must get there quickly.

The SFFD is your lifeline. Protect it! I strongly urge all citizens to vote YES on F!

James P. Olson, President
San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

Any firefighter responsible for any racist act or statement on duty, after due process, should be disciplined. Repeat occurrences must result in severe penalties.

Expensive overtime can be largely eliminated by adding more firefighters.

Differences between the union and the mayor should be resolved through good faith negotiations, not through the election process. Maintaining high morale is the only way to insure efficiency.

The neighborhood service cuts need to be restored.

Vote YES on F.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Becoming a victim in another major earthquake or runaway fire in one of San Francisco's densely populated neighborhoods continues to be a hazard for all of us.

Nonetheless, because the Firefighters Union did not endorse him, Mayor Agnos has seen fit to reduce the staffing levels of the Fire Department in any twenty-four hour period from 315 to 296. The San Francisco Republican Party believes these cuts are penny-wise, pound-foolish, and politically motivated.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. DO NOT let the Mayor's political vendetta jeopardize public safety.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition F. This proposition, if passed, will require twenty-five extra firefighters to be hired each day — five of these firefighters will have no specific functions — their daily assignment will be at the discretion of the Chief of Department. It will also require that daily truck staffing be increased from five to six persons and the fireboat staffing be increased by another two firefighters daily. These increases are unnecessary and are not required — fire suppression units are now staffed to provide effective and efficient fire service for San Francisco.

Proposition F will take management control and responsibility away from the Chief of Department by requiring organizational changes to be approved by the voters at a regular election. This would not allow the Chief, through the Fire Commission, to respond to the changing demands placed on the Fire Department. Fire protection decisions can’t wait until an election. To provide for and maintain the most cost effective and efficient fire department, I urge you to vote NO on Proposition F.

Frederick F. Postel
Chief of Department

Overtime pay is bleeding the Fire Department’s budget dry!
Over 92 percent of the budget goes for personnel costs. In 1988-89 uniformed personnel were paid salaries totaling $53,567,000 plus mandatory fringe benefits of $53,543,000 and still another $11,893,000 for overtime!

Proposition F would increase that bleeding by creating new positions not necessary for the safety of San Franciscans despite the scare statements made by the firefighters’ union.

Proposition F would cost $4,900,000 in overtime thereby siphoning away money needed to make major improvements!

We already have excellent protection but we want to upgrade it by developing a comprehensive earthquake program, by improving our response to emergency medical calls (over 4 1/2 times the number of fires) and by purchasing more modern fire equipment.

During the October quake 522 off-duty firefighters reported back immediately yet there were not enough engines and trucks for them; in fact, one old piece had to be taken out of the Fire Museum to help fight the Marina District fire.

Our firefighters work nine days out of 31 in shifts of approximately 24 hours on and 48 off.

Many are “double-dippers” holding down well paid outside jobs such as contractors, lawyers, plumbers and electricians. They still put in overtime because the Charter provides for such generous pay.

Overtime pay for a firefighter is $85 per shift, for a Captain $776 and for an Assistant Chief $1077! Last year the average firefighter’s cost to the City was $90,000, including salary, fringe benefits and overtime.

Do not pay out more money just for overtime.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

James Jefferson
President, Fire Commission
Frank Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted Souls
Commissioner, Fire Commission
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

San Francisco has the finest fire protection in California. Now is not the time to jeopardize it with Proposition F. Proposition F is an ill-advised and wasteful measure.

First, it would wrest management of the Fire Department away from the Fire Commission and the Chief, where management properly and historically belongs.

Management of the Fire Department should remain accountable to the citizens of San Francisco, through its appointed Fire Commission. This principle is violated when rigid language is placed in the Charter.

Second, Proposition F would unnecessarily increase the Fire Department’s budget by approximately $4.9 million a year.

The San Francisco Fire Department already has staffing levels on its fire engines and aerial ladder trucks that are equal to the best in California.

To overstaff the engines and trucks would be counterproductive as well as wasteful, especially in a time of limited resources and ever-increasing demands for City services.

Let life and death decisions of fire protection in San Francisco remain in the control of the Fire Commission and the Chief.

Let the buck stop where it has always stopped — with the Fire Commission and the Chief. And let San Francisco’s first-rate fire protection continue.

We can’t afford to play around with fire, or with Proposition F. A similar Proposition was defeated in November, 1987.

Vote NO on this Proposition in 1990.

Vote NO on Proposition F.

James D. Jefferson
President, Fire Commission

Frank A. Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission

Henry E. Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Sharon L. Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Ted N. Soulis
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Vote No on Proposition F.

Proposition F has little to do with fire protection and earthquake preparedness and a lot to do with unnecessary Fire Department staffing.

Vote No on Proposition F. Don’t tie the hands of the Chief and Fire Commission, preventing them from managing the department and our tax dollars. Proposition F will take $6 million a year from health services, libraries, homeless programs and other vital city services. Why? Because Proposition F will require the city to pay more overtime to firefighters who already receive higher salaries than those in Los Angeles, San Jose, Long Beach or San Diego.

Employment of unnecessary personnel is called “featherbedding.” Proposition F is just that — at a cost of $6 million.

San Francisco has the best fire protection services in the country. We already pay more per person for that service than any other city in California.

Stop a $6 million raid on the City Treasury. Vote No on Proposition F.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Like all San Franciscans, we want a safe and healthy city. But Proposition F could jeopardize our safety and health.

By spending more than $7 million on unnecessary overtime, Proposition F will take money away from other vitally needed services like fire equipment, police protection, health care and children's programs.

The annual fire department budget is already $150 million. Firefighters are already getting a pay raise of almost 10%. That's more than most city workers — and most of us.

San Francisco already has more firefighters per thousand residents than any other major Western city.

Yet San Francisco has fewer fire and emergency alarms than other cities. In 1986, San Francisco had 78,000 emergency calls. Oakland had 95,000.

We appreciate the job that our firefighters do. But we cannot support this multi-million dollar attempt to win back overtime for just 18 firefighters per day.

Susan J. Bierman
Agar Jaicks
Mauri Schwartz
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Sunset Democratic Club
Margaret Brodkin, Director Coleman Advocates for Children
Carole Migden, chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

I respect and admire the work done by San Francisco's firefighters.

It's a dangerous job.

That's why they're paid more than firefighters in any other large city in California, even though our firefighters work 15 percent fewer hours.

But today our average cost per firefighter has hit $96,000 per year.

We have been reducing this amount — and improving fire service at the same time — by hiring more new firefighters and reducing costly overtime payments.

That overtime runs as much as $585 per day for a fourth-year firefighter, and up to $1077 per day at the higher ranks.

When they argue for Proposition F, the union avoids mentioning this fact. They raise a false alarm about closing down firehouses, when in reality we are adding new firefighters as quickly as we can train them.

Ninety new firefighters are being hired this year alone. We have full classes in the Fire Academy for the first time in years.

Prop F asks you, the voters, to put an unnecessary sixth firefighter back on every fire truck, in order to give current firefighters millions in guaranteed overtime.

There's no need for it. Even a one-alarm fire in San Francisco draws 30 firefighters in response.

It's easy, when you think about the heroic work firefighters do, to justify giving them whatever they ask for.

I made the same mistake myself three years ago, before I was mayor. As a State Assemblyman and a strong union supporter, I lent my name to a measure that was similar to Proposition F.

But no group, however much we appreciate their work, is entitled to millions of taxpayer dollars a year in guaranteed, unnecessary overtime — especially when they are trying to feather their own nests by keeping out women and minorities.

With all the pressing needs facing our city, we can't afford to give away $7 million and get nothing in return. Please vote No on Proposition F.

Mayor Art Agnos
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NOTE: This entire section is new.
The Proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

NEW CHARTER SECTION: 3.548:
MINIMUM LEVELS OF FIRE
PROTECTION FOR THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Notwithstanding any other section of this
Charter, the minimum levels of fire protection for
the City and County of San Francisco shall be
specified as follows:

A. The MINIMUM level of Fire Protection for
the City and County of San Francisco, in fire
suppression, effective July 1, 1990, except as
specified in Section C shall be as follows:

1. Engine Companies 41
   Truck Companies 18
   Rescue Companies 2
   Fireboat Companies 1
   Battalion Districts 10
   Divisions 3
   Service Units 1
   Bureau of Equipment 2
   High Pressure System
   Tank (staffed)
   (Jones St. Tank)
   Assigned Firefighters
   (At Chief’s Discretion) 5

2. Fire station: The minimum number of sta-
tions shall be 41, at locations listed on the SFFD

B. MINIMUM daily staffing of Fire Com-
panies and other Units:

1. Engine Companies:
   1 Officer and 3
   Firefighters

2. Truck Companies:
   1 Officer and 5
   Firefighters

3. Rescue Company:
   1 Officer and 3
   Firefighters

4. Fireboat Company:
   1 Officer, 1 Pilot,
   1 Marine Engineer and 2 Fire-
   fighters

5. Service Units:
   1 Firefighter

6. Bureau of Equipment:
   2 Firefighters

7. Battalion District: 1 Battalion Chief,
   1 Chief’s Aide
   1 Assistant Chief,
   1 Chief’s Aide
   1 qualified person
to operate gates,
   valves and commu-
   nications equip-
   ment of the High
   Pressure System.

Required minimum staffing shall be main-
tained on a constant basis, 24 hours per day.
Sufficient personnel and positions shall be au-
thorized and funded to maintain MINIMUM re-
quired staffing levels established in this section.
When assigned personnel are not available, then
staffing shall be maintained by working of
overtime.

C. CLOSURE AND RELOCATION OF FIRE
STATIONS, DEACTIVATION OF FIRE
COMPANIES OR OF UNITS REQUIRED BY
THIS SECTION:

1. Fire Stations, Fire Companies or other
   Units required by this section may be closed or
devolved only when each of the following
   procedures is completed:

   a. It is recommended by the Chief of Depar-
      tment and approved for consideration by the Fire
      Commission.

   b. The Fire Commission shall hold at least two
      public hearings on the matter so that affected
      citizens may appear to express their views.

   c. At least one of the public hearings shall be
      held in the neighborhood of the Station, Com-
      pany, or Unit to be closed or deactivated. Such
      meeting to be held at a time and place most
      suitable for maximum public attendance.

   d. Except as provided by this section, other
      facilities or units may be closed or deactivated by
      majority of the five members of the Fire Com-
      mission upon recommendation by the Chief of
      Department.

   e. Upon conclusion of public hearings and
      approval by a majority of the five members of the
      Fire Commission for the closure or deactivation
      of a Company or Unit, the Fire Commission shall
      forward its recommendation to the Board of Su-
      pervisors within 30 calendar days.

   f. Upon receipt of the Fire Commission rec-
      ommendation, the Board of Supervisors may
      hold public hearings on the matter and they may
      approve or disapprove of the recommendation of
      the Fire Commission for closure or deactivation of
      a Station, Company or Unit. Such approval or dis-
      approvement shall be by majority vote of the
      Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors
      approves of the Fire Commission recommenda-
      tion, then they shall direct the Clerk of the Board
to have the matter put on the ballot of the next
      regular election for final determination by the
      voters of the City and County.

D. DEFINITIONS — EQUIPMENT

1. ENGINE COMPANY; A vehicle carrying
   hose and a pump to pump water of at least 1,500
   gallons per minute.

2. TRUCK COMPANY; A tractor-trailer ve-
   hicle carrying ladders and rescue equipment with
   a 100-foot aerial ladder or equivalent device to
   reach upper floors of buildings.

3. RESCUE COMPANY; A vehicle carrying
   rescue equipment capable of heavy rescue and
   diving equipment for underwater rescue.

4. FIRE BOAT COMPANY; A boat equipped
   with pumps, hose, monitor nozzles and able to
   navigate San Francisco Bay for firefighting and
   rescue duty along the shorelines of the City and
   County.

5. SERVICE UNIT; A vehicle carrying spare
   supply of air and equipment for self-contained
   breathing apparatus and resuscitators.

6. HIGH PRESSURE SYSTEM PUMP STA-
   TION; A facility capable of pumping at least
   10,000 gallons per minute from San Francisco
   Bay or other water source into the mains of the
   high pressure water system.

7. BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT; A vehicle
capable of carrying equipment for emergency
repairs or towing of fire apparatus under emer-
gency conditions.
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost? YES 288  NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Health Service System provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Supervisors may not continue to receive health insurance from the Health Service System after they leave the Board of Supervisors.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Board of Supervisors could allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System.

Controller's Statement on "G"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G will allow former Supervisors to buy health insurance coverage from the City's Health Service system, when they leave office. THERE WILL BE NO COST TO THE CITY.

The Health Service System now provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Proposition G simply allows former Supervisors to BUY continued health coverage in the City's Health Plan, at their own expense.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition G
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “G”
Former supervisors are either those who have decided not to run;
or those the electorate voted out of office.
Even as it claims they will pay their own health plan benefits,
why continue to have them in the system.

Cut bait.
Vote NO.

Marguerite Warren
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by *strike-out type*.

8.425 Persons Covered

Each plan may make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system by the dependents of members, retired city and county employees, temporary city and county employees, such other dependents of deceased and retired city and county employees as the board of supervisors may authorize by ordinance, teachers and other employees of the San Francisco Unified School District retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees of the city and county and resigned teachers and employees of the school district whose resignations occur after June 15, 1955, and within 30 days immediately prior to the date on which, but for their resignations, they would have become retired members of the said retirement system, on whose relinquishment of retirement allowances as permitted by the charter occurs after such date and resigned employees of the San Francisco Unified School District not otherwise included. A resigned employee or teacher is one whose employment has terminated other than by retirement, discharge or death or who has relinquished retirement allowances. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system to the aforementioned resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District is to enable them, subject to the health service board's exercise of its power, to participate in the benefits of the system after transferring to the State Teachers' Retirement System from the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for participation in the benefits of the system by the aforementioned resigned employees of the city and county and other resigned employees of San Francisco Unified School District is to permit the health service board to have power to treat them the same as it treats resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District.

As used in this section, and for the purpose of this section, the terms "city and county employees" and "employees of the city and county" shall include officers and employees of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco.

The board of supervisors may also provide by ordinance for the continuation in any plan by former supervisors who agree to and do pay the full cost of such benefit.

Moved since you last voted? Then you must re-register. Phone 554-4375.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?

YES 290
NO 292

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers belong to the City’s Retirement System. Under the charter, the Board of Supervisors may contract with the State’s Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) to allow certain safety employees to be members of PERS instead of the City’s Retirement System, if there is no additional cost to the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City’s Retirement System, if there would be no additional cost to the City.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City’s Retirement System.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want these employees to continue to be covered by the City’s Retirement System.

Controller’s Statement on “H”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This Charter Amendment would provide for safety retirement for eighteen civilian Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers employed by the San Francisco Fire Department, at no additional cost to the City.

Fire Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers are classified by the State of California as safety personnel and properly belong in a safety retirement program that is not offered by the City’s Retirement System for non-uniformed employees. Instead, the City contracts with the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) for its public safety officers who are not police officers or firefighters.

Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers, along with their counterparts in the uniformed firefighter ranks, provide the professional expertise necessary for the City’s fire prevention program. Proposition H provides a retirement plan for this small group of civilians equivalent to the retirement plan for their uniformed firefighter counterparts, at no additional cost to the City.

Voters approved similar measures in recent years that provided for safety requirement for probation officers, investigator groups and various other safety personnel.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition H
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.506-2 Miscellaneous Safety Employees
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the board of supervisors or the community college board shall have the power to contract with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees’ Retirement System of the State of California to provide that the probation officers, airport police officers, district attorney and public defender investigators, coroner investigators, juvenile court counselors, and institutional police, fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers who are not members of the Section 8.588 plans, shall be members of the public employees’ retirement system, and the board of supervisors, the community college board and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such contract.

The power to contract created herein shall be limited to a contract with no net increase in cost to the city and county or the community college district.

Any person who shall become a member of the public employees’ retirement system pursuant to such contract shall have the right to be a member of the health service system and the health board shall make provision for the participation in the benefits of the health service system by such persons.

Out of town on June 5, 1990? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
THANKS, SAN FRANCISCO
Residents are recycling in record numbers!

Nearly 70,000 homes in the southern and eastern parts of the City have curbside recycling. By 1991, every resident will have curbside collection service.

Until curbside reaches your neighborhood, you can recycle at our many community recycling centers.

For a free Recycling Starter Kit and information on where to recycle call:

San Francisco Recycling Program
CITY HALL
554-6193
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

PROPOSITION I

Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits? YES 293 NO 295

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the State Retirement System are allowed to work for the San Francisco Unified School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. Retired San Francisco teachers in the City Retirement system are not allowed to do so.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow retired teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. While they are consultants they would not make retirement contributions or earn additional retirement credits.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, costs could increase, the amount of which, being dependent upon the dollar amount and the number of personal service contracts executed, cannot be determined, but should not be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Jim Gonzalez and Richard Hongisto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is necessary to correct an inequity that exists between teachers in the State Teachers’ Retirement System and those in the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System. Teachers in the state system can retire up to three years early and supplement their reduced retirement income by serving as consultants to the school district developing curriculum, orienting new teachers, substituting for absent teachers, tutoring students, etc. The Charter denies the right to the four hundred teachers in the city retirement system to continue serving students and schools in these ways. Proposition I would correct this inequity by extending the same right to teachers in the city retirement system.

Proposition I will save taxpayers’ money by encouraging teachers at the top of the salary scale to retire early. New hires at the low end of the salary scale will earn little more than half as much as those at the top.

Proposition I will also improve education in San Francisco schools by continuing to take advantage of the experience and expertise of retired teachers. It will also help to solve the shortage of qualified substitute teacher.

Vote YES on Proposition I for equity, economy, and educational excellence.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will bring equity and fairness to retired teachers, save the taxpayers money and improve the educational system in San Francisco.

Assemblyman Willie Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John Burton
Supervisor Wendy Neider
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Jim Gonzales
San Francisco Democratic Party
Fred Rodriguez, President of the Board of Education

United Educators of San Francisco, Joan-Marie Shelley
Judy Dellamonica
Joanne Miller, vice-president of the San Francisco Board of Education
Thomas Ammiano
Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council
Larry Martin, Transport Workers of America
Robert Barnes
James Wachob
Jose Medina
Harry G. Britt, President of the Board of Supervisors

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the charter on February 1, 1969, and persons who become miscellaneous officers and employees after February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under Section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under Section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(a) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

"Retirement allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payments is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workers' compensation laws of the State of California, shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the retirement board, which would have been earned by the member had he worked, throughout the period under consideration, the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police department as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under Section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in Section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in Section 3.670 of the charter.

"Charter" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural; and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(b) Any member who completes at least 20 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 50 years, or at least 10 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 60 years, said service to be computed under Subsection (g) hereof, may retire from service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after reaching the age of 60 years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of two percent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of 65 years, if the allowance available to such member, pursuant to the provisions of Subsection (f) of this section, shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this Subsection (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this Subsection (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said Subsection (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of 60 years, after rendering 20 years or more of such service and having attained the age of 50 years, computed under Subsection (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under Subsection (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/4</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/2</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-3/4</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-1/4</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed 75 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or Subsection (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of 65 years may elect, without right of reversion, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system, and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of Sec-

(Continued on next page)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued)

tion 8.514 of this charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $100 per month upon retirement after 30 years of service and after attaining the age of 60 years, and provided further that as to any member within 15 years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of 65, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $100 per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied on full-time service and compensation in the calculations of retirement allowances.

(c) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least 10 years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in Subsection (g) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in Subsection (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds 40 percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of service, which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age 60, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed 40 percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earnable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one year immediately preceding his retirement. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied as full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

(d) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

(e) If a member shall die, before retirement, (1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of 12 months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(2) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired from service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that such child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under Subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) shall be paid in lump sum as follows:

(A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election, but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 years, may make the election herein provided before benefit has been paid under this Subsection (e), for and on behalf of such children if, in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this Subsection (e), any allowance payable under this Subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

(f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through his own death or any other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least 10 years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed $1,000, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service

(Continued on next page)
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retirement, but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1-2/3 percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

(g) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

(1) Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.

(2) Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitling him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contributions standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member, to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of Section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under Section 8.507.

(5) The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and service rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefor shall be required of the city and county.

(h) All payments provided under this section shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation paid to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to 7-1/2 percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of Subsection (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members, and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this Subsection (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), Subsection (h), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said value shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement, and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year, and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this Subdivision (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition otherwise submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county, held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(i) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said Subsection (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(j) Except as otherwise provided in Section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, in so far as it shall conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(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
Human Rights Commission

PROPOSITION J
Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission
and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?
YES 296
NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Human Rights Commission was created by an ordinance. Under that ordinance, the Human Rights Commission has 15 members.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment that would make the existing Human Rights Commission a charter commission; it would reduce the number of members from 15 to 11.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you want to reduce its size to 11 members.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you do not want to reduce its size to 11 members.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government in an amount not to exceed $4,200.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisor Thomas Hsieh.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Let us make human rights a fundamental part of the fabric of San Francisco.
San Francisco is the birthplace of the United Nations and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, our Human Rights Commission is not even a part of our constitution — the Charter.
Proposition J will make the Human Rights Commission a charter commission. Proposition J will take the position of the Human Rights Commission out of politics and ensures its place in the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.
Please vote in favor of Proposition J to recognize the importance of human rights to San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition J
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition J

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department and a candidate for Municipal Court Judge I urge you to vote for Ballot Measure J.

The Human Rights Commission has been a positive voice for 25 years. Thousands of San Franciscans have directly benefited from the Commission's efforts. Its mandate will be greatly strengthened by extending Charter status through this measure.

Please join me and vote yes on J!

James Harrigan
For Municipal Court

---

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "J"

We have a Human Rights Commission NOW, appointed by the Mayor. A new one in the charter would have the same appointing officer.

We don't need a confirmation of said committee. It will not take it out of politics. No reason for this.

Just another layer of government — for what.

Vote no on "J".

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: This entire section is new.
PART TWENTY-FOUR: HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
3.699-5 Commission; Composition
A human rights commission is hereby established. The human rights commission shall consist of eleven members broadly representative of the general public to be appointed by the mayor. Three of the members who are first appointed shall be designated to serve for terms of one year, three for two years, three for three years and two for four years from the date of their appointments. Thereafter, members shall be appointed as aforesaid for a term of office of four years, except that all of the vacancies occurring during a term shall be filled for the unexpired term. Members of said commission shall be compensated for each commission or committee meeting actually attended by said members in an amount as may be established and amended, from time to time, by ordinance of the board of supervisors, but not less than $50 per meeting provided, however, that no member shall be paid for attending more than two commission or committee meetings in any one calendar month.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued from page 88)

County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system, an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be re-instated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

8.584-10 Limitation on Employment During Retirement
(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired for Section 8.584 service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subject him to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.584, he shall re-enter membership under Section 8.584 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.584. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for service or disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 60 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he held the position which he held at the time of his retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he held the position from which he was retired immediately prior to its abolition.
Seven Member Commissions

PROPOSITION K
Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?

YES 298
NO 299

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department, Fire Department, Social Services Department, Port of San Francisco, Public Utilities Commission, Board of Permit Appeals, Civil Service Commission, Airports Commission and Parking and Traffic Department are managed by a board or commission. Each of these boards and commissions has five members appointed by the Mayor.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K is a charter amendment that would increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the size of these boards and commissions to stay the same.

Controller’s Statement on “K”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $18,800 annually beginning January, 1991.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh, Bill Maher, and Wendy Nelder.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K expands the opportunity for San Francisco’s varied communities to participate in City government. Proposition K increases, from five to seven, the membership of the Board of Permit Appeals and seven City commissions: Police, Fire, Social Services, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports, and Parking and Traffic. It also includes the Port Commission, subject to amendment of state law to authorize such an increase.

Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities. Only five members of these crucial commissions is insufficient to address the diversity of concerns in our City; seven members will provide greater representation and greater leadership from a variety of communities. The expansion of the size of these commissions enhances the possibility for all San Franciscans to be part of decision-making and policy-making processes at every level.

The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions. Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor, but instead of the many under-represented voices in San Francisco.

Proposition K would make these commissions representative of the interests of more San Franciscans, while maintaining the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants. San Franciscans want accessible, responsive, and active commissioners. We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns, and Proposition K is a method for achieving these goals.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

You need a decoder ring to read the Supervisors’ argument in favor of creating 18 new commissioner slots. Here’s what the Board says, and here’s what they really mean.

The Board says: “Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities.”

The Board means: All you interest groups out there, it’s time to get yours.

The Board says: “The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions.”

The Board means: With 18 more political appointments, a mayor won’t offend as many supporters by passing them over for city jobs.

The Board says: “Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor.”

The Board means: Adding 18 new city commissioners isn’t really a boon to the incumbent mayor — unless he’s re-elected.

The Board says: “Proposition K would . . . maintain the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants.”

The Board means: Increasing commission memberships by 40% isn’t that big a deal.

The Board says: “We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns.”

The Board means: A fair hearing before city commissions isn’t enough; we want guaranteed results!

Let’s stop speaking in code and talk plainly. Proposition K is based on the notion that people should be treated as groups — not individuals — in the political process. That’s offensive, and so is Proposition K.

Please vote NO on K!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is a textbook example of what's wrong with contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K demeans us because it lumps city residents into groups, rather than respecting their rights as individuals.

Proposition K divides us because it stresses what such interest groups (the polite euphemism is "communities") disagree about, rather than what all San Franciscans share in common.

Proposition K debases us because it is premised on a "quota system" for city boards and commissions. There shouldn't be "white seats" or "black seats", "gay seats" or "straight seats" on city commissions. There should be but two qualifications for service as a city commissioner: San Francisco residency and individual ability!

Vote NO on Proposition K!

San Francisco is indeed a polyglot and richly diverse community. City residents come from all corners of the country and the globe. Their political opinions range from radical to reactionary and all points in between.

It's impossible for each point of view, each ethnic group, each political persuasion, each neighborhood to be represented on city commissions. Increasing the membership on those bodies from five to seven persons is like buying a bigger umbrella in a hurricane. It won't make a bit of difference.

It is possible, however, for city commissioners from all walks of life to represent views and interests other than their own. It happens all the time in countless actions by city boards and agencies. And if we want to encourage consensus and better understanding among San Francisco's many "communities", we must resist attempts — such as Proposition K — to make the labels we all wear easier to read.

Three years ago, Mayor Agnos campaigned on the slogan, "One City, One Future". The supporters of Proposition K have failed to heed those words.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The opponents of Proposition K are clearly on the wrong page of the textbook of contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K values us because it gives city residents greater ability to be heard, individually and as a community.

Proposition K unites us because it reinforces what we all share in common: respect for democracy. If, as the opposition claims, the ability to have more access to representation is divisive, democratic ideals such as checks and balances must therefore also be divisive and undesirable.

Proposition K elevates us because it originates from that respect for democracy. This does not limit or allocate, but reasonably expands available seats on the commissions. Proposition K effectively dilutes the influence of special interests in favor of more broad-based views.

San Francisco is an extremely diverse city and that diversity should be reasonably represented. Democracy requires the opportunity for representation of all points of view. Good government demands that the number of appointed officials be limited so that debate can be functional. Proposition K addresses these two needs: increased citizen participation, and reasonable size to facilitate getting work done.

If you take the opposition's argument — that it is not meaningful to have representatives from different neighborhoods, ethnicities, political persuasions — to its logical extreme, you could have one member commissions achieving a consensus at the price of democracy.

Proposition K is good government, since it integrates the multiplicity of voices into a united future for the residents of San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition K!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Seven Member Commissions

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

We need to create an open, democratic, and participatory local government.
This measure will encourage more participation.
Vote YES on K.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Individuals and community groups strongly support K. Increasing the membership on these bodies expands the opportunity to participate for all San Franciscans.
Vote YES on K!

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Robert McCarthy
Ruth Picon
President, Latino Democratic Club
Gerald Whitehead, Pres.
Bernal Heights Community Foundation
Jake McGoldrick
Arnie Scher
Natalie Berg
Sodonia Wilson,
San Francisco Board of Education
Alma Jackson
Margaret Brady
Reverend Amos Brown
Yori Wada

Mayor Art Agnos
Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John L. Burton
State Senator Milton Marks
Fr. James Goode
Carole Migden
Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes
Political Action Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Catherine Baccari
Bob Dockendorff
Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Vote No on Proposition K.
Proposition K unnecessarily tinkers with our commission system for managing city departments.
Many of the most important city functions — police and fire services, libraries and health care — are governed by five-member city commissions. Proposition K would increase the size of these commissions to seven members. The Planning Commission would be expanded to nine members.
For what reason? The supporters say that the commissions cannot reflect our diverse community unless we allow the mayor to appoint more commissioners. They miss the point of the commission system.
Commissioners are not advisors or members of a community-wide study panel. They are managers. They set city policy, recommend hundreds of millions of dollars in spending, and hire and fire key departmental personnel.
Preserve our system of citizen management. Don’t make city commissions debating societies.
Vote No on Proposition K.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Are not seven Deputy Mayors at the rate of $94,000 a year a sufficient number of political plums for the Mayor? Does he really need eighteen more commissioners to achieve good government in San Francisco?

Do not give the Mayor additional tools to promote his re-election efforts. The San Francisco Republican Party urges voters to Vote No on Proposition K.

San Francisco Republican Party
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Anna M. Guth

William E. Grayson
Honor H. Bulkley
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Brian Mavrogeorge
Ronald G. Kershaw
Sam T. Harper
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

No sound arguments have been presented which support the need for Proposition K. Enlarging Boards and Commissions would increase city costs without improving productivity. Indeed, extra members may impede efficiency and result in protracted proceedings.

Don’t give the Mayor additional opportunities for patronage. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw

Brian Mavrogeorge
Paul Kavouksorian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulroney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence
Martin Keller

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

PROPOSITION K WILL ADD TO BUREAUCRACY
Proposition K will hinder quick and fair response to citizen concerns. Larger commissions do not mean better commissions; on the contrary, they mean a less efficient, more cumbersome process.

PROPOSITION K WILL NOT MAKE COMMISSIONS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INTERESTS OF SAN FRANCISCO
Present commissions serve a diverse San Francisco by appointment of individuals who reflect and possess sensitivity, respect for different backgrounds and points of views.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

Sharon Bretz
Susann L. Danielson
Jean Kalil
Victor Makras
Esther Marks
Beverly Prior

Larger commissions and larger support bureaucracy are not the answer to better representation. The answer is less political patronage and more appointments based on experience and knowledge. This proposal only makes government more cumbersome and less effective.

... Vote NO on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Proposition K is not about democracy. It is about patronage. It is about creating many new commission positions to hand out as political plums. To whom? For what? And why should the taxpayers be forced to pay for it?

No one, not even the author, Supervisor Ward, claims that it will improve the efficiency of the government, yet it will certainly add to the costs. The true costs will include trips, staff time, expenses, etc., with no discernable benefit to the public.

This measure will lead to longer meetings, more arguments, divisiveness and politics while providing less management oversight.

Proposition K is an insider’s game. They gain and the voters pay. It is a costly bad idea and should be soundly rejected by the voters.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Bill Maher

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”

If qualified commissioners were appointed who understood they represented ALL of San Francisco this charter amendment would not be necessary.

There are nine commissions listed for additional members — 18 more appointments. Just another avenue for political appointments.

Vote No on Proposition “K”.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strikethrough type.

PART FOUR: POLICE DEPARTMENT
3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, police force, an office of citizen complaints and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of five seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission to seven members, shall continue to hold their respective positions, subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the police department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the police commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-2 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter.

PART FIVE: FIRE DEPARTMENT
3.540 Fire Department

The fire department shall be under the management of a fire commission, consisting of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor; and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years of 1948, 1949, and 1950, respectively, two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The chief of department shall have power to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for fire-fighting purposes.

The commissioners shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the fire department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the fire commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-2 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter.

Positions of officers and employees of the fire department legally authorized shall continue, and the incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall continue as the officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

PART EIGHT: SOCIAL SERVICES
3.570 Composition of Department; Commission

There is hereby established a social services department. This department shall consist of a social services commission of five seven members, a director of social services, and such employees and assistants as may be necessary to carry out the work and functions of said department.

The members of the social services commission shall be appointed thereto by the mayor and shall be selected for their respective positions on the basis of their interest in and understanding of the problems of public welfare. The members of said commission shall serve without compensation and no person shall be eligible to serve on said commission while holding a salaried public office, position or employment.

The term of office of the members of the said commission, subject to the provisions hereof relative to removal and the terms of the first mem-

(Continued on next page)
The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3.590 Commission; Composition

A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o’clock, on the 8th day of January, 1932, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of the other four commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936. The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS

3.650 Board Composition

The mayor shall appoint five seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $425 per year. One such term shall expire at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934 and 1935, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936, and two terms at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1996, and upon these and successive expirations the mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SEVENTEEN: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county. The civil service commission shall consist of five seven members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and any member of the amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the 1st day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and, provided further, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall be as follows; one shall expire on June 30, 1996 and one on June 30, 1998, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. No less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: “I am appointed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration.”

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this

(Continued on page 128)
**Commissioner Residency Requirement**

**PROPOSITION L**

Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?

| YES 300 | NO 301 |

---

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** Candidates for elective office and members of charter boards and commissions must be San Francisco residents and electors. For other boards, commissions and advisory bodies, the law creating them may set residency requirements.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition L is a charter amendment that would require the members of all boards, commissions and advisory bodies to be San Francisco residents and electors.

This rule would not apply where a non-charter board, commission or advisory body requires a person with specific qualifications, and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found. Also, this rule would not apply to the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Fine Arts Museums, the Asian Arts Commission, the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission and the elected members of the San Francisco Retirement Board and Health Service Board.

Proposition L would delete the current requirement that candidates and members of charter boards and commissions be residents and electors for a certain length of time before assuming office, which courts have found unconstitutional.

**A “YES” VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

**A “NO” VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “L”**

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “L”**

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Angela Alioto, Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, and Doris Ward.

**NO:** Supervisors Thomas Hsieh and Bill Maher.

**ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.**
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

This charter amendment provides that all individuals serving on city boards and commissions and committees with few exceptions, must be citizens of voting age of San Francisco.

Members of boards and commissions and committees often have policy making and regulatory responsibilities. Clearly, San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco. With a population of 750,000 residents, surely we have enough qualified and talented San Franciscans who can get the job done.

This charter amendment offers the appointing officer with some flexibility. If a qualified candidate for a public post requiring specialized skills cannot be found in our city, then, following such a declaration, the appointing officer may search elsewhere.

Let's open up more opportunities for our residents to serve San Francisco. VOTE YES FOR THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERSHIP ON CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I was mistaken in one of my objections to Proposition L. Some years ago, a court decision invalidated the voter-adopted Charter requirement that a person be a San Francisco resident for five years before appointment to a city commission. I disagree strongly with that decision, for the reasons cited in my ballot argument appearing on the opposite page. The inoperative language remained in our Charter, however, and Proposition L disingenuously removes it — like pruning a dead branch from a tree.

But, there are still plenty of reasons to vote against Proposition L.

(1) Proposition L eliminates the requirement that a commissioner be an “elector” of San Francisco (a voter, meaning also a U.S. citizen) for at least one year. This Charter provision has not been altered by a court, but Proposition L would strike it from the books.

A person could move into town, register to vote, and be appointed that day to a city post.

(2) Proposition L exempts three city commissions — Health System, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board — from any residency requirement whatsoever.

(3) Proposition L would allow non-residents to serve on any board or commission created by the Board of Supervisors. In fact, Proposition L could even be interpreted to allow the appointment of non-citizens to such posts!

Don’t be misled or confused. If you want San Franciscans to make decisions about San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition L!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

If you want San Francisco residents to serve on all city commissions established by the charter, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you think San Franciscans should serve on boards and committees created by the Board of Supervisors, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you favor city residents serving on the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees, vote NO on Proposition L.

The Board of Supervisors says “San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco.” I agree completely. Trouble is, Proposition L weakens the existing residency requirement in our City Charter.

Charter Section 8.100 states that no person “shall be appointed as a member of any board or commission unless he shall have been a resident of the City and County for a period of at least five years.” Proposition L eliminates the five-year residency requirement! Proposition L also exempts from any residency requirement whatsoever members of the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees.

The idea behind the five-year residency rule is that city commissioners should have first-hand knowledge and personal experience of San Francisco’s people and neighborhoods, its problems and possibilities. City commissioners should not just rely on staff reports and statistical abstracts. Proposition L would destroy this sensible safeguard. Instead, a person could move into town and be appointed, that day, to a city post!

Finally, Proposition L purports to extend the Charter’s residency rules to advisory boards and committees established by the Board of Supervisors. But the residency requirement can be waived for a person “with specific experience, skills, or qualifications”. That’s a loophole big enough to drive a truck through!

San Franciscans should make decisions about San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition L.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for most advisory panels of the City.

Under Proposition L, panel members MUST be residents of San Francisco.

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for membership on the Health System Board, Retirement Board and War Memorial Board.

Under Proposition L, there is no change. Membership on the Health System Board and Retirement Board is by DIRECT ELECTION of city employees. The Health Fund and Retirement Fund are operated by and for city workers. Because employees are not required to live in the city, there are serious constitutional problems with denying a worker the right to be a candidate for trustee of a fund controlled by employees.

The way things are now, the courts have thrown out San Francisco’s five-year residency requirement. Reports the City Attorney:

“In the years since Charter Section 8.100 (residency rule) was originally adopted, the California courts have struck down all durational residency requirements applicable to candidates for elective or appointive office.”

Most Supervisors like the durational requirement. But even Supervisors cannot overrule the Supreme Court.

The bottom line: Proposition L does not cover everything. Just most things. It’s time San Franciscans were making the decisions about San Francisco. Proposition L is a major start in the right direction.

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE. YES ON PROPOSITION L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

San Franciscans deserve to be represented by commissioners who live within San Francisco, not by employees filling in for their ex-officio bosses. Vote for San Francisco commissions made of San Francisco voters.

... Vote Yes on Proposition L!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Don't clutter the Charter with unnecessary provisions. Vote No on Proposition L.

Proposition L would require almost all commissions and advisory board members to be city residents. That makes sense — so much sense that, for most commissions, it is already the law.

This is one more example of a needless Charter amendment. If the Board of Supervisors wants to require members of any advisory body to be city residents, they can pass an ordinance to accomplish it.

Adding an unnecessary provision to a Charter that is already too long and complicated is not the answer.

Vote No on Proposition L.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.100 Qualifications

(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for at least one year immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retirement system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.680, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.

Notwithstanding this requirement, in the case of boards, commissions or advisory bodies established by legislative act, the residency requirement may be waived by the appointing officer, or entity upon a finding that the board, commission or body requires the appointment of a person with specific experience, skills or qualifications and after exercising due diligence, an eligible and willing appointee residing within the city and county could not be located.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.
REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease. Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals it's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be TOXIC FREE 554-4333

HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR YOUR HOME'S TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday
8 am to 4 pm. 554-4333
Commission Gender Composition

PROPOSITION M

Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by the Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?

YES 302

NO 304

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter requires some City boards and commissions, such as the Police and Fire Commissions, to have at least one woman member. However, the charter does not have a general policy on balancing the number of men and women on City boards and commissions.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a charter amendment that would create a City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex. This charter amendment does not apply to the Commission on the Status of Women.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “M”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “M”

On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Bill Maher and Wendy Nelder.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.

107
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The 1990s are here — but you would never know it by the few women serving on City boards and commissions. In fact, of ten major commissions — Police, Fire, Airports, Ports, Public Utilities, Parking Authority, Social Services, City Planning, Elections, Housing Authority — women hold just 18 percent of the seats. And only one woman serves as a president of these commissions.

Women do not fare much better on other key commissions. For instance, women hold just two seats on the seven-member Recreation and Park Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission. Three women serve on the eleven-member Small Business Advisory Commission.

Despite the enormous influence and regulatory controls most commissions have over the lives of all citizens, women’s voices and leadership on city panels do not equal their numbers in society.

These gloomy statistics aside, women have begun to make gains during the past two years. Women are now being regularly considered and appointed to boards and commissions. But, clearly, much more needs to be done.

Proposition M will emblazon into the Charter a policy goal of gender equality on all boards and commissions. This amendment, authored by Supervisor Richard Hongisto, is a simple measure of justice.

Only the Commission on the Status of Women is excluded from the provisions of this charter amendment, since its sole purpose is to serve as an advocacy forum for women.

Increasingly, communities and groups are instituting gender parity provisions in their constitutions with much success. For instance, the Democratic Party has dramatically brought about near gender equality of delegates to its national and state conventions.

Let’s start the 1990s off with a renewed commitment to fairness and equality.

VOTE YES ON THE GENDER PARITY AMENDMENT.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M moves San Francisco into the 1990s. It is stunning to review the composition of our city boards and commissions and see just how few women are serving. Women comprise 18 percent of the seats on ten major commissions. This is an untold tragedy. Women have been making gains in recent time. We can do even better.

Proposition M is about fairness and equality. Iowa enacted a law in 1987 to require greater gender balance on all boards, commissions, committees, and councils.

Vote Yes for Gender Justice. Yes on Proposition M.

SF Chapter, National Organization for Women
Legal Advocates for Women
San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Creating political leadership opportunities for women will strengthen the public policy decision-making process. Vote YES on M.

As a predominately lesbian and gay Republican volunteer organization we believe it is a travesty that after fifteen years of three liberal Democrat mayors only 38% of the city’s Commissioners are women. This negligence has prompted the need to enact gender-parity. We support Proposition M.

In the future, the provisions of Proposition M should be amended to apply to the Commission on the Status of Women. Women and men must actively dialogue so that our city begins to address the concerns of all.

Judiciary Project/California
TJ Anthony
Mary C. Dunlap
Ruth Picon, President, Latino Democratic Club
Helen Grieco, Director, SF NOW
Laura Campbell
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Agar Jaicks, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Greg Day, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Jean K. Harris
Geraldine Johnson
Joyce Newstat, Chair, Lesbian Caucus, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
James Harrigan

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw
Paul Kavouksorian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mularney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Commission Gender Composition

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Requirement that any commission be comprised of a certain number of persons of any gender is as inappropriate as requiring a certain number of persons who have red hair or blue eyes. Please vote to maintain the mayoral prerogative to appoint the best San Franciscans for the job.

... Vote NO on Proposition M!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Vote No on Proposition M.
Like Proposition L, but only more so, Proposition M does not belong in the City Charter.
The power to make appointments to boards and commissions rests with the Mayor. Proposition M would write into the Charter a non-binding policy statement urging the Mayor to fill not more than 50% plus one of any commission with members of the same sex.
The City Attorney advised the Board of Supervisors that the Constitution prohibits the city from adopting a quota for male and female appointments. Instead, the Board of Supervisors proposes to clutter up the Charter with a non-binding, legally unenforceable policy statement.
If the Board of Supervisors wants to send a message to the Mayor it should be done by resolution, not costly and unnecessary Charter amendments.
Vote No on Proposition M.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “M”
There is nothing in the charter NOW that prevents the Mayor or Board of Supervisors to appoint more women to achieve gender parity now.

Why now does it have to be written in concrete.
Vote NO on “M”.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Entire section is new.
3.503 Composition of Boards and Commissions. It is the policy of the city and county, which shall be considered a goal when filling vacancies on boards or commissions appointed by the mayor, or otherwise provided by this charter, except for the Commission on the Status of Women, to achieve gender parity on these boards and commissions by limiting to a simple majority of board and commission membership the number of members who are of the same sex.

---

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 24.
MISSING SOMETHING IN YOUR LIFE?

If your life seems to be missing that special warmth that comes from having a pet, come and see us at the new San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department. We have a wide variety of dogs, cats and other animals available for adoption.

A waggly tail, a sweet meow or a gentle squeak - it'll make you glad to come home at night.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PROPOSITION N

Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?

YES 305
NO 307

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter does not limit the number of consecutive terms a person may serve on the Board of Supervisors. A full term on the Board of Supervisors is four years.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a charter amendment. Under Proposition N, no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors. After two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, a person must wait four years before serving again. Any person appointed to the Board of Supervisors to complete more than half a four-year term would be considered to have served one full term. A member of the Board of Supervisors who resigned with less than half a four-year term remaining would be considered to have served a full term. This charter amendment would go into effect July 1, 1990. Each Supervisor holding office on that date would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when his or her current term ends.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the charter so that no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors and you want to prohibit persons who served two consecutive four-year terms from serving on the Board of Supervisors again until four years after their second consecutive term in office.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to limit Supervisors to serving two consecutive terms.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On January 25, 1990, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition N to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,151* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 45,408 of the signatures submitted were valid, 5,257 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is a non-partisan, reasonable, fair and democratic measure to reform our government and improve the present city-wide system for electing supervisors. Neighborhood, civic leaders, current and former elected officials, community activists, business owners, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, unionists, and minorities all support Proposition N.

Limiting politicians’ consecutive terms is not radical or extreme. In fact, it helps to prevent political corruption and power grabbing. More than 150 cities, towns and counties in the United States have laws limiting politicians terms. Governors in 30 states can only serve two terms. San Mateo county limits supervisors terms and for more than 30 years San Francisco’s mayors have been limited to two consecutive terms.

Proposition N is a very modest and reasonable proposal.

Proposition N does not recall or force any current member of the board from office. Proposition N allows supervisors whose terms expire in 1991 to serve until January 1995 if they are reelected. Supervisors whose terms end in 1993 may serve until 1997 if reelected. Former supervisors may run for office again after 4 years.

The current system favors incumbent politicians and denies experienced newcomers a fair chance to serve. Since 1973, only 3 newcomers have been elected to the city-wide board. 5 supervisors have already served 10 years. By 1995 most board members will have been in office 14 years or more.

We know that a lake or pond will stagnate unless its waters are replenished from time to time. So too will an elected body grow stale without a regular infusion of fresh faces and new ideas.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Richard Bodisco
Chairman, San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
Steve Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu
Harold Hoogasian
Joseph L. Powell
Raymond Chalker
Robert A. Reveles
Robert C. Sanchez
Joel Ventresca
Barry Lastra
Daniel Willsan

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N backers have misrepresented the facts to get you to vote for N. Since just 1982 three non-incumbent supervisors have been independently elected to the Board. Proposition N is not true reform — it only tinkers with the citywide election process. It is not democratic — it takes power away from the people. It is not a solution — it’s an additional problem.

Supervisors are elected to carry out the will of the people. When they fail to serve, they are unelected — by vote of the people. Appointed department heads, who are not supposed to have their own political agendas, are balanced only by the Mayor’s and the Board’s overseeing eyes.

With the Mayor already limited to two terms, the Board must not consist only of rookies and lame ducks, or department heads can consolidate their power and bide their time, waiting until watchdog Supervisors are automatically thrown from office. Proposition N threatens accountability and increases the chances for bureaucratic corruption.

Uninformed actions are foolish actions — closely examine the facts, and you’ll agree that blindly forcing change is a bad plan. If Proposition N passes, nothing can stop department heads from installing power bases immune to voter inspection. Voters have the right to choose — this measure permanently limits that right.

PROTECT YOUR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Two years ago, San Francisco voted on Proposition O, a recall of the Board of Supervisors thinly disguised as a ‘good government’ initiative. San Franciscans saw through this scheme, and sent the measure down to defeat.

Last year, the same group attempted to offer a similar proposal to the voters, but failed to collect enough signatures to qualify it for the ballot.

Now they’re at it again.

They say that Supervisors have lost touch with the people of San Francisco, and should automatically be thrown from office after they’ve served two terms — but by bringing up this rejected issue again and again, they’re proving that THEY are the ones who are out of touch.

San Francisco doesn’t need a two-term limit. When supervisors stop working for the people, they stop getting elected. If Board members are prematurely removed, more power falls into the hands of civil servants and department heads, who are unaccountable to the voters. These unelected officials who already hold great power must be balanced by supervisors free to do their jobs, or citizens lose their representation.

The diversity of our City is one of our greatest strengths. San Franciscans have always individually evaluated our city’s varied issues, judging each on its specific merits. The Board of Supervisors is similarly diverse, and should also be evaluated selectively. Citizens should use the election process to tell their representatives when they’re not doing their jobs — not by acting blindly and installing an arbitrary time limit. San Franciscans are smart enough to tell the difference between voting an incompetent out of office and firing a valuable employee without cause.

Proposition N denies San Franciscans the right to vote for legislators of their choice, and that’s not fair.

Vote NO on Proposition N.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Let’s talk about what WE want City Hall to do for US, not the politicians.

Politicians will tell you anything to advance their political careers.

They won’t tell you the TRUTH about the Two Term Limit.

The politicians say we failed to collect enough signatures last year to qualify for the ballot.

But here’s what their appointee, the city’s Chief Administrative Officer says:

“Last year’s Proposition removal was forced by an error, one which we admitted, apologized for and tried to repair . . .”

(Letter to Two Term Limit — Chairman — Richard Bodisco, dated February 7, 1990.)

We need new leadership in City Hall.

We have some hard and serious problems to solve in San Francisco and we can’t solve them with political rhetoric and name calling.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N removes experienced supervisors from the Board.

FACT:

Proposition N insures that San Francisco will always have 5 or 6 supervisors with seniority and experience on the Board.

Proposition N also gives experienced and concerned citizens an opportunity to serve without needing to become professional, career politicians.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N will take away your right to vote for a legislator of your choice.

FACT:

Proposition N gives you more choices because it removes the current system which favors incumbent politicians.

The politicians have spoken too long for themselves.

It is time City Hall spoke for us.

Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Submitted by San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
Richard Bodisco
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Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

This citizen’s initiative is a good government reform measure which will guarantee change, encourage competition, improve the chances of electing new political leadership, and curtail the influence of special interests.

Vote YES on N.

SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

Change is the driving force in our economy, our lives...and our government! Eight years on the Board of Supervisors is enough time to initiate changes espoused in any candidacy. Our City government is in desperate need of change. Vote for new life in San Francisco government.

... Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

The longer supervisors remain in office the more likely they become captives of special interests who bankroll their costly campaigns.

Entrenched incumbent politicians often end up working against the public interest, rather than for it.

Only two supervisors have been defeated at the polls since the end of 1980.

New faces, new ideas, new leaders, and new directions are needed at City Hall.

Vote YES on N.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

The Two-Term Limit is an idea whose time has come!

The United States Constitution limits the President to two terms in office. Similarly, the San Francisco Charter limits our Mayor to two terms.

Incumbent San Francisco Supervisors, however, continue to win re-elections year after year. This has made many of them less accountable to the voters.

Eight years is enough! Let’s bring new people, new ideas, and new energy to our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Citizens for a Better San Francisco

It works for executive offices, let’s put a limit on the terms of service for our supervisors. As Thomas Jefferson called it, “rotation in office”. Let’s have some healthy competition for these positions, let’s take advantage of the many experienced people around who are willing to serve. Let’s vote YES on Proposition N for reasonable reform.

John and Carol Maertzke

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will ensure that we have a Board of Supervisors of concerned citizens, not career politicians. For almost forty years, San Francisco has limited its Mayor to eight years in office. Many cities around the Bay Area, such as San Jose, Richmond, Mountain View and Redwood City, limit terms in office for their city councils. Yet we have had supervisors serve up to 16 years in office. Why? Because by raising large sums of money and using the power of incumbency, supervisors face little chance of defeat when running for re-election.

Proposition N will not remove any member of the Board of Supervisors from office. It is a fair proposal that allows each current supervisor to run for one more four year term. But in the future, each supervisor will be limited to eight years in office.

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will give the city fresh leadership on the Board of Supervisors. It will open up the city’s political processes, reversing the trend in recent years towards full-time professional politicians. Most importantly, it will mean that our elected representatives put the city’s needs and interests ahead of their desire for re-election.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

I’m supporting Proposition N because of my concern about the status of women and children in San Francisco.

As a long time supporter and treasurer of a shelter for battered women in the City, I have had the opportunity to closely observe how our City government works. I think there are more important things than politics.

San Francisco needs leaders in government who will show more compassion and concern about peoples’ lives as opposed to their reelection campaigns.

I don’t feel that every member of the Board of Supervisors is bad, but the two term limit will improve the current system and help our Supervisors do a better job for us.

That is why I am voting YES on Proposition N.

Millie Favetti

Over the past 20 years women have made enormous gains in electoral politics. The situation is far, far from ideal but some positive changes have taken place. Therefore, we think it is important to encourage and support the entry of women into elective politics.

We’re supporting Proposition N because it ensures that more women will have the opportunity to assume leadership roles in City government. The two year experiment with district elections produced more women supervisors than at any other time in San Francisco’s history.

The gains women have made could be easily lost under the current city-wide system. Proposition N will prevent the clock from being turned back because it allows newcomers a fair chance to compete without always having to run against entrenched incumbents.

Proposition N is equitable and fair to everyone.

Join us and vote YES on Proposition N.

Helen Dawson
Miriam Smith

As a small business owner and long time resident of San Francisco, I’m supporting Proposition N because it makes good sense for our City.

Limiting Supervisors’ terms will create a Board of Supervisors more accountable to the needs of San Franciscans. Under the current city-wide system, too many Supervisors see service on the Board as a career.

They worry more about keeping their seats than about doing the job they were elected to do. As a result, politics is all to often put ahead of the City welfare.

Let’s get politics out of City Hall.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Zdenka Bodisco
Mike Salarno
Harold Hoogasian
Small Business Owners
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

We're supporting the Two Term Limit because San Francisco needs new political leadership. The Two Term Limit will open the "Door of Opportunity" for new candidates to serve on the Board of Supervisors.

The Two Term Limit will allow a new generation of civic leaders to represent our City. It is a fair and democratic way to reform the current system and to restore citizens' confidence in City Hall.

San Francisco's government should reflect the diversity of the people who live here. This is the meaning of a Democratic and free system. The Two Term Limit insures that new people with new ideas will have a fair chance to serve the City.

Don't be fooled by arguments of professional, career politicians. The Two Term Limit is good for our community and it is good for San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Steve M. Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu

WHY DIDN'T WE GET TO VOTE ON THE TWO-TERM LIMIT LAST YEAR?

Because Louise Renne found a legal loophole to get the measure thrown off the ballot after the Registrar of Voters had certified that it qualified for submission to the electorate.

Never mind that when Renne violated a number of election laws several years ago she got everyone to overlook the "technicality."

But what do you expect?
This is the same Louise Renne who sued the Olympic Club because it had no female members conveniently "overlooking" the fact that her husband Paul belongs to the all-white, all-male San Francisco Golf Club.

Say "No" to Renne's legal machinations!
Vote "Yes" on "N."

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

WHAT ARE THEY AFRAID OF?

Why are the Supervisors and their contributors fighting the two-term limit so hard?

Why did City officials use a legal loophole to get this same measure thrown off the ballot last fall?

Are they afraid they won't be able to give away another city street worth $9 million to the Rockefellers for free like they did in 1987?

Are they afraid that the people might vote to turn them out?

Clean up City Hall! Yes on N!

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic Senate Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The Two-Term Limit is a reform whose time has come!
At the Federal, State, and Local levels, political reformers agree that the powers of incumbency virtually preclude incumbents from being defeated at the polls, and that term limitation is the only way to ensure turnover in legislative bodies. Even Attorney General John Van de Kamp has proposed a twelve-year limit for State legislators.

Since the return to City-wide elections in 1980, only two incumbent Supervisors have been defeated at the polls. They were replaced by Wendy Nelder and Angela Alioto — the daughters of a former Police Chief and Mayor, respectively. Because of this trend, Supervisors have become burned-out, complacent, less accountable to the voters, and more beholden to the special interests who contributed to their re-election campaigns.

New blood is badly needed in any legislative body to keep it healthy and alive. Many non-incumbents have an agenda, new energy, and fresh approaches to governing. If they are allowed to be elected and they are competent, they should be able to translate their agenda into legislation in eight years and then move on to higher office. If they aren’t able to enact their agenda, either they are incompetent or their agenda is out-of-step with the sentiments of the City. In either case, there is no need for Supervisors to serve on the Board more than eight years.

Proposition N will remedy stagnation on our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on N.

Harold M. Hoogasian
Christopher L. Bowman

Proposition N would limit San Francisco supervisors to two consecutive terms of office, just like the mayor. It’s a modest reform that deserves your vote.

Proposition N would not force any incumbent out of office. All current supervisors could run for one more term after their present term expires. And after four years, they could run again and hold office for two more terms.

The President of the United States has been limited to two consecutive terms of office since 1951. The Mayor of San Francisco has been limited to two consecutive terms since 1953. San Mateo County has a term limit for its board of supervisors. Proposition N is not a new or radical idea; it’s an overdue reform for a stagnant system.

The founders of our city charter envisioned supervisors as part-time citizen legislators, not full-time professional politicians. Proposition N respects and revives that tradition.

A bit of fresh air never hurt anybody — even two-term supervisors!

Please vote YES on Proposition N.

Senator Quentin Kopp

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

The current system of electing supervisors in San Francisco badly needs reform. But Proposition N is not the answer. The Board of Supervisors is not accountable to the people, largely because of the pernicious influence of large monetary contributions. A two-term limit would only exacerbate the problem. All supervisors would either be rookies or lame ducks, resulting in a tremendous shift of power to the bureaucracy, without lessening the powerful influence of money in campaigns.

What San Francisco needs is real campaign reform — limiting the ability of supervisors to vote on the pet projects of their major contributors, and district election of supervisors. Both would greatly reduce the enormous sums of money needed to run for office citywide.

Proposition N is a false promise of reform. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N!

Dennis Antenore
Robert Barnes
Ron Braithwaite
Supervisor Harry Britt
Gordon Chin
Brother Kelly Cullen
Catherine Dodd R.N.
Noah Griffin
Sue Hestor
Agar Jaacks
Geraldine M. Johnson
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco
Labor Council
Leslie Katz
Tony Kilroy

Myra G. Kopf
Steven M. Krefting
William J. Brandy Moore
Jim Morales
Connie O’Connor
Ruth Picon
Mauri Schwartz
Yori Wada

Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead
Harold T. Yee
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943 and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and a public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, 11 members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected to a term of four years, from the commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, the respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors who shall hold office on the eighth day of January, 1981, shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on said date and the 11 persons elected as members of the board of supervisors at the general election in 1980 shall succeed to said offices on said eighth day of January, 1981. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of supervisors elected at the general election in 1980 shall be as follows: the six members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of four years; the five members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms.

Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the eighth day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1977, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the eighth day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor, or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

The effective date of this section as amended is July 1, 1990. All supervisors holding office on that date shall be deemed to have served one full four year term upon the expiration of their then current terms of office.
Hypodermic Syringes

PROPOSITION O
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles? YES 309 NO 310

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law regulates the sale, distribution and use of hypodermic syringes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on "O"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

"Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted it would not affect the cost of government."

How "O" Got on the Ballot
On September 15, 1989 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,173 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,774 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

The connection between AIDS and unclean needles is unchallenged. Virtually every authority on the subject agrees that sharing needles increases the chances of contracting AIDS. San Francisco has an estimated 13,000 IV drug users, each of whom is at risk of contracting AIDS and spreading it to their sexual partners or their unborn children. Tens of thousands of people are being directly threatened with contracting AIDS because it is illegal to obtain clean, safe needles.

Some groups are trading clean needles with addicts for their dirty ones. This removes contaminated needles from circulation and can dramatically cut the infection rate among drug users and their partners. But these groups face up to a six months in jail and a $1,000 fine. One member of this group, who lost her mother to AIDS, contracted through a dirty needle, said, "I lost a parent to this because this bureaucracy sits around and talks while lots of people are dying." Dr. John Newmeyer of the Haight Ashbury Free Medical Clinics said, "People are dying because of our institution’s resistance to AIDS risk reduction methods."

In an attempt to stop this disease from being spread to drug users and their partners AIDS prevention workers are risking legal persecution. Jerry DeJong, who works with substance abusers and is a member of the Mayor’s Narcotic’s Task Force, said “...with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives.” But in a sane, free society it shouldn’t be necessary to break the law to save lives.

The only way this deadly policy can be changed is for the state legislature to change the law. These State laws should be repealed.

Pamela Williard Pickens
Secretary San Francisco Libertarian Party

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition O
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition O
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Dr. John Watters of the Urban Health Study says that, "The middle class have access to clean needles." Poor people can’t get clean needles, because they are illegal. Black and Latino IV drug users have a more difficult time finding clean needles and are thus more likely to be infected with AIDS. Because minorities are more likely to be infected with AIDS a higher proportion of their sexual partners or unborn children are being infected. AIDS is likely to become the leading cause of death in young Blacks and Latinos if things continue as they have. Legal clean needles will help save their lives.

Christina Groth

The San Francisco Department of Health estimates that there are 13,000 IV drug users in the city. If clean needles remain unavailable to them the AIDS infection rate can easily reach over 60%. If these 60% infect just two other people either through shared needles or sex, the total number of infected people can reach 23,400. San Francisco can’t afford the financial burden it is under today from AIDS cases. Prevention through clean and legal needles can save us millions of tax dollars without costing us a cent. Legal needles make financial sense.

Isaac Klein

The San Francisco Chronicle has reported on the use of needles for IV drug use in Scotland. The newspaper said that in Edinburgh police launched a crackdown on the availability of clean needles. Within 18 months of the crackdown 50% of all IV drug users were infected with AIDS. Soon their sexual partners and unborn babies were infected with the disease. But 30 miles away in Glasgow the police took no action against the availability of clean needles and only 4 to 7 percent of needle users were infected. Dr. Roy Robertson, Edinburgh’s leading authority on AIDS said, “Making needles available to addicts is not the only answer to the problem of AIDS among drug users but certainly, it has to be part of the solution.”

VOTE YES!

George Meyer

WHAT IS CANADA DOING RIGHT?

In Canada, fewer than 1% of AIDS cases are from needles!
In the United States, about 50% of new cases now involve needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners and babies, (up from about 20-30% in the beginning of the epidemic).
What is Canada doing right?

The AIDS epidemic has hit here many times worse than there. Why?
In Canada, drug-users can buy sterile needles in drugstores.

GRASSROOTS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 0

SURGEON GENERAL KOOP ON CLEAN NEEDLES

"One of the strongest advocates of making needles legal is Surgeon General Koop who addressed that issue last November (1987):

"I'm asked about clean needles everywhere I go. I've always said the same thing. If clean needles will do anything to contain a part of the epidemic, we should not have any foolish inhibitions about so doing."

(S.F. Sentinel 1/22/88)

Wm. Schwartzman, M.D.

---

Clean needles cause no diseases.

Legal needles are clean needles.

Vote Yes.

William Schwartzman, MD

---

Does this initiative "condone drugs"?

If you vote Yes, that could be interpreted as condoning drugs.

But if you vote No, that could equally well be interpreted as condoning the spread of AIDS (and hepatitis, and many other diseases).

The AIDS epidemic was caused by a combination of germs, working together to collapse the immune system.

N.Y.'s health department has concluded that the HIV epidemic already existed among New York addicts in the 1970's.

That epidemic existed only because New York has laws against addicts buying clean needles.

If we keep these deadly laws, no one can predict what future epidemics might result.

GRASSROOTS

---

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES ENCOURAGES STERILE NEEDLES

The National Academy of Sciences the country's most prestigious scientific organization in 1986, issued a major study titled "Confronting AIDS". Many lives could have been saved if California had promptly implemented the conclusion drawn by America's leading scientists:

"IT IS TIME TO BEGIN EXPERIMENTING WITH PUBLIC POLICIES TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF STERILE NEEDLES AND SYRINGES BY REMOVING LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS TO THEIR POSSESSION AND USE."

Wm. Schwartzman, MD

Wm. Steinsmith, MD

---

The issue is not "free needles".

Some of us believe that mass giveaways of clean needles is best. Others of us believe it would be enough if doctors and pharmacies were allowed to sell needles, as with diabetics.

Legal needles are as cheap as ballpoint pens, so cheap that price would be no barrier.

This initiative takes no position on "free needles" programs, only for legalization — a prerequisite for either approach.

GRASSROOTS
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Under present California law, even doctors aren’t allowed to provide needles except for approved purposes. So far “stopping AIDS” is not an approved purpose.

Under “legalization”, needles are a medical question, not a police question. A doctor’s prescription could still be required, as with diabetes. Whatever controls are adopted, needles will be better controlled under legalization than they are now.

William Steinsmith, M.D.

Dr. Don Francis, an epidemiologist with the Centers for Disease Control said, “We can’t overstate the threat of AIDS among addicts in the minority population in the inner city.” Dr. Francis says that there is no evidence that legal, clean needles increase the use of drugs. The only thing stopping clean needles is the law. It’s time for Sacramento to repeal the law and save lives.

Will Wohler

According to the New York Times a new, rare virus known as HTLV-II is spreading through the IV drug community because of needle sharing. Spread in the same manner as AIDS, this virus “could cause leukemia or other serious diseases and may exact a rising toll in future years.” Surveys have found that 20% of addicts in New Orleans were infected and in San Francisco a preliminary survey of blood donors showed this new disease has a higher rate of incidence than the AIDS virus. Because it can take as long as 20 years to develop no one can know for sure how many people have been infected. Clean, legal needles will stop the transmission of this disease. VOTE YES!

John Whisman

Clean needles save the lives of innocent victims of AIDS. Not everyone who gets AIDS because people share needles is an addict. Some are small babies. The Centers for Disease Control says 314 babies were born in 1988 with AIDS because their mothers used infected needles. Dr. James Buehler of the CDC said “We need to do what we can to prevent the sharing of dirty needles. Sharing dirty equipment is the worst problem.” In California it is illegal to obtain clean needles so addicts share. Because they share, babies are born with AIDS. Save lives. Legalize needles. VOTE YES!

Mark Pickens

Illegal needles, which force IV drug users to share unclean needles, is now the cause of over one-third of all AIDS cases in the United States according to the federal government’s Centers for Disease Control. In 1988, 10,747 people contracted AIDS because of sharing unclean needles. Some of these people never used needles themselves. 226 were men who had sex with women who used needles, 623 were women who had sex with men who used unclean needles and 314 were unborn babies. Over 1,000 people who don’t use drugs were infected because clean needles are illegal. VOTE YES FOR LEGAL, CLEAN NEEDLES!

Pamela Williard Pickens

Proposition O was endorsed by the Central Committee of the Democratic Party of San Francisco on March 21, 1990. VOTE YES!

John Whisman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Clean, legal needles will save lives. Jerry De Jong of the Mayor's Narcotics Task Force said, "The bottom line is that this is not a moral or legal issue. Unfortunately with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what's sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives." Something is very wrong when its illegal to save lives; and that wrong must be corrected. Tell Sacramento that we want to legalize saving lives. We need clean, legal needles now!

Ron Dorsey

Illegal needles are the primary means of spreading AIDS to minority communities. Most of the IV drug users and their partners who have been infected with AIDS are Black or Latino. Most of the babies born with AIDS because of needle sharing by their mothers are also Black and Latino. Blacks and Latinos are now more likely than ever before to become infected with AIDS because clean needles are illegal. Legal, clean needles will slow the infection rate and decrease the number of deaths in minority communities. Illegal needles hurt Blacks and Latinos more than they hurt others. Support legal needles.

Jim Peron

Prof. Ethan Nadelman, in the Washington Post, reported that "The governments of England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, the Netherlands and several other countries have actively attempted to limit the spread of AIDS by removing restrictions on the sale of syringes ...." Dr. Nadelman notes that there is growing evidence that legal needles do not increase the use of drugs but they do save lives.

George O'Brien

A former prosecutor of high-level drug dealers, Ben Clark, said in The Daily Recorder, a law newspaper, that legal restrictions on clean needles "have had the disastrous effect of forcing drug users to share syringes. Over half the addicts in New York State are infected with AIDS, and the rate of infection among intravenous drug users in Illinois is growing dramatically."

While some people may say addicts deserve to die, Clark notes, "... the issue is not simply whether society should sit back and watch addicts kill themselves off: AIDS transmitted by needles does not stay within the druggie population. Unborn children of AIDS-infected female users may become infected. The sex partners of persons with AIDS are exposed to the disease. Needle-sharing prostitutes interact with the drug-free heterosexual community on a daily basis." Clark says that clean, legal needles have never been proven to increase drug use but they do save lives. VOTE YES!

Sam Grove
Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION O

There is no scientific evidence that unlimited and uncontrolled availability of hypodermic syringes/needles will stop the spread of AIDS. Proposition "O" would open the floodgates to the purchase and distribution of hypodermic syringes, without prescription, in drug stores, supermarkets and in the streets without medical supervision under the guise of stopping the spread of AIDS. Addicts will continue to commit crimes to pay for the dope since possession and sale of drugs, such as crack cocaine and heroin, will still be illegal.

Latest statistics show that over 80 percent of inmates in our already overcrowded jails are there for illegal drug offenses.

Who will protect the public against the careless disposal of these used needles by addicts?

Black communities in San Francisco are under siege from the sale of illegal drugs and the crime this produces. Approval of Proposition "O" by the voters permitting use of unprescribed legal needles and illegal drugs could leave the City open to millions of dollars in lawsuits for unsupervised use of a medical procedure by intravenous drug addicts from death and other causes.

WE URGE A "NO" VOTE ON PROPOSITION "O". It should not be City policy to support the removal of all restrictions in the distribution, sale and use of hypodermic syringes.

Rev. Amos Brown
Hon. Naomi Gray
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Senator Quentin Kopp
Dr. Raye Richardson
Lulann McGriff
Dr. Juliianne Malveaux
Melvin Miles
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TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION O

We, the people of the City and County of San Francisco, California, call upon the California State Legislature to eliminate all sanctions, criminal, regulatory, or civil, on the manufacture, use, sale or other distribution of hypodermic syringes. We do this to reduce the spread of AIDS and other diseases.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION K (Continued from page 100)

charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of $100.

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such a time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission after the regular daily working hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

This amendment shall become operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY: AIRPORTS COMMISSION
3.690 Commission; Composition

An airports commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on September 1, 1996. On the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

All rights, claims, actions, orders, obligations, proceedings and contracts relating to the airport department under the public utilities commission existing prior to the effective date of these amendments shall not be affected by the adoption thereof, and shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the airports commission.

This amendment shall be operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY-TWO: PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION
3.698 Commission — Composition

A parking and traffic commission and the department of parking and traffic are hereby established. The parking and traffic commission shall consist of five seven members. If not in conflict with state law, members of the parking and traffic commission shall serve ex-officio as members of the parking authority.

The term of each member shall be for four years; provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section shall, by lot classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided further, that terms of the two commissioners created by the amendment of June, 1990 shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fifth day of December, 1992; and on the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month. Any person may serve concurrently as a member of the San Francisco parking authority and the parking and traffic commission.
Did you know that you can vote before Election Day? Vote absentee in person at City Hall (Room 158) starting May 7 or by mail — fill out the application on the back cover.
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IS GOING TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON ELECTION DAY A PROBLEM?

If you are unable to go to your polling place to vote on Election Day (Tuesday, June 5, 1990), you may vote by absentee ballot in one of two ways:

1. **Vote at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.** Starting on May 7 through June 5, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., you can vote in Room 158 at City Hall.

2. **Vote by mail.** Complete the application for an absentee ballot on the back cover. Tear or cut off the back cover, fold it in half with the address of the Registrar of Voters on the outside, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated, and mail the form.

Voters who have specified disabilities may apply to be a **permanent absentee voter.** Please refer to page 24.
**ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION**

Must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990

June 5, 1990 Consolidated Primary Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>MIDDLE INITIAL</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX OR MAIL DROP ADDRESS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER AND STREET</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (If different from above)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.O. BOX OR STREET</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I HAVE NOT AND WILL NOT APPLY FOR AN ABSENTEE BALLOT BY ANY OTHER MEANS.

X

SIGNATURE (DO NOT PRINT) DATE DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER EVENING PHONE NUMBER

➢➢➢ I understand that voters with specified disabilities may qualify as Permanent Absent Voters. See page 24.

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
VOTE!

Polls are open from 7 am to 8 pm
See the label on the back cover for the location of your polling place.

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there is still a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:30 a.m. to about 9:00 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL
I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ________________________________
Address ___________________________ Apt. # _________
Telephone No. (required) ______________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s): __________________________
Second choice locations (if any) __________________________

Signature ________________________________
TABLE OF CONTENTS
Voter Information Pamphlet
Consolidated Primary Election June 5, 1990

GENERAL INFORMATION
Poll Worker Application ........................................... Inside Front Cover
Purpose of the Voter Information Pamphlet .................. 3
Voting Instructions .................................................. 4
Sample Ballot ......................................................... 5-21
Words You Need to Know ......................................... 22
Voter Selection Coupon ............................................ 23
Voting Accessibility for the Disabled ......................... 24
Permanent Absentee Voter Application ....................... 24
Your Rights as a Voter ............................................. 25
Local Offices to be Voted on This Election ................. 25
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures ............... 36
Absentee Ballot Application ..................................... Back Cover
Location of Your Polling Place ................................ Back Cover
Index ........................................................................ 130

CANDIDATES FOR ASSESSOR
Paul E. Schwenger .................................................... 26
Richard D. Hongisto .................................................. 26
Wendy Nelder .......................................................... 27
Ronald G. Kershaw ................................................... 27

CANDIDATE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
Jeff Brown .................................................................. 28

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERIOR COURT
JUDGE, OFFICE #3
Alex Saldamando ....................................................... 29
J. Dominique Olcomendy ........................................... 29

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERIOR COURT
JUDGE, OFFICE #5
Kay Tsenin .................................................................. 30
Carlos Bea .................................................................. 30

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERIOR COURT
JUDGE, OFFICE #15
Donna Hitchens .......................................................... 31
Jerome T. Benson ....................................................... 31

CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL COURT
JUDGE, OFFICE #1
James Harrigan .......................................................... 32
Julie Tang .................................................................... 32
Ellen Chaitin .............................................................. 33
William J. O'Connor .................................................. 33

CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL COURT
JUDGE, OFFICE #3
Lillian K. Sing ............................................................ 34
Jerome A. DeFilippo ................................................... 34

PROPOSITIONS
A Public Safety Improvement Bonds .......................... 37
B School Facilities Safety Special Tax ....................... 45
C Equipment Lease Financing .................................. 51
D Neighborhood Beautification Fund ....................... 55
E ................................................................................. Withdrawn
F Minimum Firefighter Staffing ........................................................................................................ 61
G Former Supervisor Health Benefits ..................... 75
H Fire Inspector and Engineer Retirement Benefits .... 79
I Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts ................. 83
J Human Rights Commission .................................... 89
K Seven Member Commissions ................................. 93
L Commissioner Residency Requirement ................. 101
M Commission Gender Composition ....................... 107
N Two-Term Limit for Supervisors ......................... 113
O Hypodermic Syringes .............................................. 121

PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 5, 1990 election. The Pamphlet includes:
1. a Sample Ballot (i.e., a copy of the ballot you see at your polling place or the one you receive when you vote ........................................... Page 5-21
2. the location of your polling place .................................. (see label on the back cover)
3. application for absentee ballot ........................................ back cover
4. definitions of words you need to know ......................... 22
5. information for disabled voters; and application for permanent absentee voter status ......................... 24
6. rights of voters ......................................................... 25
7. statements from the candidates who are running for office ......................................................... 26-34
8. information about each proposition, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the proposition, and the legal text ......................................................... 37-128
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE Stub OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT UP]. PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfora con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
请把带针之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE Stub SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。在封袋上，有空白格預備供投票人應用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOBERNADOR</th>
<th>省長</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. FRANK WONG</td>
<td>Retired Systems Engineer / Ingeniero en Sistemas Jubilado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>Political Science Teacher / Profesor de Ciencias Políticas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>Singer / Cantante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES PINEDA JR.</td>
<td>Administrator; Army Veteran / Administrador; Veterano del Ejército</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANKLIN R. GERATY</td>
<td>Retired Intelligence Agent / Agente Jubilado de Espionaje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>Farmer-Electrician-Rancher / Granjero-Electricista-Ranchero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYDON BYRNE</td>
<td>Entrepreneur / Empresario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANNE FEINSTEIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES A. MAHON III</td>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>Attorney General, California / Procurador General, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK CALNEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VICEGOBERNADOR</th>
<th>副州長</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lieutenant Governor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. MC CARTHY</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor of California / Vicegobernador de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Mervin Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March Fong Eu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Gray Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Kathleen Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wesley Sanders, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTY</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA REINER</td>
<td>District Attorney of Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLÓ SMITH</td>
<td>District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS 保険委員</td>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY MURPHY</td>
<td>Certified Insurance Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER A. ZELMAN</td>
<td>Director, Consumers' Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY COLLIS</td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL PRESS</td>
<td>Consumer Advocacy Commentator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY BOURHIS</td>
<td>Insurance Consumers Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL BLANCO</td>
<td>Living Trust Attorney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D 13, 14 & 15 7-20
### MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN
Member, State Board of Equalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMIL G. POLLACK</td>
<td>Tax Compliance Specialist</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS JOHN PAPAN</td>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD TABASH</td>
<td>Lawyer, Business Consultant</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAD SHERMAN</td>
<td>CPA / Taxpayer's Representative / Contador Público Titulado / Representante del Contribuyente</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BALDWIN</td>
<td>Governing Board Member, Moopark Sch. Dist. / Miembro del Consejo Gobernante Distrito Escolar de Moopark</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH G. COLMAN</td>
<td>Equalization Member's Deputy / Asistente de un Miembro de Compensación</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS
United States Representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NANCY PELOSI</td>
<td>Member of Congress, 5th Congressional District / Miembro del Congreso, Distrito 5 del Congreso</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)
(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)

### MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL
Member of the State Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.</td>
<td>Speaker, California Assembly / Orador, Asamblea de California</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JAIKES</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo (现任)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATALIE BERNES</td>
<td>Community College Educator / Educadora de Colegios Comunitarios (社區教育家)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIRLEY B. BLACK</td>
<td>President SEIU 790 / Presidente SEIU 790 SEIU 790 (SEIU 790 工會主席)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT BARNES</td>
<td>Employment Counselor / Consejero de Empleos (就業顧問)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BIERNER</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo (现任)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo (现任)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIGDEN</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo (现任)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES LEGARE</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo (现任)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD K. CHAN</td>
<td>Civil Engineering Manager / Gerente de Ingenieria Civil (土木工程經理)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo (现任)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL AARON WILLIAMS</td>
<td>Business Consultant / Consultor de Negocios (業務顧問)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE M. RAYA</td>
<td>Fundraising Consultant / Consultor para Reunir Fondos (募款顧問)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE J. DODD</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo (现任)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo (现任)</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BELISLE DALEY</td>
<td>Citizen / Ciudadana (市民)</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN P. DUNBAR</td>
<td>Educator / Educador (教育家)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK GLEASON</td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERARD GLEASON</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY GRIFFIN</td>
<td>Union Representative / Representante Sindical (工會代表)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTOR HSI</td>
<td>Management Consultant / Consultor Administrativo (管理顧問)</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE J. IVY</td>
<td>Deputy Sheriff / Bailiff / Asistente al Sheriff / Alguacil (執法官)</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTOR SEETO</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo (现任)</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALOTA APARTEARIA</td>
<td>JUDICIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN BALLOT JUNE 5-1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDETE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador 退休法官，教育家</td>
<td>132 132 132 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria 学院学监</td>
<td>134 134 134 134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL HONIG State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estructural de Instrucción Pública 州教育司</td>
<td>135 135 135 135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK ISLER Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios 退休教师，商人</td>
<td>137 137 137 137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3 Superior Court Judge, Office #3</td>
<td>137 137 137 137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal 地方法院法官</td>
<td>141 141 141 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal 地方法院法官</td>
<td>143 143 143 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5 Superior Court Judge, Office #5</td>
<td>143 143 143 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLOS BEA Incumbent / Titular del Cargo 现任</td>
<td>147 147 147 147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAY TSENIN Attorney / Abogada 律师</td>
<td>149 149 149 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15 Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>149 149 149 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior 高等法院法官</td>
<td>153 153 153 153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS Attorney / Abogada 律师</td>
<td>155 155 155 155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</td>
<td>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY &amp; COUNTY</td>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>RONALD KERSHAW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSE PUBLIC</td>
<td>Paul Schwenger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC Defender</td>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDICIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LILLIAN D. SING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUICE DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>JUICE DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
<td>DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William O'Connor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT, OFFICE #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote for One
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

107 HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

YES 185  →  NO 187

108 PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

YES 189  →  NO 190

109 GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 192  →  NO 193

110 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

YES 195  →  NO 197

111 THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

YES 200  →  NO 203

N 51, N 52 & N 53  12-1N
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

初選 1990年6月5日

省提案提交選民投票

超黨派投票

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

189 SÍ 赞成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990.

Esta acta dispone un empréstito de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($500,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluye: (1) reparaciones de emergencia y mejoramiento temporal para familias e individuos sin vivienda. (2) nuevas viviendas de arriendo para familias e individuos incluyendo viviendas de arriendo que tienen las necesidades especiales de los ancianos, incapa"bles y trabajadores del campo. (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya viejas. (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

189 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA AYUDAR AL TRÁNSITO DE 1990.

Esta acta dispone un empréstito de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($500,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de tecnología de transporte y el transporte público. Los fondos se usarán para mejorar el transporte público y el tráfico en el área de San Francisco. El Fondo General se establecerá para gestionar los fondos. El Fondo General se gobierna por un comité de los gobernadores de los condados y la ciudad de San Francisco.

190 SÍ 赞成

190 NO 反對

192 SÍ 赞成

192 NO 反對

195 SÍ 赞成

EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS.

Enmienda constitucional legislativa. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto de bienes a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo.

197 SÍ 赞成

197 NO 反對

ACTA PARA LA DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESBOLLOSAMIENTOS DE 1990.

Esta medida establecería un programa de descongestionamiento del tráfico para todo el estado y permitiría al gobernador reducir la congestión del tráfico mediante la construcción de carreteras verticales, calles y caminos locales, a instalaciones de transporte en gran escala. Esta medida establecería un aumento del 50% en los costos por uso de los camiones y un aumento de cincuenta centavos por galón de combustible el 1 de enero de 1990, y un aumento adicional de uno de cada año en los siguientes cuatro años. Esta medida pone al día las limitaciones en los años anteriores para permitir que se financia el descongestionamiento del tráfico, el tráfico en gran escala, calles y caminos, servicios para los ancianos, y otras programas estatales de preservación, de acuerdo con las normas de los gobiernos estatales y locales. Esta medida continúa disponiendo que la educación pública y los colegios de educación superior de la comunidad reciben al menos el 40% de los fondos del presupuesto estatal general, y que los ingresos de la ley son insuficientes para compensar el aumento.

200 SÍ 赞成

200 NO 反對

203 SÍ 赞成

203 NO 反對

107

108

109

110

111

200年减轻交通拥堵及限制支出法案。此法案旨在解决一项问题——交通拥堵，计划征收新税来帮助缓解交通拥堵。这项法案将在1990年8月1日开始实施，每年增加燃油税1分。这项法案适用于公共教育和高等教育。该法案也将为减轻交通拥堵提供资金，包括改善公共交通系统、建设道路等。该法案的主要受益者是交通拥堵的受害者。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials' compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES 211</td>
<td>NO 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands &quot;peace officer&quot; definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226</td>
<td>NO 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230</td>
<td>NO 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NÚMERO</td>
<td>PROPUESTA</td>
<td>ACTA</td>
<td>NP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPIEDAD DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.**

Transferir $300 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir árboles. Prohiba agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $16 millones provenientes de la sobrecarga en cigarrillos y productos de tabaco; $12 millones de Fondo General; a menos que la Legislatura efectúe otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por mano de propiedades.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Legislatu...</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Reapportion...</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Earthquake Safety and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond Act of 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1990 School Facilities Bond Act. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

236 SI 贏成

LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujeta la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la votación legislativa y gabarito de las votaciones. Se crea un Comité de Ética Legislativa, impacto fiscal. Las aguas de la inmigración en los giros por redistribución podrían ser compensados parcialmente e en su totalidad por los costos de la votación pública y la posible redistribución por la cuenta. Los costos por las disposiciones para direcciones serán probablemente menores.

238 NO 反對

240 SI 贏成

REDISTRIBUCIÓN FOR COMISIÓN, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los ahorros.

242 NO 反對

243 SI 贏成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVOS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para aliviar el congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

245 NO 反對

246 SI 贏成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, las 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de las Young Harris, la Academia Matematías de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y movimientos, para la seguridad y seguridad.

248 SI 贏成

250 NO 反對

254 SI 贏成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, aditamentos a prueba de sismos, reparación, renovación y reparación de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

256 NO 反對

258 SI 贏成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolsos de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.

259 NO 反對

17-1N
**PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.**

| A | YES 263 | NO 265 |

**Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.60 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels ( parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?**

| B | YES 269 | NO 272 |

**Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?**

| C | YES 277 | NO 278 |

**Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?**

| D | YES 280 | NO 281 |

**WITHDRAWN**

| E | YES 284 | NO 285 |
CUIDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
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BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA SEGURIDAD PÚBLICA, 1990. Para continuar una deuda en bonos de $412,400,000 para la adquisición, construcción y reparación de edificios de propiedad de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, incluyendo la reparación de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros para el terremoto, la aprobación de esta propuesta permitirá a la ciudad y condado seguir proporcionando el acceso para las personas necesitadas; siempre y cuando no se contrajera más de $55,000,000 de dicha deuda en bonos en un año fiscal en particular, y siempre y cuando la autorización de la cantidad de $412,400,000 no exceda la cantidad real recibida en cuentas del FOMA o del Estado de California para las reparaciones de los daños causados por el terremoto y la reducción de los peligros.

263 SI 贷成
265 NO 反對

Tendrá el Distrito No. 90-1 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (i) la reparación, la restauración, y el reemplazo de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco dañadas por el terremoto del 17 de octubre de 1989 (el terremoto); (ii) la mejora es tanto de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, como (iii) la reconstrucción de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las Instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (iv) la conservación diferida de capital en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (v) la devolución de los recursos de seguridad contra incendios en las Instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos varían relacionados a los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recaudado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual; ($2 para parcelas residenciales de familias unidas y parcelas no residenciales, de $20 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.50 por parcela durante los años siguientes al sexto año, y ($4 para parcelas de uso mixto [con una o más unidades residenciales adiante de uno más y otros comerciales]) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, de $23.50 por unidad de vivienda durante los seis (6) primeros años y de $16 por unidad de vivienda durante los años siguientes al sexto año, con las denominadas de parcelas de residencias de familias unidas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles referentes a método de distribución y tasas anuales, para las personas mayores, ciertos terrenos de edificios de propiedad de la ciudad y condado, y las cantidades de parcelas comerciales oficiales, se dispone de mayores detalles en la resolución No. 90-3-12-11-11-11 adoptada por el Consejo del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 13 de febrero de 1990, y será establecido un límite de aprobaciones de $12,800,000 por año fiscal relacionado a los mismos para el Distrito de Instalaciones Comunitarias?

266 SI 贷成
272 NO 反對

¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisiores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujetos a límites de deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento de equipos por alquiler de una empresa sin líneas de lucro, si el Contralor certifica que el costo neto a intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros términos de financiamiento por alquiler?

277 SI 贷成
278 NO 反對

¿Creará la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vechíordiario y Limpieza de las Escaleras en las Paredes para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las esculturas de las paredes, permitiendo que las edades se desarrollen hasta un uno por ciento de sus impuestos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un límite anual de este porcentaje de manera tal de tener $1 millón disponible en el fondo cada año?

280 SI 贷成
281 NO 反對

ELIMINADA

E 撤消

¿Se realizará una enmienda a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 40,7 horas después de lo cual un bombero gana horas extra y (2) permitir que la Comisión sobre Incendios, sujeto a un máximo establecido por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de correo de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turno de 24 horas que comienzan a las 8 a.m.?

284 SI 贷成
285 NO 反對

F 撤消

市議會是否制定消防安全及消防用地的基金來支付現有消防安全及消防用地的費用，並允許通過徵收貨物稅及財產稅的費用，讓各商家及住戶們均分擔的成本之一和此基金，每年此百份之率會被稅監以補貼一百萬元基金？
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290</td>
<td>NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293</td>
<td>NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298</td>
<td>NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305</td>
<td>NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309</td>
<td>NO 310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE
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PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

288 SI 贊成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?

289 NO 反对

290 SI 贊成
¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?

292 NO 反对

293 SI 贊成
¿Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?

295 NO 反对

296 SI 贊成
¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?

297 NO 反对

298 SI 贊成
¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tráfico, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Premisas de cinco a siete miembros?

299 NO 反对

300 SI 贊成
¿Serán los requisitos de los miembros de las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que sean miembros de una de las siguientes: comisiones y comités o miembros del Consejo de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando, en caso de no cumplirse con estos requisitos, se aplique una adecuada compensación en población, económicamente equivalente a los residentes de la Ciudad que cumple con estos requisitos?

301 NO 反对

302 SI 贊成
¿Se reformará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo a comisión nombrado por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otro modo sea una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?

304 NO 反对

305 SI 贊成
¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos periodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervecadores; y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un periodo completo de cuatro años cuando termine su periodo actual?

307 NO 反对

309 SI 贊成
¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que elimine todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de agujas hipodérmicas?

310 NO 反对

N 51, N 52 & N 53
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ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — If you do not wish to go to your polling place to vote, you may vote by mail or by going to the Registrar's Office in City Hall in person. This is called absentee voting.

BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest.


CHARTER BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (PROPOSITION J, K, L) — Boards and commissions created by the Charter, either directly or indirectly.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITION O) — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

DEFERRED CAPITAL MAINTENANCE (PROPOSITION B) — Major building repair projects that have been postponed.

ELECTOR (PROPOSITION L) — A person who is eligible to register to vote.

FINANCE (PROPOSITION C) — Various ways to pay for something over time. This may include raising money or offering something in trade.

FISCAL YEAR (PROPOSITION A, D) — The twelve months from July 1 to June 30 make up a fiscal year. The City budgets revenues and expenses on a fiscal year basis.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INITIATIVE (PROPOSITION F, O) — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE (PROPOSITION D, J) — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters. For such a law to be passed by the Board of Supervisors, a majority, (or in some cases, three-fourths) of the Supervisors must vote to approve the law at two consecutive meetings.

OUTSTANDING PRINCIPAL (PROPOSITION A, C) — The actual amount of borrowed money, not yet paid back. Principal does not include interest charges.

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party's candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a political party's candidate for each office you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A person who has turned in the required papers and signatures with the Registrar of Voters to run for an office as a write-in candidate. The name of this person will not be on the ballot. Voters who want to vote for this person can do so by writing the name of the person on the inside of the grey envelope given with the ballot.

SPECIAL PROPERTY TAX [MELLO-ROOS DISTRICT] (PROPOSITION B) — A flat tax on a parcel of land, which is not based on the property's value. The special tax would be in addition to current property taxes. This tax requires a two-thirds majority vote.

STAFFING LEVEL (PROPOSITION F) — The number of employees on duty at any one time.

TAX EXEMPT DEBT (PROPOSITION C) — Money borrowed by the City which is paid back with interest. The lenders are not taxed on the money earned from these loans.

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now," "The Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters' rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.
# VOTER SELECTION COUPON

**CUT OUT THIS COUPON AND TAKE IT WITH YOU TO THE POLLS.** After reading this pamphlet, write down the names of the candidates of your choice, and circle the numbers corresponding to **"YES"** or **"NO"** on the propositions. Completing this coupon will help you vote faster and help reduce lines at the polls. **PLEASE NOTE** — This is a Primary Election. You can only vote for partisan offices if you are registered as a member of a party, and if there are candidates from your party running.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE -- OFFICE 15</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE -- OFFICE 1</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE -- OFFICE 3</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE -- OFFICE 5</th>
<th>ASSessor</th>
<th>PUBLIC DEFENDER</th>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNOR</td>
<td>(Check Ballot for the number of candidates to vote for)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT. GOVERNOR</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARY OF STATE</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROLLER</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURER</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE COMMISSIONER</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, BOARD OF EQUALIZATION</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>E WITHDRAWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCAL PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>WITHDRAWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS**

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, and Molly Wood

Board of Supervisors appointees: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gillham, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that absentee ballots be mailed to them or they may vote in person at City Hall from May 7 through June 5 during normal working hours (see “Your Rights as a Voter” section of this pamphlet). In addition, voters with specified disabilities enumerated below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library’s Branch for the Blind at 3150 Sacramento Street produces and distributes tape recorded copies of the State and Local Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually-impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voter’s office by calling 554-4386.

ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them. The persons providing assistance may be someone who came with the voter, or poll workers can be asked to provide needed assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the sidewalk in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If your polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided that this will not impede the flow of traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large print instructions on how to vote and magnifying sheets to enlarge the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows for seated voting.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip tool and pen to be used in punching the ballot and signing in.

APPLICATION TO BE A PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

The physically disabled may apply to be permanent absentee voters. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, you will automatically receive an absentee ballot every election until you move or re-register.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the form below and return it to the Registrar of Voters. Room 158, City Hall, San Francisco, 94102. Each time you move or re-register to vote, you must apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases you do not need to re-apply.

I hereby apply for “Permanent Absentee Voter” status in San Francisco by reason of:

_____ Lost use of one or more limbs.  _____ Lost use of both hands.

_____ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g. cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair).

_____ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease.

_____ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities.

_____ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

_____ PLEASE SEE EXPLANATORY LETTER ATTACHED.

Name  

FIRST  MIDDLE  LAST

Residence Address  STREET

   #  

Mailing Address  STREET

   #  CITY  ZIP- CODE

(if different than residence address given above)

I declare under penalty of Perjury that the above is true and correct:

Date  Signature

(Return only this page; do not return the whole book)
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens over 18 years old who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 8, 1990.

Q — I moved before May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 8 and June 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — If you are registered as a member of a political party you may choose a candidate for:
Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner,
Member-State Board of Equalization (District 2), Member-State Assembly, State Senator if you live in Senate District 8, United States Representative, and members of the County Central Committee.
Non-partisan offices are:
Superintendent of Public Instruction, Superior Court Judge, Municipal Court Judge, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 5, 1990. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let us know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help you.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don’t know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any test?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to my polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 5 by:
• going to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall from May 7 through June 5, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday; or
• mailing a request for an absentee ballot. You may send in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. The application must be received by the Registrar of Voters before May 29, 1990.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include:
• your home address
• the address to which you want the ballot mailed
• your printed name and your signature.
Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is paid $98,670 a year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is paid $102,882 a year.
The Public Defender represents the following persons unable to pay for their own lawyer: 1) persons accused of crimes, 2) juveniles in legal actions, and 3) persons in mental health hearings.
Candidates for Assessor

PAUL E. SCHWENGER

My address is 16 Ord Court, Apt. #4
My occupation is Deputy Assessor
My age is 53
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan, Mission High School graduate, and San Francisco State University graduate. I have been a Deputy Assessor for San Francisco for the past 22 years. I have been awarded the SRPA, Senior Real Property Designation, which is one of the highest awards for professional appraisers. My 22 years of experience will enable me to effectively represent homeowners’ and renters’ concerns before State Legislative Committees. I will analyze property values to make sure business pays its fair share and I will oversee the operations of the Assessor’s office in an experienced and professional manner.

Paul E. Schwenger

The sponsors for Paul E. Schwenger are:

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: With 28 years of public service, I am the only candidate with real management experience.

As Sheriff of San Francisco, I managed 399 employees; as Police Chief, 2,500; as New York Prison Commissioner, 13,000.

While this would be the largest managerial responsibility faced by the other candidates, it would be my smallest.

I want to be your assessor so I can make it a model agency. I know government and real estate. I am dedicated to public service and to lower taxes for you.

Mayor Agnos agrees I am the rational choice.

I would appreciate your vote.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Assessor

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Attorney/Supervisor
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have absolutely no ownership or income interests in real property which create any conflict of interest as Assessor.

As attorney for 25 years, Supervisor for three terms, and past President of the Board, I have a proven record of unique, practical accomplishments.

Just as I’ve fought for reduced local government spending, I’ll work for new statewide lower assessment formulas with the same energy that created the nationally copied No-Smoking Ordinance; the Police Fingerprint Computer which reduced our crime rate; laws allowing earthquake victims to quickly replace damaged buildings.

My goal is to achieve fair, reduced property assessments.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:


RONALD G. KERSHAW

My address is 3533 21st Street
My occupation is Real Estate Portfolio Manager
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are: B.S. Accounting, Brigham Young University 1975

MBA Real Estate, Golden Gate University 1986

Eleven years experience in all aspects of property management, appraisals, renovation and property sales

Currently responsible for supervising a real estate portfolio of $150,000,000

Past President SF Chapter, Institute of Internal Auditors
Currently, President, Log Cabin Club of San Francisco
San Francisco homeowner and resident since 1975.
San Francisco needs a fiscal conservative who is the only qualified candidate to become the City’s new Assessor.

Ronald G. Kershaw

The sponsors for Ronald G. Kershaw are:


Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender represents people in trouble who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. The responsibility must be performed ethically, competently, and efficiently. During three terms in office, with the help of a superb staff of men and women, that duty has been fulfilled with compassion, dignity, and with the highest professional standards of the American legal system.

In the next term, I pledge to continue to carry out the special trust of this office: to guarantee that everyone in this City has the full benefit of our Constitution and is treated with fairness and with justice.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #3

ALEX SALDAMANDO

My address is 700 Arkansas Street
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: In my 11 years presiding as a Municipal Court Judge, I have worked to protect the citizens of San Francisco. I have delivered justice swiftly and firmly, in a fair and impartial manner. As a Superior Court Judge, I would bring the same approach to felony criminal cases and complex civil disputes. I am currently President of the California Judges Foundation. My background includes experience as a prosecutor and a public interest lawyer. A graduate of the University of California (Berkeley) and Hastings College of Law, I live with my wife and two children on Potrero Hill.

My sponsors include: Judge Ira Brown, Jr.; Judge John Dearman; Judge Isabella Grant; Judge Ed Stern; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Lillian Sing; Former Judge Charles Renfrew; Mayor Art Agnos; Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein; Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi; Assemblyman Willie Brown; Assemblyman John Burton; Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Harry Britt; Supervisor Jim Gonzalez; Supervisor Terence Hallinan; Supervisor Willie Kennedy; School Board Member Rosario Anaya; School Board Member Libby Denebeim; School Board Member Fred Rodriguez; Commissioner Paul Melbostad; Larry Mazzola, President, Local 38; Thelma Shelley, Director, Performing Arts Center; Benny Yee; Stan Smith, Building Trades Council; and Police Commissioner John Keker.

J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY

My address is 340 Magellan
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a Municipal Court Judge since 1974, native Californian, resident San Francisco since 1937; attended local schools, N.D.V., St. Ignatius, USF and USF School of Law; married Patricia M. Berti, admitted State Bar 1960, devoted thirty years to public service; adjunct Professor of Law, USF; participant, member and/or lecturer for many organizations — Salesian Boys Club, 44 years — Municipal Court Speakers Bureau — California Judges Association — California Center for Judicial Education and Research — San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project; Supervising Judge, Preliminary Courts, Presiding Judge, Assistant Presiding Judge, Court Administrative Committee member eight years; honored by: San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Irish-Israeli-Italian Society, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, Lawyers Club, USF School of Law and USF Law Society for outstanding community service.


Alex Saldamando

J. Dominique Olocomendy

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge  
Office #5

KAY TSENIN

My address is 637 Steiner Street  
My occupation is Attorney and Counselor at Law  
My age is 43 years  
My qualifications for office are: B.A., San Francisco State University (Dean's List), graduate, University of San Francisco School of Law. Attorney for sixteen years specializing in civil litigation. Pro-Tem Municipal Court Judge in San Francisco for five years.

Born in China, moved to San Francisco as a child, graduate of George Washington High School.

Broad Community service includes founding of environmental law societies while in law school, Vice President for Legal Affairs for California National Organization for Women (NOW), Board Member for the Russian American Credit Union and San Francisco Trial Lawyers and Board Advisor for the Legal Advocates for Women. Vice-President, Alamo Square Neighborhood Association.

Strong commitment to equal justice for all without prejudice or bias. The following San Franciscans support me because they feel that the Superior Court needs a judge with my background, legal expertise and perspective on the law:

Sheriff Mike Hennessey, Supervisor Harry Britt, Dr. Leland Yee, Attorney Paul Melbostad, Jean Harris, Calvin Welch, Attorney Sue Hestor, Attorney Mary C. Dunlap, Roberto Esteves, Bob Ross, Matthew Rothschild, Pat Norman, Jonathan Bulkley, Susan P. Kennedy, Adrian Bermudez, Lawrence Brinkin, John H. Cushner, Attorney Anne Kiruvehkin, Eugene Kiruvehkin, N. Arden Danekas, Laura E. McBride, Donna Yutzy, Gale Armstrong.

CARLOS BEA

My address is 2727 Pierce Street  
My occupation is Judge Superior Court #5  
My qualifications for office are: I am a Superior Court Judge in San Francisco and author of articles in several professional journals, such as California Trial Lawyers and Defense Research Institute's. Am recognized by the State Bar for pro bono work with members of the Hispanic Community. Have served two terms as a member of the Board of Visitors, Stanford Law School. Was a panelist and lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar. Was an adjunct professor, Hastings College of Law and Stanford Law School. I graduated from Stanford Law School and have been an attorney in San Francisco since 1959.

Sponsors include: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Ollie Marie-Victoire, all the judges of the Superior Court, Angela Alioto, Ernest Chuck Ayala, Willie Brown, Jr., John Burton, Jim Gonzalez, Quentin Kopp, H. Jesse Arnelle, James Herman, Mary Noel Pepys, Robert McDonnell, G. Joseph Bertain, Edward McFetridge, Zeppelin Wong, Paul Renne, Leo Murphy, Jr., Gina Moscone, James Brosnahan, Barbara Caulfield, Robert Morales, Paul Haerle, Michael Hardeman, Howard Nemerovsky, Edwin Heafey, Jr., Larry Mazzola, Vincent Friia, Putnam Livermore, William Coblenz.

Kay Tsenin

Carlos Bea
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #15

DONNA HITCHENS

My address is 468 30th Street
My occupation is attorney
My age is 42 years
My qualifications for office are: Over the past thirteen years, I have represented clients in San Francisco courts, taught law to San Francisco students and served on the Boards of Directors of private and public agencies designed to further the cause of justice in our city.

   My experience as a mediator, counselor and advocate demonstrates my willingness to pursue alternative dispute resolutions. Judicial leadership and integrity are standards that the community should demand. My record attests to my ability to meet those standards.
   • J.D. UC Berkeley 1977
   • Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates, a public interest firm specializing in sex discrimination cases. 1978 – 1984
   • Co-founder, Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom
   • Staff Counsel, ACLU. 1984 – 85
   • Partner, Hitchens & Brenner. Small Business, non-profit corporations, civil rights and family law. Presently
   • Former chair, San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women.
   • Member, Board of Directors, Pacific Primary Preschool.

SUPPORT: Assemblymember John Burton; Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisors Nancy Walker, Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, and Terence Hallinan; Judge Lillian Sing, Judge Mary Morgan, and Judge Herbert Donaldson; Commissioners Jim Jefferson, Adrian Bermudez, Jr., James Morales, Paul Melbostad, Richard Grosboll, and Leni Marin; Hon. Libby Denebeim; Hon. Leland Yee; Carol Migden; Will Leong; Catherine Dodd, R.N.; Jeff Mori, and Mauri Schwartz

Donna Hitchens

JEROME T. BENSON

My address is 187 Robinhood Drive
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the Superior Court
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are:
   • 23 years public service in the courtroom protecting victims, litigants and the community.
   • 7 years as Chief of the Criminal Division in the District Attorney's Office including:
      • 65 felony jury trial prosecutions for murder, rape, child abuse, drugs, white-collar fraud.
      • Stanford Law School graduate 1964.
      • Chairman, State Bar of California Subcommittee on Jury Instructions (Criminal).
      • Member, Project Safer California.
      • Fair and equal application of the law without regard to race, sex, or economic status.
      • I am a native San Franciscan and homeowner living with my wife and two daughters near Miraloma Park.
      • My judicial office is dedicated to fair rulings, hard work, human sensitivity, and legal equality.

CITYWIDE SUPPORT:
   State Senator Quentin Kopp; Justice Harry Low; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Public Defender Jeff Brown; Sheriff Michael Hennessey; Former Chief of Police Alfred Nelder.

SUPERVISORS:
   Angela Alioto, Tom Hsieh, Wendy Nelder;

JUDGES:
   John Ertola, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Ina Geymant, Paul Alvarado, Isabella Grant;

LABOR:
   Mike Hardeeman, Stan Smith, Kevin Ryan;

ATTORNEYS AND COMMUNITY:
   William Coblenz; Harold Dobbs; Charles Breyer; Airport Commission President Morris Bernstein; Wayne Friday; Benny Yee; Louis Giraudo; Doris Thomas; Christopher Bowman; Haddie Redd; Elizabeth Aguilar-Tarchi; Ron Huberman;

Jerome T. Benson

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
OFFICE #1

JAMES HARRIGAN

My address is 494 Mangels St.
My occupation is Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department.
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I live in Glen Park with my wife, Serena Lee, and our three children.
I received my law degree with academic awards and Law Review distinction in 1975 from Golden Gate University, San Francisco.
I have completed more than 80 jury and court trials in Municipal and Superior Court, representing thousands of citizens and victims of crime in civil and criminal cases in private practice, as a public defender, and as Legal Counsel to the Sheriff.
My expertise includes: employment law, labor relations, criminal, landlord/tenant, and constitutional law. As Counsel to the Sheriff, I resolve the legal affairs of a major law enforcement agency. My work brings me before the civil and criminal justice system each day.
"James Harrigan is by far the best qualified candidate. No other candidate has his broad range of experience: public service and private practice; law enforcement and defense law; extensive courtroom experience and administrative expertise. I strongly urge your vote for James Harrigan."

Sheriff Michael Hennessey

I have not listed my sponsors. I firmly believe the voter's decision should be based on one's qualifications and experience — not on political connections.
I pledge equal application of the law. I ask for your support.
Thank you.

James Harrigan

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Ave.
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My qualifications for office are: What I am in life, I owe to my family and to an excellent education: M.A., counseling, Stanford University; B.A., psychology, University of San Francisco; Juris Doctorate, Hastings College of Law. I began practicing law in 1982 and have been an assistant district attorney since 1983: with experience in criminal prosecution and family law enforcing child support. I have served 10 years on the College Board; my colleagues elected me president three terms because of my firm but fair judgment. My duties include equitably settling conflicts, grievances and contracts. In my years of public service, compassion, integrity and common sense have always guided my decisions; and as a judge that will continue to be the case.

My supporters:
Justice Harry Low
Judges: Isabella Grant, Lenard Louie, David Garcia, Larry Kay, Mary Morgan, Bill Mallen, Herbert Donaldson.
District Attorney: Arlo Smith
Public Defender: Jeff Brown
Senators: Milton Marks, Quentin Kopp
Attorneys: Charlie Clifford, Harriet Ross, William Coblentz, Cedric Chao, Roberta Achtenberg
BART Director: Mike Bernick
Commissioners: Rosario Anaya, Tim Wolfred, Chuck Ayala, Naomi Gray.
Supervisors: Thomas Hsieh, Angela Alioto
Walter Johnson; Alex Esclamado; Reverend Amos Brown;
Carole Migden;
UC Regent Yori Wada.

Julie Tang

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

ELLEN CHAITIN
My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I'm honored that MAYOR ART AGNOS and 8 PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION — who know my courtroom experience and qualifications in civil and criminal law — endorse me.

As a lawyer in private practice 18 years, mother of 2 children, married 19 years, I care about the strength and integrity of San Francisco's courts.

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred community trust — not a consolation prize for a restless politician. A lawyer lacking courtroom experience is unqualified to be judge.

In HUNDREDS of court appearances and trials, as chair of the Bar Association Criminal Justice Advisory Council, as a San Francisco Delinquency Prevention Commissioner, and as a Hastings Law School teacher, I have demonstrated a longstanding commitment to professional excellence.

Community and law enforcement leaders who acknowledge my legal service and endorse me:

SPAKER Willie Brown
SUPERVISORS Nancy Walker, Bill Maher, Harry Britt, Terrence Hallinan
JUDGES Dorothy vonBeroldingen, John Dearman, Edward Stern
COURT COMMISSIONER George Colbert
SENATOR Milton Marks
SCHOOL BOARD JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Libby Denebein, Myra Kopf
POLICE COMMISSIONER John Keke
FIRE COMMISSIONER Sharon Bretz
SHERIFF LIEUTENANT Connie O'Connor
POLICE OFFICERS VICE PRESIDENT Paul Chignell
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY Charles Wood
BUSINESSMAN Mel Swig
PUC COMMISSIONER Rodel Rodis

WILLIAM J. O'CONNOR
My address is 3615 Buchanan St. #206
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I am the most qualified candidate for this office. I have had judicial experience, serving as Municipal Court judge pro tem for over five years, and have been commended by the Presiding Judge for the quality of my service. I have been a journeyman lawyer for 15 years, with both criminal and civil experience, and have done over 30 jury trials.

With Amnesty International and Church representatives, I have been an International Trial Observer.

I have been a Board Member of the Elizabeth Frye Center and the Irish Forum, and a volunteer on the Bar Association's free legal services panel.


William J. O'Connor

Ellen Chaitin

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
LILLIAN K. SING

My address is San Francisco Municipal Court, 400 Van Ness Ave.
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the San Francisco Municipal Court
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: I am an incumbent judge, and have been a judge since 1981. I am the first Asian-American woman judge in the history of Northern California. In 1988, I was awarded Trial Judge of the Year by San Francisco Trial Lawyers Association, one of the highest awards a Bar Association can bestow. Last year, I was unanimously elected as Municipal Court's Presiding Judge. As Presiding Judge, I implemented the Pro Tem Judge Program, drastically reduced backlog in civil/criminal cases, brought Trial Court Funding to San Francisco, spearheaded San Francisco's first judicial forum "Access To Justice" attended by 680 people. I served as a faculty member with the California Center for Judicial Education/Research which trains all new judges in California and am a faculty judge with the National Institute for Trial Advocacy which trains trial lawyers. In 1988 I lectured throughout China on the U.S. Legal/Judicial System.
Join San Francisco judges led by Presiding Judges Choppelas, and Marie-Victoire, Mayor Art Agnos, President Harry Britt, and the entire 11 Board of Supervisors, Assembly Speaker Willie Brown, Assemblyman John Burton, Senator Milton Marks, Former Police Chiefs Nelder/Cahill, DA Arlo Smith, PD Jeff Brown, Sheriff Michael Hennessey and retain me as judge.

Lillian K. Sing

JEROME A. DEFILIPPO

My address is 1534 38th Avenue
My occupation is Attorney at Law
My qualifications for office are: A third generation San Franciscan. I have practiced law in The City since 1973, served as the Legal Officer of the San Francisco Police Department and a Deputy City Attorney. I am committed to the impartial application of our laws in all judicial proceedings. Having served twenty years as a Police Officer attaining the position of Lieutenant, I am well aware of the frustrations each of us feel by the impact of crime in our City. If elected, I am committed to the imposition of the maximum sentence allowed by law for persons convicted of violent crimes or narcotic sales.
Partial list of sponsors follows:
Ann Alberigi, Catherine Archbold, Alfred Arnaud, Martin Bastiani, Chief Thomas Cahill, Ann Carrick, Peter Cimarelli, Hon. Antone Cincotta, Clement Collins, Jean DeFilippo, Cantor Martin Feldman, Nancy Feldman, H. Welton Flynn, John Fracchia, Carol Fujoka, John Gallagher, Judith Gallen, Kathleen Gee, Dr. William Gee, Susanna Lee, Margaret Leong, Maureen Mahoney, Carmelita Mathais, Phyliss Moylan, James Pagano, Renzo Panelli, Timothy J. Riordan, Rollin Schroth, Joan Swensden, Spiron Tentes, Paul Vigo, Rita Young

Jerome A. DeFilippo

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against these measures. All arguments, “official” and paid, are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None of them has been checked for accuracy by this office or any other city official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Official Arguments”

There is one “official” argument for and one against each measure, and they are published at no cost. “Official” arguments are selected by the Registrar of Voters in accordance with the priorities set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code as summarized below:

For:
1. Person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee supporting the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Against:
1. For a referendum, person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee against the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Rebuttals

Authors of official arguments may each prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. As with official and paid arguments, rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Each rebuttal follows immediately after its corresponding official argument.

Paid Arguments

All paid arguments are accepted for publication upon (1) deposit of an amount equal to $50 plus $1.50 per word, (2) submission of a petition containing valid signatures of registered voters in lieu of the printing fee at the rate of two signatures for each dollar of the fee, or (3) a combination of a printing fee and signatures which together equal the number of signatures and/or amount of money required to qualify the argument for publication.

For each measure, paid arguments follow after the official arguments and rebuttals. All paid arguments supporting a measure are printed together followed by all paid arguments against that same measure. Paid arguments within each group (e.g. all paid arguments in favor of Proposition Z) are not printed in any particular order. Rather they are arranged so that each page is fully utilized.

There is one ballot measure for which paid arguments were not accepted. The School Facilities Safety Special Tax measure is being proposed under state law; only one argument for, one argument against, and respective rebuttals for this measure are allowed.

Again, arguments and rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked by this office or any other city official or agency.
PROPOSITION A
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

YES 263
NO 265

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City buildings were damaged by the October 17, 1989 earthquake and many may not survive another strong earthquake. Many City buildings contain asbestos and many are not accessible to disabled persons. Many City buildings do not meet current health, safety and building codes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $332,400,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This total would be reduced by the amount of grants the City receives from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the State of California for earthquake repair and hazard reduction. No more than $65,000,000 of bonds could be sold in any fiscal year.

This money would be used to pay for safety improvements to some City buildings, including repairing earthquake damage, making the buildings better able to survive earthquakes, removing or reducing the danger of asbestos in these buildings, making them more accessible to the disabled and bringing them up to current codes.

The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds for not more than $332,400,000 to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue bonds to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

Controller’s Statement on “A”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that the approximate costs would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$332,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>$244,314,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$576,714,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bond authorization limits the issuance of bonds to no more than $65 million per year. Assuming a single sale on a 20 year basis at current interest rates with no reduction for possible FEMA or State funding, annual debt service on each $65 million increment would amount to $5,638,750, which amount is equivalent to one and forty-eight hundredths cents ($0.0148) in the current tax rate.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”
On February 26, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A the earthquake repair and protection measure.

Proposition A provides $332.4 million to repair earthquake damaged city buildings and to seismically reinforce many of them so that they would not sustain as much damage (or worse) during a future earthquake. This improves public safety while it also protects the investment we are making in repairs.

Your “Yes on A” vote will provide for:
- Repairs of earthquake damage, asbestos removal and handicapped accessibility work in over 200 earthquake damaged city buildings.
- Seismic strengthening of the Civic Center complex including City Hall, the Veterans Building, Opera House, Department of Public Health and Civic Auditorium.
- Seismic strengthening for the Palace of Fine Arts/Exploratorium, nine additional branch libraries, two additional police stations, two jails and the services building at San Francisco General Hospital.
- Replacement of the broken and earthquake damaged water and sewer lines at the Zoo.

Proposition A represents a prudent investment which would protect many irreplaceable public buildings from major damage or collapse in a future earthquake.

In order to keep property taxes from rising more than 2-3¢ per $100 of assessed value, Proposition A will not allow more than $65 million in bonds to be sold in any one year. It further requires that any Federal or State earthquake relief money we receive to repair these buildings reduce the amount of bonds sold. This assures that local taxpayers will not be required to pay for repairs that can be made using Federal/State emergency relief assistance.

Vote Yes on Proposition A to protect city buildings and increase public safety in a next major earthquake.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Chief Administrative Officer.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

When future earthquakes strike, our libraries need to be safe. Proposition A will provide funds to help earthquake proof our library system. Vote YES on A.

Michael Mellor, President
Friends of the San Francisco Public Library

This bond issue will help to ensure the seismic safety of the Palace of Fine Arts, home of the Exploratorium which is visited by over 600,000 people a year. Prop A represents a prudent investment to improve public safety and protect irreplaceable public buildings. We urge all citizens to vote "Yes" on Proposition A.

Exploratorium
F. Van Kasper, Chairman
William K. Coblentz, Vice Chairman
C. Richard Kramilich, Vice Chairman
G. Steven Burrill, Treasurer

Replacement of the earthquake-damaged, underground, 50-year-old water, gas and sewer lines at the San Francisco Zoo is critically needed for the safety and well-being of the animals. It will significantly improve public services to the 1.2 million children and adults who visit annually. The Zoological Society will endeavor to raise funds to renovate and build new above-ground facilities to supplement the $26 million included in the bond issue for the Zoo. Help make the Zoo a true sanctuary.

David E. Anderson
Zoo Director
Phil Arnold
Assistant General Manager
Recreation & Park
William Brewer Ely IV
Headmaster, Town School
Mary Burns
General Manager
Recreation & Park
Margaret K. Burks
Executive Director, Zoological Society
Jack W. Castor
Animal Keeper Shop Steward, Local 858
Todd Cecil
Children’s Zoo Keeper
Sherri Chiesa
President, Local 2
Robert Todd Cockburn
Executive Director, Clean Water Program
Rosemary Davidson
Urban School
Dolores A. Donovan
Animal Control & Welfare Commission

Keith G. Eickman
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Roy Eisenhardt
Director, California Academy of Sciences
Becky Evans
Conservation Activist
Norman Gershenz
Director, Ecosystem Survival Plan
Arthur J. Goedewaagen
Board Member, SPEAK
John E. Hafernik Jr.
Professor Biology, SFSU
Roger Hopkins
Director, Children’s Zoo
Michael Housh
Assistant to the Mayor
David J. Howe
Animal Keeper
Mark Hurley
Animal Control & Welfare Commission
Norma J. Kristovich
Zoo Docent Council
Connie Lurie
Vice Chairman, Zoological Society Board

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Zoological Society Board
Frances May McAteer
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Amy Meyer
People for GGNRA
Andrew Nash
President, San Francisco Tomorrow
Trent W. Orr
Recreation & Park Commissioner
Elizabeth D. Rieger
Zoo Volunteer
Fred A. Rodriguez
School Board Member
Carroll Soo-Hoo
Zoo Benefactor
Stephen V. R. Spaulding
Zoological Society Treasurer
James J. Walsh Jr.
Citizens Advisory Committee on Wastewater Management
Connie O’Connor
President, Recreation & Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We must rebuild and repair our infrastructure. The October 17 quake was a warning. More resources going to earthquake preparedness programs today will save lives in the future. Vote YES on A.

Joel Ventresca
Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods Candidate for Supervisor

We urge everyone to vote Yes on Proposition A. The people of San Francisco have a $3.5 billion investment in public buildings. This bond issue will be used to fund repairs to many of our facilities damaged in last October’s earthquake, including City Hall, General Hospital, neighborhood libraries, police stations and cultural buildings. It will also provide monies necessary to make life-safety improvements to other city buildings.

Your Yes Vote on Proposition A will protect lives and property in the event of another major earthquake at a very small cost to businesses and homeowners. Because bonds to finance repairs will be sold over 6-10 years, replacing older bond issues as they are paid-off, the result will be an almost unchanged tax rate. In fact, the City’s independent budget analyst found that the tax bill for an average homeowner will increase by less than $5.00 a month.

Proposition A is a small price to pay to preserve our investment in the city’s valuable public facilities.

Vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

We ask that you join with us in Voting YES ON PROP. “A”. Your “Yes on A” vote will provide funds to protect the two remaining Police Stations which are not yet earthquake safe or provided for in previous bond issues.

In an emergency we can do our jobs only if our own police facilities are earthquake resistant and if we can get to those places in the City which most need our services. That is why it is important to us that as many City buildings as possible are made earthquake resistant. The less damage and street obstruction that results from a future earthquake, the better we can get to these parts of the City where we are most needed. The safer the public buildings in the City are made, the better we will be able to serve the rest of the City if we ever have to face a major earthquake emergency.

For security vote “Yes on A”.

Michael Keys President
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

The damage done by the October 17th earthquake to San Francisco’s most important public buildings is considerable. To correct that damage and prepare for the future vitality of our City demands the kind of response represented by Proposition A. This proposition carefully earmarks funds to upgrade buildings such as City Hall, the War Memorial Opera House, and the Department of Public Health offices which are treasures that can never be replaced or reproduced. They not only need to be repaired, but strengthened structurally and improved, to meet today’s building codes. The Federal Government will pick up some of the damage, but much more will be needed if these vital components of our City’s daily life are to be improved and made ready for the next major quake. Proposition A requests a large sum, but this is a time when we as a City have to agree to such a request. We strongly urge your support of Proposition A.

American Institute of Architects/San Francisco Chapter

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We ask you to join us in voting “Yes on A”. The primary purpose of Prop “A” is to protect lives and public buildings from the effects of the next earthquake. As San Franciscans we all share the responsibility of having to do all we can to avoid the loss of life, the suffering and the huge costs which another, perhaps stronger or longer quake would bring. Thus we see Proposition “A” as a necessary, prudent investment in all our future.

We have a special reason to support “Prop A” and to ask you to vote YES ON “A” as well. That special reason is the fact that 20 of the buildings which will be repaired or strengthened against future earthquakes if Prop “A” passes will also be made fully accessible to the disabled. We want our City’s buildings to be repaired, to be made safe and to be made accessible to all San Franciscans.

Vote “Yes on A”.

Kathy Uhle, Executive Director,
Independent Living Resource Center
Michael L. Comini, Executive Director,
Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired

James D. Jefferson, President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn, Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bretz, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Soulis, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Frederick F. Postel, Chief of Department

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition “A”. Many city buildings were damaged in the October 17 earthquake. If these buildings are repaired and strengthened the Fire Department will be much safer when responding to future emergencies. Please help the Fire Department do its job safely and effectively by voting “Yes” on Proposition “A”.

We urgently request that you vote “Yes on A”. The War Memorial complex of buildings, dedicated to San Francisco’s veterans, are one of our city’s treasures, irreplaceable architecturally and economically. They are central to our history and we owe it to ourselves to make sure they are made as fully earthquake-resistant as possible.

The October 17 earthquake was a warning which we must heed. Proposition “A” is a prudent and necessary response. It will protect our treasured buildings and, even more importantly, it will protect the lives of those who use them and the memories of those whose lives they commemorate.

Harold F. Jackson, Chairman, American Legion War Memorial Commission
Claude M. Jarman, Jr., Vice-President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Mark Ryser, Executive Director, Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage

Save lives.
Support earthquake safety.
Vote YES on Propositions A and B.
Also vote YES on Proposition N. Limit San Francisco Supervisors to two four-year terms.

Terence Faulkner
Republican State Assembly Candidate
San Francisco Republican Party Chairman (1987-89)

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Candidate
Past San Francisco Democratic Party Secretary
Max Woods
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic County Central Committeewoman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
**Public Safety Improvement Bonds**

**PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A**

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for your safety. Let us learn from the October 17th earthquake. 15 seconds of moderate shaking resulted in the need for $32 million in repairs to city buildings in the Civic Center alone. We need to be better prepared. We need to reduce known safety hazards.

Please, vote YES on Proposition A.

Ken Dowlin, City Librarian
Steve Coulter, Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson, Library Commissioner
Lonni Chin, Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil, Library Commissioner
Dennis Normandy, Library Commissioner
Roselyne Swig, Library Commissioner

Help the City of San Francisco and the Zoo rebuild. The animals will benefit, too! Vote YES on A.

Susanne Barthell,
Zoo Advisory Committee member,
Zoo Volunteer
Sophie Papageorge,
Zoologist
Jorge L. Garcia, D.V.M.
Zoo Medicine Specialist
John J. Alcaraz,
Retired Zookeeper
Roni Joan Howard,
Educator

David J. Howe
Animalkeeper
Terrence J. Moyles
Linda Caratti
Animalkeeper
Anthony Sharp
Animalkeeper
Martin E. Dias
A.K.A. Big Bison, Animalkeeper
Jack W. Castor
Lion House, Animalkeeper
Sandra Keller
Director, Citizens for a Better Zoo

Proposition A will help restore structural safety to the San Francisco County Jails in San Bruno, which were built in 1934 and are badly in need of repair. This is the oldest operating jail in California and sits near the San Andreas fault.

For the safety of City employees and county jail inmates, please vote YES on Proposition A.

Michael Hennessey
San Francisco County Sheriff
Deputy Albert Waters, President
San Francisco Deputy Sheriff's Association

**PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A**

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION A

This bond issue is iffy.

It should have been presented to the voters as two separate bond issues.

One for $75 million — earthquake repairs to be partly refunded by F.E.M.A. for our present estimated damages. Another for

$257.4 million to take care of our needed capital improvements so neglected by this and past administrations.

Vote NO and get one issue back on the November ballot.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Calling and providing for a special election to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, June 5, 1990, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of the City and County of San Francisco a proposition to incur the following bonded debt of the City and County for the acquisition, construction, and improvement by the City and County of San Francisco of the following municipal improvements, to wit: Public safety improvement bonds, 1990, $332,400,000, to pay for the cost of public safety improvements to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled, all related to public safety to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including related acquisition, construction, and reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purpose; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction; authorizing and directing the chief administrative officer and the controller to monitor the issuance of bonds and the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction and to take any appropriate action so that the bonds issued will not duplicate FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Such election and the procedure for voting for or against the proposition; fixing the maximum rate of interest on said bonds and providing for the levy and collection of taxes to pay both principal and interest thereof; prescribing notice to be given of such election; consolidating the special election with the general election; and providing that the election precincts, voting places and officers for election shall be the same as for such general election.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 5th day of June, 1990, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the herein-after described municipal improvements in the amount and for the purposes stated:

Public safety improvement bonds, 1990, $332,400,000, to pay for the cost of public safety improvements to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled, all related to public safety to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including related acquisition, construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purpose; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

Public safety improvement bonds, 1990, Resolution No. 88-90, $332,400,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in said resolution are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. Authorizing and directing the chief administrative officer and the controller to monitor the issuance of the bonds and the actual post-audit receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction and to take any appropriate action so that the bonds issued will not duplicate FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 4. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 5. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 5, 1990, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 31, 1990.

Section 6. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"Public safety improvement bonds, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, (Continued on next page)
however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special election, each voter to vote for any said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 7. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 12 per centum per annum, payable semianually, provided, that interest for the first year after the date of any of said bonds may be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 8. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 9. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 10. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.
PROPOSITION B

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (I) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (II) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (III) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (IV) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $18.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269
NO 272

Analysis
by City Attorney

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Some School District buildings were damaged by the earthquake. Some District buildings do not meet present earthquake and fire standards.

The State Mello-Roos law allows the Board of Education to submit to the voters a measure authorizing a special property tax to pay for repairs and other improvements to school buildings.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize a special property tax to pay for costs of repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety. Some of the money would also be used for deferred capital maintenance. The repairs and maintenance would be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis. Since no money would be borrowed, there would be no interest costs to pay.

The tax would last for 20 years. The tax on single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels could be no more than $46 for each of the first six years and no more than $32.20 for each of the last 14 years. The tax on other types of parcels could be no more than $23 for each dwelling unit for each of the first six years and $16.10 for each dwelling unit for each of the last 14 years. Dwelling units occupied by persons 65 years of age or older would be eligible for an exemption from this tax. The measure would also set an annual appropriations limit of $12 million.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to authorize this property tax to pay for repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety and you want to authorize this annual appropriations limit.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to authorize this tax.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed special tax levy be approved, in my opinion, it would increase revenues for the San Francisco Unified School District, net of estimated senior citizen exemptions, by approximately $8 million per year for the first 6 years and $5.6 million per year for the next 14 years, based on the current assessment roll of the City and County. The approximately $127.2 million generated over a 20 year period by this special tax levy would be restricted for use by the District for the repair, restoration, replacement, seismic upgrading and capital maintenance of School District facilities."

How "B" Got on the Ballot

On February 13, the Board of Education voted 5-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Board members voted as follows:


NO: Leland Yee.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When the earthquake struck last fall, our school buildings suffered. Sustaining major damage and at special risk in the future are our buildings that were not earthquake proofed in the 1970’s. In that category are our child care centers serving our youngest students. Also, in the fall of 1988 the City Fire Marshall inspected our schools and reported that the majority of our school buildings do not meet fire safety standards. Our 63,000 students and the community groups that meet at our schools in the evenings and on weekends must have buildings that can withstand earthquakes, and meet fire safety standards.

Proposition B will authorize a tax to provide for: repairing earthquake damage at 131 sites including the reconstruction of John O’Connell High School, seismic improvement of nine Children’s Centers, correction of fire code and safety violations at 97 sites and seismic improvement of John Swett, Jean Parker and Bessie Carmichael Elementary Schools and Parkside Curriculum Center. In addition, there will be funds for deferred capital maintenance.

Two years ago the citizens of this City voted to support major repairs for our school buildings. Now we must protect that investment by repairing the present earthquake damage and seeing that all our schools can withstand future earthquakes, be as safe as possible in case of fire and be well maintained into the next century.

Civic organizations who have joined in supporting Proposition B include: San Francisco League of Women Voters, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SF/PTA, Parents’ Lobby, San Francisco Labor Council, United Educators of San Francisco, and Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth.

Submitted by Superintendent Ramon C. Cortines, San Francisco Unified School District, and Fred Rodriguez, President, Board of Education.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition B
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California
February 13, 1990

(For Board Meeting February 13, 1990)


REQUESTED ACTION:

WHEREAS, the Board of Education of the “Board” of the San Francisco Unified School District (the “District”), did, on January 9, 1990, adopt its Resolution of Intention (the “Resolution”) to form Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District (the “Community Facilities District”), and levy a special tax therein, pursuant to Chapter 2.5 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 3311) of the California Government Code, commonly known as the “Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982,” as amended, (the “Act”); and

WHEREAS, a copy of the Resolution (which sets forth a description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, the name of the Community Facilities District and the types of facilities proposed to be financed by the District (the “Facilities”)), providing that, except where funds are otherwise available, a special tax sufficient to pay for all Facilities and the financing thereof (to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District) is proposed to be levied within the proposed Community Facilities District; and the financing thereof (to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District) is proposed to be levied within the proposed Community Facilities District; and

Section 3. As proposed in the Resolution, a community facilities district is hereby established pursuant to the Act, designated “Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District.”

Section 4. The map and legal description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, filed with the Clerk of this Board on January 24, 1990, are hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the boundaries of the Community Facilities District.

Section 5. The Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District, set forth in Exhibit “B” hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, shall be the Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District.

Section 6. As provided in Exhibit “B”, it is the intention of this Board, subject to the approval of the qualified electors of the Community Facilities District, to levy a special tax sufficient to acquire, construct and improve the Facilities including administrative expenses to be incurred by the District and the Community Facilities District in connection therewith; said tax to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District.

The rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax, in sufficient detail, shall be determined by the Board and the Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, is described in Exhibit “A” hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.

Section 7. The description of the proposed voting procedure, as set forth in the Resolution, is hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the voting procedure to be used in these proceedings.

Section 8. The special tax has not been precluded by a majority protest pursuant to Section 53324 of the Act.

Section 9. The Facilities to be funded from the special tax are identified in Exhibit “B” hereto.

Section 10. In accordance with Section 53340.1 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 herein, that the two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, this Board shall designate the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District as the office, department or bureau which will be responsible for annually preparing the current roll of special tax levy obligations by assessor’s parcel number on non-exempt property within the District and which will be responsible for estimating future special tax levies pursuant to Section 53340.1 of the Act.

The name, address, and telephone number of the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District, and the person responsible for administering the District, is as follows: Director of Fiscal Services

Fiscal Services Department
San Francisco Unified School District
135 Van Ness Avenue, Room 215
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 241-6480

Section 11. In accordance with Section 53328.3 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the

(Continued on next page)
consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, the Clerk of this Board shall record the notice of special tax lien provided for in Section 3114.5 of the Streets and Highways Code. Upon recordation of the notice of special tax lien pursuant to Section 3114.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, a continuing lien to secure each levy of the special tax shall attach to all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District, and the lien shall be confirmed in force and effect until the special tax obligation is permanently satisfied and the lien cancelled in accordance with law or until collection of the tax by this Board ceases.

Section 12. A boundary map of the Community Facilities District has been recorded pursuant to Sections 3111 and 3113 of the Streets and Highways Code at Book 39, Page 182-183 in the Book of Maps of Assessment and Community Facilities Districts in the Office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 13. All prior proceedings taken with respect to the establishment of the District were valid and in conformity with the requirements of the Act.

Section 14. In accordance with Section 53325.7 of the Act, the annual appropriations limit of the District, as defined by subdivision (b) of Section 8 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution, is hereby preliminarily established in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year, and said annual appropriations limit shall be submitted to the voters of the District as hereafter provided. The proposition establishing said appropriations limit shall become effective if approved by the qualified electors voting thereon and shall be adjusted in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 53325.7 of the Act.

Section 15. The Board hereby calls an election and submits the question of levying the special tax, and the establishment of the annual appropriations limit for the District in connection therewith, to the qualified electors within the District, at an election to be held on Tuesday, June 5, 1990, all in accordance with and subject to the Act, the terms of which shall be applicable to such election.

Section 16. The Board hereby further directs that the election at which the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith is submitted to the qualified electors within the District shall be consolidated and shall be combined in one ballot proposition, all as provided by the Act; and the Board further directs that notice of the consolidated election on the combined proposition of authorizing the levy of the special tax and of establishing an appropriations limit be published as required by law.

Section 17. If two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax are cast in favor of levying the tax, as determined by this Board after the canvass of the returns of such consolidated election, the Board may levy the special tax within the territory of the District in the amount and for the purposes as specified in this resolution. The special tax may be levied only at the rate and may be apportioned only in the manner specified in this resolution, subject to the Act, except that the special tax may be levied at a lower rate.

Section 18. The Clerk of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution, a certified map of the boundaries of the Community Facilities District, a sufficient description to allow the election officials to determine the boundaries of the District, and the assessor’s parcel numbers for the land within the District to the Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco within three business days after the adoption of this resolution. ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 13th day of February, 1990. President of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District ATTEST: Clerk of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District Recommended by: Ramon C. Cortines Superintendent of Schools

EXHIBIT A
RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT BASIS OF SPECIAL-TAX LEVY
The annual special tax shall be levied on each separate parcel within Community Facilities District No. 90-1, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco County, California ("CFD 90-1") as shown on the San Francisco County Assessor’s records, subject to the maximum rates specified below, as established by the Board of Education ("Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District ("District").

DETERMINATION OF PARCELS SUBJECT TO SPECIAL TAX
The records of the County Assessor of San Francisco County shall be used to determine the parcels subject to the special tax. The basis for determining the parcels will be the Secured Property Tax Roll. The land use code contained in the Secured Property Tax Roll, in combination with records maintained by the Assessor of the number of dwelling units on each residential parcel in CFD 90-1, will be the basis for assigning the appropriate tax rate to each parcel. If the District determines that the records maintained by the Assessor are incorrect with respect to one or more parcels, the District will assign the appropriate land use code and dwelling unit count based on its review of the property. All special taxes shall be based on parcels established in the County Assessor’s records as of March 1 of each year and all land use categories shall be based on building permits and other relevant development approvals granted by the City and County of San Francisco or any successor jurisdiction as of June 1 of each year.

Using the records of the County Assessor, the District shall prepare a list of the parcels subject to the tax. The District shall establish the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.

1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which, supported publicly-owned and non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that leasehold/possessory interests shall be taxed.
2. From the parcels remaining identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor’s data, and the District’s review of building permits issued, and other changes in development status:
   a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
   b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
   c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
   d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on that parcel will be classified based on the uses that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX
The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $32.20 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CFD 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CFD 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.

(Continued on next page)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B (Continued)

Description of Facilities to be financed:
(i) Repair, restoration, and/or replacement of District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), to the extent that (A) such repair, restoration, or replacement is outside the scope of work approved by federal and state agencies for assistance from such agencies; (B) costs incurred in such repair, restoration, or replacement are ineligible for federal or state assistance; or (C) insufficient federal or state funds are appropriated, obligated, or approved to pay for repair, restoration, or replacement which would otherwise be eligible for federal or state assistance. Pending receipt by the District of disaster assistance from federal and/or state agencies, the Community Facilities District may advance funds to the District to pay costs eligible for federal or state disaster assistance; provided that upon receipt by the District of federal or state disaster assistance relating to such costs, the District shall promptly reimburse the Community Facilities District for any such advances.
(ii) Seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other District facilities.
(iii) Correction of fire safety violations of District facilities.
(iv) Deferred capital maintenance of District facilities. Incidental expenses, including the cost of planning and designing the Facilities and the cost of environmental evaluations thereof; all costs associated with the creation of the proposed Community Facilities District, the determination of the amount of and collection of taxes, the payment of taxes, and costs otherwise incurred in order to carry out the authorized purposes of the Community Facilities District; and any other expenses incidental to the construction, completion, and inspection of the Facilities and permitted under the Act.
BOUNDARIES OF SPECIAL TAX DISTRICT

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THIS _______________ DAY OF _______________.

RAMON C. CORTINES, CLERK OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE WITHIN MAP SHOWING PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, WAS APPROVED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AT A REGULAR MEETING THEREOF, HELD ON THE 9TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1990, BY ITS RESOLUTION NO. 90-053.

RAMON C. CORTINES, CLERK OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

FILED THIS _______________ DAY OF _______________ 1990, AT THE HOUR OF _______________ O’CLOCK _______________ M.IN BOOK _______________ OF MAPS OF ASSESSMENT AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICTS AT PAGE _______________ IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER IN THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

BRUCE JAMISON COUNTY RECORDER COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE: TITLE 3 DIVISION 1 CHAPTER 2 ARTICLE 2, 23138 — SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY LIMITS

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER, BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAN MATEO, IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN, ON THE EXTENSION OF NORTHERN LINE OF T3S OF MOUNT DIABLO BASE; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE PACIFIC COAST, TO ITS POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE WESTERLY EXTENSION OF THE LOW-WATER LINE ON THE NORTHERN SIDE OF THE ENTRANCE TO SAN FRANCISCO BAY, BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MARIN AND NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE, EASTERLY, THROUGH POINT BONITA AND POINT CAYAJO, TO THE MOST SOUTHEASTERLY POINT OF ANGEL ISLAND, ALL ON THE LINE OF MARIN; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE EASTERN LINE OF MARIN, TO THE NORTHEAST POINT OF GOLDEN ROCK (ALSO KNOW AS RED ROCK), BEING A COMMON CORNER OF MARIN, CONTRA COSTA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE DUE SOUTHEAST FOUR AND ONE-HALF STATUTE MILES TO A POINT ESTABLISHED AS THE CORNER COMMON TO CONTRA COSTA, ALAMEDA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, ON THE WESTERN LINE OF ALAMEDA COUNTY TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF T3S, R.W., M.D.B. & M., THENCE WESTERLY ON THE TOWNSHIP LINES AND AN EXTENSION THEREOF TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING. THE ISLANDS KNOWN AS THE PARRALONIES (PARRALLONA) ARE A PART OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY.

PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO STATE OF CALIFORNIA

KCA ENGINEERS, INC. CONSULTING CIVIL ENGINEERS

JANUARY 1990
Equipment Lease Financing

PROPOSITION C

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277
NO 278

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City obtains computers, telephone systems and other equipment by paying for it all at once or by leasing it until it is paid for, which is called "lease financing." The City may not enter into long-term leases for financing equipment unless (1) the voters approve it, or (2) the lease requires the Board of Supervisors to approve the payments each year. When the Board of Supervisors must approve the lease payments each year, interest rates are higher than when the lease payments are not subject to annual approval. Also, interest rates charged by for-profit companies are generally higher than interest rates charged by non-profit corporations.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment. Under Proposition C, the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval, could authorize the lease financing of equipment without the lease payments being subject to annual approval. A non-profit corporation would be created to buy the equipment and would issue tax-exempt debt to pay for it. The City would lease the equipment from the non-profit until it was paid for. The total principal of the debt issued by the non-profit corporation could not be more than $20 million in the first year. This limit on the outstanding principal would increase five percent each year. The Board could approve this type of lease financing only if the Controller certified that the interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application, costs could be increased or decreased in presently indeterminate but probably not substantial amounts."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would allow the City to lease finance needed equipment at the lowest possible interest rates. The City would establish a non-profit corporation, which would buy equipment approved by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors and lease it to City departments.

The charter currently requires the voters to approve lease financing if done through non-profit corporations. Financing through a non-profit is the less expensive method because interest rates are tax-exempt. The City has had to occasionally use the more expensive method because it is not always possible to delay purchasing critical equipment until an election is held.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Saves the City money by allowing current and future leases for equipment to be financed at lower interest rates (currently 6% to 7%) than must now be used with private corporations (ranging 9% to 16%).

By simply refinancing existing leases, the City could save over $500,000.

Additional money could be saved on any future leases.

Gives the City the option to pay cash for equipment or to finance it expeditiously at a low cost to the City.

Allows quicker replacement of inefficient and outdated equipment, which will reduce maintenance costs, decrease downtime, and increase productivity for equipment which has outlived its economic useful life.

Provides restrictions to insure prudent use of this financing mechanism.

Requires the Controller to certify that the lease is the least costly financing method.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Officer.

---

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition C
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition C

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

7.309 Voter Approval of Lease Financing
(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.
(b) For the purposes of this section, "lease financing" occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.
(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:
(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or
(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or
(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.

Remember to VOTE on Election Day, Tuesday June 5, 1990. Your polling place is open from 7:00 in the morning to 8:00 in the evening.
Recycling is not only easier than you might think, it's a simple way you can do your part for environmental conservation—and feel good about it, too.

All you need is an ordinary brown paper bag.

Each time you set up your kitchen garbage, place an extra brown bag or two out for recycling. Then every day just drop your newspaper into a recycling bag—a week's worth of papers fits perfectly (and your newspapers will stop piling up on the floor!).

When you're finished with an aluminum soda or beer can simply pop it in a separate bag. The same goes for bottles; just put them in a bag, labels and all. Then when you're on the way to the supermarket or heading out for the day, drop off the bags at a Recycling Center near you. Or, you can tie your newspaper with string and the garbage company will collect it free of charge.

That's it. When you think about it, isn't recycling almost as easy as not recycling?

And it really is the right thing to do.

For a free Recycling Guide and a list of Recycling Centers near you, call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL
554-6193
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

PROPOSITION D
Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no special City fund to pay for neighborhood beautification projects or graffiti clean-up. Money can be spent for this purpose only when the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors approve it in the City’s budget.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is an ordinance that would create a “Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund” (“the Fund”) to pay for cleaning up graffiti on public buildings and beautifying the neighborhood.

The Chief Administrative Officer would manage the Fund. Businesses could pay up to one percent of their payroll or business taxes into the Fund. Grants or money donated for graffiti clean-up would be deposited in the Fund. The goal of the ordinance is to produce for the Fund $1,000,000 each year, adjusted annually for inflation. The Controller would change the percentage of taxes businesses could pay into the Fund to produce $1,000,000 in the fund each fiscal year.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this fund.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

“Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, General Fund revenues could decrease by as much as $1.4 million in fiscal 1990 and as much as $1 million per year, adjusted for inflation, thereafter.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Neighborhood Beautification Fund

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D asks the voters to make the revitalization of our neighborhoods and the wiping out of graffiti a top city priority without raising taxes.

Proposition D will permit those employers currently eligible in San Francisco to earmark up to 1% of their payroll or gross receipts tax bill to establish The Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

The fund will be used to award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city. The Budget Analyst has estimated that approximately one million dollars would be available every year.

Proposition D creates a unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers to keep our city attractive. It will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting and graffiti clean-up.

Also, Proposition D will fund public information and education campaigns to combat litter, and instill in our youth the old-fashioned virtue of respect for public and private property.

The fund created by Proposition D will be administered by the Chief Administrative Officer with public input from environmental organizations and neighborhood committees.

Proposition D was authored by Supervisor Jim Gonzales and has been submitted to the voters with the support of the Sierra Club, San Francisco Beautiful, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

According to their ballot argument, the Board of Supervisors wants to create a “unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers” to reduce graffiti. What’s stopping them from doing that now?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?
The supervisors also say they want to provide “seed money” for planting trees and improving street lighting. Well, why haven’t they placed items in the city budget to do so?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?
In their rebuttal argument, the supervisors claim that “many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle.” Whose fault is that, if not their own?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?
Finally, the supervisors have the temerity to state: “With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark” funds for graffiti. What would be “fair” is if San Francisco businesses paid lower taxes. But no one should be “earmarking” tax dollars except elected representatives of the people!

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?
There’s no question that graffiti is a serious problem demanding serious solutions. But what good is it to divert $1,000,000 a year from other city programs? That’s robbing Peter to pay Paul! It’s bad government!

Why do we need Proposition D? We don’t.
Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

I know something about graffiti. I wrote the city ordinances prohibiting the sale of spray paint and large, felt-tip pens to minors. I also authored the state law to allow police officers greater latitude in arresting juveniles who deface public transit vehicles. This year, I’m pursuing a bill to revoke for one year the driver’s license of any person convicted of graffiti vandalism.

Proposition D is not about graffiti or “neighborhood beautification”. It’s about diverting millions from the city’s General Fund. It’s about depriving existing city programs of critically needed revenue. Proposition D is a financial shell game.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Proposition D would allow any city business to designate up to 1% of its payroll tax check for deposit in a special fund. According to the supervisors’ Budget Analyst, Proposition D could divert up to $1,440,260 from the General Fund in the program’s first year.

Thereafter, annual diversions would approximate $1,000,000, plus inflation.

That’s over $1,000,000 per year which cannot be spent on police services, fire protection, libraries, and public health.

As you can plainly see from my legislative record, I’m no soft touch when it comes to graffiti prevention and clean-up. But Proposition D is the wrong approach. “Special funds” and “segregated accounts” have no place in our city budget.

Graffiti programs deserve adequate city funding, and the Board of Supervisors and Mayor should move promptly to appropriate such funds in the next regular budgetary cycle.

The voters, meanwhile, should move promptly to reject Proposition D on June 5th!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We need a city plan that invests in the quality of our neighborhoods . . . Now. It’s obvious laws banning the sale of spray paint and felt pens have done nothing to stop the sprawl of graffiti or create a climate of cooperation between city officials and neighborhood groups to find real solutions.

Proposition D is about beautifying our neighborhoods consistently. Proposition D is about wiping out graffiti permanently. With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark a mere one-hundredth to be poured back into the neighborhoods.

Out of a greater than two billion dollar annual budget, the city can afford guaranteed million dollars to help keep our city beautiful, clean, and graffiti-free. Year in and year out, many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle. Proposition D will provide a solid foundation for the revitalization of our neighborhoods, which no one can tamper with and that requires no new taxes.

Over the last few years, individual Supervisors have spent many weekends planting trees and removing graffiti with neighborhood groups. Working with groups such as SF ALIVE, San Francisco Conservation Corps, 24th Street Revitalization Committee and the West Portal Merchants Association to make our neighborhoods shine has taught us one thing . . . neighborhood environmentalists and city departments working together as partners will be a winning combination for San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

When City Hall and neighborhood organizations work together, problems can be solved. Vote YES on D.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

There is a reason that the San Francisco Beautiful, the Sierra Club and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, along with dozens of neighborhood groups support placing PROPOSITION D on the ballot.

San Franciscans are united in wanting to preserve and enhance our city’s attractiveness and keep San Francisco one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

Our Supervisors put PROPOSITION D on the ballot for your approval because they realize that a more attractive city starts with people like you and me and our neighbors who truly care about San Francisco.

YES ON PROPOSITION D creates a working partnership between our neighborhoods and city government;

YES ON PROPOSITION D means a more beautiful city and enhancement of your neighborhood and mine;

YES ON PROPOSITION D accomplishes this with NO NEW TAXES, allowing large employers to earmark up to 1% of their current payroll tax for beautification and graffiti cleanup;

YES ON PROPOSITION D pays for neighborhood-generated projects, giving residents a say in how these reserved funds are spent;

YES ON PROPOSITION D is the first step to guaranteeing more beautiful and attractive neighborhoods.

Join your neighbors, business owners and environmentalists by voting YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Al Pross, Chair
COMMITTEE FOR BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBORHOODS

The quality of life in our neighborhoods will truly become a top city priority with the passage of Proposition D.

• Proposition D will provide over a million dollars a year from the business community to stop neighborhood decay (through a voluntary checkoff on their payroll or gross receipts tax bill).

• Proposition D will award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city.

• Proposition D will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting, and graffiti clean-up.

• Proposition D will fund an educational campaign to teach our youngsters a new respect for public and private property.

Let’s protect our city’s special livability. Let’s foster civic pride. Let’s invest in the long term health of San Francisco’s residential neighborhoods. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Graffiti is a blight on the beauty of San Francisco. We strongly encourage the continued generosity of grants and donations to eradicate this problem. However, during the current deficit-ridden period, it is irresponsible for the City to direct at least $1,000,000 a year from the General Fund for this purpose.

The San Francisco Republican Party urges you to vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley
William E. Grayson

Anna M. Guth
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"
Why add more government to your taxes.
$1 million per year to be funded from Payroll taxes which has a sunset clause to expire in 1990.
Then who pays the tab? You do.
If the police would assert their powers and nab the violators, instead of the City offering to pay to clean up their "works of art" this ordinance would not be necessary.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Marguerie Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION D

[Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund]

AN ORDINANCE, ADDING SECTIONS 10.98 AND 10.98-1 TO THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO ESTABLISH A NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND AND SPECIFYING THE PURPOSES THEREFOR AND AMENDING PART III, SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, BY ADDING ARTICLE 12B-1 THERETO, TO PROVIDE THAT ANY BUSINESS WHICH OWES A PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX OR BUSINESS TAX MAY ELECT TO DESIGNATE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE TAX FOR DEPOSIT IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND.

NOTE: All sections are new.

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Sections 10.98 and 10.98-1 thereto, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.98. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: FINDINGS AND INTENT.

(a) Findings.

The proliferation of graffiti on public buildings and other public property has created a blight which offends both citizens and visitors to San Francisco. The removal of such graffiti will enhance the beauty of the city in which we live and will encourage others to visit and to relocate here. Removal will thus both reflect and renew our civic pride and contribute to our economic viability. Providing a source of funds for the promotion of neighborhood beautification projects will support the efforts of local residents and businesses to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and the local economy, and assist in reducing the amount of graffiti in San Francisco.

(b) Statement of Intent.

The Board of Supervisors wishes to address the above concerns by establishing a neighborhood beautification and graffiti clean-up fund which will promote neighborhood beautification projects, including projects designed to improve the environmental quality of neighborhoods, and finance the clean-up of graffiti on public property.

SEC. 10.98-1. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: ESTABLISHMENT; ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS; DUTIES.

(a) Establishment of Fund. There is hereby established a special fund for the purpose of receiving all donations of money which may be collected by the City and County of San Francisco for the purposes enumerated in Section 10.98(b). Monies deposited in the fund shall only be expended for the purposes enumerated therein, provided that such expenditures shall include reimbursement to City and County departments for expenses incurred in the administration of the fund. The special fund shall be known and designated as the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

(b) Acceptance of Gifts. All donations of money which may be offered to the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund are hereby accepted for such purposes. Any grants, gifts and bequests from private sources for this purpose shall be deposited into said special fund.

(c) Duties of the Chief Administrative Officer.

1. The Chief Administrative Officer, or his or her designee, shall be responsible for the administration of the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund, and shall have all such authority as may be reasonably necessary to carry out those responsibilities.

2. The Chief Administrative Officer shall promulgate such rules and regulations as he or she may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Section and Section 10.98. Before issuing or amending any rules and regulations, the Chief Administrative Officer shall provide a thirty (30) day public comment period by providing published notice in an official newspaper of general circulation in the City of the intent to issue or amend the rules and regulations. The rules and regulations shall be approved by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. Such rules and regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the qualifications of applicants and factors to be considered in the award of grants to fund programs to help remove graffiti and promote neighborhood beautification projects, including preference for the following projects: youth programs and innovation projects, that are neighborhood generated, and projects designed to benefit areas of San Francisco that are economically disadvantaged.

3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall submit a semi-annual report to the Board of Supervisors setting forth an accounting of the amounts disbursed and the uses for which said funds were made.

(d) Budgetary and Fiscal Provisions of the Charter. The monies in this fund are subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter and may be expended only when authorized by appropriation ordinance of the Board of Supervisors.

(e) Interest. Interest earned from the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund shall become part of the principal thereof, and shall not be expended for any purpose other than that for which said funds are established.

(f) Accumulation of Monies in Fund. The balance remaining in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Charter Section 6.306 and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said fund for the purposes recited herein.

Section 2. Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code is hereby amended by adding Article 12B-1 thereto, to read as follows:

ART. 12B-1

NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND TAX

OPTION.

SEC. 1030. Initial Option. Commencing in tax year 1990, any business, as defined in Section 1002.1 of this Code, that is subject to the Payroll Expense Tax or the Business Tax may elect to designate up to one percent (1%) of its tax liability for deposit in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

SEC. 1031. Amount of Fund Annually. It is the intent of the voters of the City and County of San Francisco that one million dollars ($1,000,000.00), derived from tax proceeds designated by the taxpayers pursuant to Section 1031, shall be deposited annually into the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund. The Controller shall annually adjust this figure for inflation to reflect changes in the most recently available U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index for Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose Metropolitan Area, or its successor index.

SEC. 1032. Subsequent Option. For each tax year after 1990, the Controller shall determine the amount of fund revenues actually generated in the prior year, including the interest thereon and the balance, if any, remaining at the close of the tax year. On the basis of the prior year's experience of taxpayer contributions and total revenues generated by the payroll expense and business taxes, the Controller shall calculate a percentage ceiling of total tax liability which taxpayers may designate for deposit in the fund in the following tax year. The Controller shall set the percentage ceiling so that the revenues produced thereby are most likely to generate a total of one million dollars (adjusted for inflation) in the fund for the forthcoming tax year. The Controller shall transmit his or her calculation to the Board of Supervisors, which shall adopt a new tax designation ceiling, if necessary, in advance of the tax year to enable the Tax Collector to perform his or her collection duties.

SEC. 1033. Severability. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective. In addition, the voters declare their intention that should any portion of this initiative ordinance or all of it be declared invalid in whole or in part, such invalidity shall have no effect upon the continued validity of the Payroll Expense Tax and Business Tax.
PROPOSITION F

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Fire Commission has the authority to decide the number and staffing of fire companies and the number and location of fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors may change the number of firefighters. The Fire Commission may close or move fire stations or reduce the number of fire companies if it decides they are no longer needed. A fire company typically consists of a fire engine or other emergency vehicle and the firefighters needed to operate it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would specify a minimum number of fire stations and fire companies and minimum levels of staffing for those fire companies. Proposition F would increase the number of firefighters assigned to some types of fire companies. This means that the number of firefighters on duty at all times would increase from 297 to 322. Where necessary, Proposition F’s minimum level of staffing would be met by firefighters working overtime. Overtime pay for firefighters is one and one-half times their normal salary.

Proposition F would limit the power of the Fire Commission, Mayor and Board of Supervisors to set the number of fire stations and staffing levels.

Before closing any fire station or reducing the number of fire companies or units required by Proposition F, the measure would require (1) a recommendation by the Fire Chief; (2) approval by the Fire Commission, after public hearings; (3) approval by the Board of Supervisors; and (4) approval by the voters.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current salary rates and staffing levels of the Fire Department, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $4.9 million per year.”

How “F” Got on the Ballot

On March 2, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition F to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,485* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 21 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 56,364 of the signatures submitted were valid, 15,879 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WHAT IS PROP F?

PROPOSITION F IS A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WILL ESTABLISH A MINIMUM LEVEL OF FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS FOR SAN FRANCISCO. IT GIVES THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE FIRE CHIEF THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MANAGE THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITIZENS.

SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT BECAUSE IT WILL:

(1) GUARANTEE THAT THE PRESENT 41 FIRE STATIONS STAY OPEN
(2) GUARANTEE FULLY-STAFFED FIRE TRUCKS AT ALL TIMES
(3) GUARANTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BEFORE ANY FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED
(4) GUARANTEE THAT YOUR FIREBOAT WILL BE STAFFED WITH A FIREFIGHTING CREW OF TWO THE 7.1 QUAKE OF OCTOBER 17 WARNED US AGAIN — WE MUST BE PREPARED!

ITEM A — MAYOR AGNOS CUT THE FIRE DEPARTMENT ON-DUTY STAFFING BY 19 PERSONS A DAY IN 1989.

PROP F RESTORES THOSE CUTS.
ITEM C — PROP F DOES NOT REQUIRE “GUARANTEED OVERTIME” AND, IN FACT, BY JULY 1992 NO OVERTIME WILL BE NEEDED FOR THE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS OF PROP F.

(Overtime is now caused by large numbers of vacant positions. New hiring will eliminate all vacancies and overtime by July 1992. Prop F will safeguard this full-staffing.)

PROP F IS A COMMON SENSE MEASURE TO GIVE ADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION TO ALL CITIZENS.

VOTE YES ON F!

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F;
COMMITTEE FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTH-QUAKE PREPAREDNESS
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

It is clear that Proposition F is not a Fire Safety Issue. It is clearly an issue to guarantee overtime.
1. This Mayor and Board of Supervisors have never closed a single fire station and have no intention to close firehouses.
2. Most major cities in America considers five firefighters per truck to be fully-staffed. More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire.
3. Proposition F will not restore cuts in firefighters. We are mandated by law to provide 90 new firefighters this year. Proposition F only guarantees overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day, $3.5 million per year.

Our firefighters do a tough job! But we compensate them well! We need new equipment — not more overtime. Following the earthquake, a fire truck had to be taken from the fire museum to fight fires. Let's not waste money which could be used for new firefighting equipment.
San Francisco voters rejected a similar proposal in 1987 and it should be rejected again in 1990.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will waste millions of your tax dollars. Just look at the facts.

Fact: Proposition F does not hire new firefighters. The Federal Consent Decree already sets hiring standards — 90 new firefighters will be hired this year without Prop. F.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that Assistant Chiefs and Battalion Chiefs will continue to have chauffeurs.

Fact: Proposition F is not needed to save fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors have no intention of closing any fire stations.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that 18 current firefighters will get daily time-and-a-half overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day . . . or more than $3.5 million extra per year.

Fact: Proposition F is not a fire safety issue. Virtually every major American city deploys five or fewer firefighters on fire trucks. A sixth firefighter is featherbedding, not firefighting.

More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire. That’s enough people to raise ladders, ventilate rooftops and carry out lifesaving tasks.

FACT: Our firefighters do a tough job. But they are well compensated already and do not need additional guaranteed overtime . . . especially when there are so many other pressing needs in San Francisco.

FACT: Firefighters in San Francisco are currently paid $300 more per month than the average salaries of firefighters in the four largest California cities. But the other firefighters work 15 percent more hours than San Francisco.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters already receive 23 percent more vacation, sick and holiday leave than other city workers. A recent study by the Controller shows that increased overtime results in increased sick leave and disability.

Study the facts and you’ll agree. Proposition F is nothing more than $7 million per year in unnecessary guaranteed overtime.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

FACT: PROP F does:
• Guarantee that the 90 new firefighters cannot later be eliminated by politicians.
• Require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people before cutbacks can be made to the minimum staffing.
FACT: The Mayor DID cut back Fire Department staffing in August 1989 from 315 to 296.

FACT: Assistant and Battalion Chiefs DO NOT have “chauffeurs.” They DO have an operations and communications assistant.

FACT: Prop F IS needed to guarantee public review and input before any fire station can be closed.

FACT: SIX fire stations have been closed by the Mayor’s office since 1972 without any public review.

FACT: Prop F DOES guarantee that the 19 on-duty firefighters cut by the Mayor in 1989 will be restored. When sufficient new firefighters are hired, NO OVERTIME will be required.

FACT: PROP F IS A FIRE SAFETY ISSUE!
FACT: San Francisco firefighters ARE REQUIRED to work overtime because previous policies of politicians allowed large numbers of vacant positions to occur.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters DO NOT get a paid health plan for dependents, nor do they get longevity pay or other benefits enjoyed by firefighters in the four largest California cities.

FACT: ALL city employees, including firefighters, receive EXACTLY THE SAME vacation, sick and holiday leave. This is a city Charter requirement.

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I STRONGLY SUPPORT PROP F!

Prop F will benefit all the people of San Francisco. Over 71,000 voters from every part of the City signed the petition to put Prop F on the ballot. They expressed enthusiastic support for a stronger Fire Department.

The City is becoming increasingly built-up, causing greater congestion. This means that fire hazards are increasing and adequate fire protection will be even more important to us than ever.

The October 17th earthquake was an urgent reminder of how fragile our city is and how important our Fire Department is to all of us.

When you, the people, call for help, whether it is for a medical emergency, a rescue, or fire, the firefighters come.

I STRONGLY SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!

They provide vital services to our citizens. Last year, our firefighters answered a record-breaking 58,000 alarms and saved thousands of lives. The greatest number of calls came from the Tenderloin, the Inner Mission, the Fillmore, Civic Center/Hayes Valley, Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley. I WANT TO BE SURE YOU GET THE HELP YOU NEED — WHEN YOU NEED IT!

Over the past 20 years, unlike other city departments, Fire Department staffing has been slashed by 40%! THREE FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT AGREE THAT THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY ARE TOO FEW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS! THEY AGREE THAT NO MORE FIREFHOUSES SHOULD BE CLOSED.

We NEED Proposition F. It will:
- Put firefighters back on the ladder trucks
- Put firefighters back on our fireboat
- Bring daily staffing up to an adequate level
- Guarantee that any proposed closings of fire companies will be subject to a public review and vote by the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people
- Guarantee the SFFD the funding it needs

THE COST OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT IS ONLY 2 CENTS A DAY FOR EACH OF US! That 2 cents could easily save a life — maybe yours, or that of a loved one. PROPF WILL BENEFIT ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

I STRONGLY SUPPORT IMPROVED FIRE PROTECTION IN SAN FRANCISCO!

I SHARE THE CONCERNS OF THE 71,000 VOTERS WHO PUT THIS PROPOSITION ON THE BALLOT. Fire Department daily staffing has been forced so low that our safety is threatened. WE MUST KEEP OUR FIREFHOUSES OPEN AND FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED.

In addition to fighting fires, our firefighters perform many services for our elderly, disabled and low income families that no one else does. FIREFIGHTERS RESPONDED TO OVER 58,000 EMERGENCIES LAST YEAR, INCLUDING 26,000 MEDICAL CALLS.

We depend on our firefighters to protect our families, homes, and businesses. Our narrow streets, steep hills and rows of wood frame buildings make firefighting very difficult. SAN FRANCISCO HAS SPECIAL FIREFIGHTING AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL NEEDS! We are different from other California cities with their wide streets, flat terrain and detached buildings!

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING FOR PROPOSITION F. THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL BENEFIT ALL OUR CITIZENS.

WENDY NELDER, Member
Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

STOP REDUCTIONS IN CITY FIRE PROTECTION! VOTE YES ON F!

Over 71,000 San Francisco voters from every neighborhood, ethnic group and economic level joined to put PROPOSITION F on this ballot. They are concerned because politicians have reduced daily staffing to a dangerous all-time low while emergency calls reached an all-time high of 58,000 last year. People want their neighborhood firehouses to stay open and their fire engines, aerial ladder trucks and fireboat fully staffed to meet their emergency needs. They want a Charter amendment to take politics out of fire safety decisions.

Remember October 17? We learned that we need a strong Fire Department to fight fires, perform rescues and coordinate civilian volunteers. When both bridges are down, we need a strong SFFD!

THIS IS A COMMON SENSE PROPOSITION — IT IS SUPPORTED BY 3 FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT!

Join your friends and neighbors! VOTE YES ON F!

John L. Molinari
Former member of the Board of Supervisors

ONLY YOU CAN STOP FURTHER DANGEROUS CUTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

Over the years, the San Francisco Fire Department has assisted hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans in time of great personal need. The people understand how important the SFFD is in their lives, and OVER 71,000 OF THEM SIGNED THE PETITION TO PLACE PROPOSITION F ON THE BALLOT. The citizens want to be heard!

SFFD EMERGENCY RESPONSES ARE INCREASING DRAMATICALLY EVERY YEAR! Fiscal year totals have gone from 28,000 in 1970 to over 58,000 in 1989, while politicians have slashed daily on-duty staffing from 482, when I was Fire Chief, to today's all-time low of 296. Department resources are being stretched thinner and thinner despite greater and greater needs. THIS DANGEROUS TREND MUST BE STOPPED!

The Department must be able to meet the complex and highly varied needs of today's San Francisco. These include fighting structural fires, providing medical assistance, performing cliff and water rescues, responding to BART and MUNI fires and accidents, controlling hazardous materials emergencies, assisting victims of industrial accidents, and responding to many other emergency needs.

Many seniors, low income families and handicapped people rely on the SFFD to help them. THE PERSONAL ATTENTION THAT THE SFFD PROVIDES CAN NEVER BE CONVERTED TO SELF-SERVICE OR AUTOMATED! Firefighters, not machines, put out fires, perform rescues and meet all the other emergency needs of our city. You need these firefighters! THE NEXT CALL HELP MAY BE YOURS!

The need for Fire Department services crosses all social, ethnic and economic strata. We can all get behind this quality of life issue. Proposition F will strengthen your Fire Department and take politics out of fire safety.

William F. Murray
Chief of Department, SFFD, Retired

VOTE YES ON PROP F!

It takes teamwork to put out a fire. Without it, lives and property can be lost. Without it, firefighters can pay a hard price, for their lives, when in danger, may depend on having a buddy to lend a hand or go for help. As much a part of their job as hose, ladders, and water is that firefighters work in pairs when possible. It can be critical where dense smoke obscures vision or — as so many San Francisco neighborhoods well know — when trying to maneuver on a steeply pitched roof.

Current staffing of aerial ladder trucks leaves one firefighter without a buddy, the team short one vital hand. Proposition F will restore the balance that a fire — and time-tested system needs.

It also will mean two firefighters ready to move out with the fireboat when it has a job to do. Because they weren't readily available, the fireboat was delayed in pumping bay water to put out the disastrous Marina fire after last October's earthquake.

That's why I'm voting "Yes" on Prop F and am urging all San Franciscans to do the same.

Edward J. Phipps
Chief of Department, SFFD (Retired)
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I OWE MY LIFE TO THE QUICK AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS STATIONED AT MY LOCAL FIREHOUSE

Over 26,000 San Franciscans received emergency medical assistance last year by the SFFD. Many lives were saved because firefighters were on the scene in 3 minutes of less. The neighborhood firehouse is an essential part of San Francisco's complex fire protection system.

The October 17th earthquake and the great Marina fire showed us how vital it is to have our Fire Department maintained at an adequate level. There were no firefighters on board the Fireboat Phoenix when it arrived in the Marina, and for over 1 1/2 hours firefighting and search and rescue operations were hindered by a lack of firefighters, as well as by a lack of water. UNDERSTAFFING CAN CAUSE FIRE DEATHS.

Proposal F will answer these critical needs by restoring funds for adequate staffing of fire companies, including the fireboat, and it will require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission and Board of Supervisors before any further cutbacks in fire protection can be made.

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING YES ON F!

John Barbagelata

PENNY-POWER! LOOK — HOW CAN YOU BUY SOMETHING PRICELESS FOR ONLY PENNIES A DAY?

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F!
FOR ONLY 2 CENTS PER DAY, YOU WILL:
• KEEP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIREHOUSE OPEN
• KEEP FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED
• KEEP YOUR FIREBOAT IN SERVICE AND STAFFED WITH FIREFIGHTERS
• GUARANTEE THAT NO FIREHOSES OR FIRE COMPANIES WILL BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT
• REMOVE POLITICS FROM FIRE SAFETY
THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL COST EACH OF SAN FRANCISCO'S 732,000 RESIDENTS JUST PENNIES A DAY:

YEAR 1 — COST $5.3 MILLION = 2 CENTS PER DAY!
YEAR 2 — COST $2.8 MILLION = 1 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 3 — COST $0.8 MILLION = 1/2 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 4 — NO ADDITIONAL COST!
THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE POLICY YOU WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON'T MISS THE CHANCE!

VOTE YES ON F!

W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

WE STRONGLY SUPPORT PROPOSITION F!

No one worries more about costs than working people. For their hard-earned dollars, breadwinners demand value in return.

Value is what Proposition F is all about. It restores adequate staffing of engine and ladder truck companies, staffs the fireboat, and assures that you and I will have a voice in any proposed closing of a fire company or firehouse.

Proposition F is an insurance policy that is clearly a benefit to all San Franciscans. And, there is no question that the benefits greatly exceed the cost — to each of us, just 2 cents a day for the first year, 1 cent a day for the second year, and no cost thereafter.

Without adequate fire protection, San Francisco has too much to lose.

VOTE YES ON F!

Walter L. Johnson
San Francisco Labor Council
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
THEY PROVIDE ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL SERVICES FOR OUR CITIZENS, AND NO ONE ELSE CAN DO THEIR JOB! We have 500 high rise buildings, BART and MUNI tunnels, and large business, school and hospital complexes where firefighting requires many firefighters.

On October 17, we were lucky! It was just a warning.
THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY IS TOO LOW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR

DISASTER NEEDS!
Let's all get behind Proposition F! It will assure stability in Department funding, guarantee adequate staffing for our firehouses and apparatus, and permit long-range planning and improvements. Our firefighters need your vote!

James A. Hood
Chairman
San Franciscans for Fire Safety

VOTE YES ON F!
SAN FRANCISCO IS A FRAGILE CITY. OVER 90% OF ALL STRUCTURES ARE OF WOOD FRAME CONSTRUCTION. YOUR HOMES ARE BUILT IN SOLID BLOCKS OF WOODEN BUILDINGS. THIS SITUATION PRESENTS THE POSSIBILITY OF A DISASTEROUS FIRE OR CONFLAGRATION OCCURRING, ESPECIALLY FOLLOWING AN EARTHQUAKE.
THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS THE LIFELINE FOR ALL OF US WHO LIVE IN THIS CITY. THE EARTHQUAKE ON OCTOBER 17TH AND THE GREAT FIRE IN THE MARINA SHOW HOW IMPORTANT THE FIRE DEPARTMENT IS TO SAN FRANCISCO.
POLITICIANS ARE USING SHRILL RHETORIC AND OTHER OFFENSIVE TACTICS IN AN ATTEMPT TO MISLEAD THE PUBLIC AS TO WHAT THE REAL MEANING OF PROP F IS. DO NOT BE MISLED! PROP F PROVIDES THREE MAIN POINTS:

- ESTABLISHES THE PRESENT 41 NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS AS A MINIMUM STANDARD
- PUTS A FIREFIGHTING CREW ON THE FIREBOAT
- REQUIRES PUBLIC HEARINGS AND APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION. THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE CITIZENS BEFORE A FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED.
THESE ARE COMMON SENSE MEASURES THAT PROVIDE A MINIMUM LEVEL OF PUBLIC SAFETY FOR OUR FAMILIES AND CITY.
PLEASE JOIN ME, AND THE 70,000 OTHER SAN FRANCISCANS WHO SIGNED THE PETITIONS TO PUT PROP F ON THE BALLOT, AND VOTE YES ON "F!"

FRANK T. BLACKBURN
ASSISTANT FIRE CHIEF

VOTE YES ON F!
Fire protection is vital for our families and businesses.
Prop F will stabilize protection and prevent further cuts in the Fire Department.
Protect our city. Vote Yes on F.

Robt. E. Donohue
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
Charles D. Cresci
Deputy Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Charles H. Lee
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T TAKE YOUR FIREFIGHTERS FOR GRANTED!
San Francisco firefighters answered a record 58,000 calls for help last year. Of these, 26,000 were for medical emergencies. Heart attacks, auto accidents, building collapses, childbirths were just a few. BUT EVERY YEAR THERE ARE FEWER AND FEWER FIREFIGHTERS TO HELP YOU! In 1970 there were 482 firefighters on duty each day — in 1990 there are only 296!
Six firehouses and 12 fire companies have been closed.

FIRE SAFETY DECISIONS MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE HANDS OF POLITICIANS! Only a Charter amendment will assure that your Fire Department is adequately staffed to meet San Francisco's special needs — now and in the future. FOR JUST 2 CENTS A DAY, WE CAN KEEP OUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS OPEN AND OUR FIRE APPARATUS ADEQUATELY STAFFED.

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE WE WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON'T MISS THE CHANCE! VOTE YES ON F!

Walter G. Jebe
John J. Figone
Caesar A. Churchwell
Alessandro Baccari
Virgil Caselli
Marsha Garland
Tom Creedon
Ed Farrah
Michael Salanno

NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS

Pride, trust, reliance. They're all wrapped up in a San Francisco institution. The neighborhood fire station turns out to be more — it's a rock, an anchor, a point of reference in people's lives.
City residents have said so loud and clear in endorsing Proposition F. Besides setting a minimum number of firefighters to be on duty each day, the June ballot measure guarantees a public hearing in the area concerned and a vote of the people, if needed, before any fire station may be closed.

Seventy thousand people petitioned to put F on the ballot. Their reasons all had a common core. It's not THE fire station but OUR fire station, they said — a place to expect and get help in a fire or medical emergency, a place the local community can turn to and rely on if the earth shakes, buildings fall, and other resources break down.

Neighborhoods and fire stations. The one requires the other, San Franciscans say.

John W. Flaherty
Mark L. Kaplan
Robert L. Barisone
Elvera Jane Barisone
William A. Roberts Jr.
Maureen Porter
William Porter Jr.
Homer G. Miles
Dorothy L. Miles
Peter C. Gardner
Joan M. Gardner
John Daly
Lucia R. Flaherty
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T BE MISLED BY MAYOR AGNOS!
PROP F IS A LIFE AND DEATH ISSUE!
FIRE, INSURANCE AND EARTHQUAKE EXPERTS AGREE: SAN FRANCISCO FACES THE HIGHEST RISK OF CONFLAGRATION OF ANY CITY IN THE UNITED STATES!
FIRE RISK IS HIGHER THAN IN 1906!
SAN FRANCISCO'S FIRE PROTECTION NEEDS ARE DICTATED BY THE NATURE OF OUR CITY, with its:
- Blocks and blocks of adjoining wood frame buildings
- Steep hills
- Narrow streets
- Traffic congestion
- Network of overhead electrical, trolley and telephone lines
- Prevailing winds
- 500 high rise buildings
- High density residential areas
- Large population of seniors and low-income families
- High vulnerability to severe earthquake damage
- Isolation from outside help in time of disaster
SAN FRANCISCO IS IN TROUBLE BECAUSE THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY. Former SF Fire Chief Emmet Condon in his book "Denial of Disaster":
"THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT IS BELOW THE DAILY MANNING LEVEL THAT ANY EXPERIENCED CHIEF OFFICER KNOWS IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SERVICE TO THE CITY." Condon continues:
"I WOULD AGREE THAT THE HAZARD OF FIRE TO THE CITY AFTER A SIMILAR DISASTER TODAY IS MUCH GREATER THAN IN 1906." And,
"SYNTHETIC MATERIALS HAVE GREATLY INCREASED THE FIRE RISK IN MODERN BUILDINGS AND WILL MAGNIFY THE FIRE PROBLEM IN THE MULTIPLE FIRES THAT WILL BREAK OUT AFTER A SERIOUS EARTHQUAKE."
At least 400 of the city's 500 high rise buildings do not have modern life-safety systems! HIGH RISE FIRES CAUSE A HUGE DRAIN ON FIRE DEPARTMENT RESOURCES.
PROP F IS STRONGLY SUPPORTED BY INDIVIDUALS; CITIZEN, BUSINESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS; FIRE SAFETY EXPERTS, AND A WIDE SPECTRUM OF KNOWLEDGEABLE CIVIC LEADERS.
There is no significant opposition to Prop F.
PROTECT YOURSELF, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR FRIENDS — YOU HAVE A LOT TO LOSE! VOTE YES ON F!

GERRY LONG
Concerned Citizen

WHY VOTE YES ON F? WHY A CHARTER AMENDMENT?
City politicians have been consistently unresponsive to your fire safety concerns. It is the duty of the City to provide its citizens with adequate fire protection and earthquake preparedness. Instead, Fire Department staffing has been cut to a dangerous level.
THE POLITICIANS SAY, "TRUST US!"
We can see that this has not worked, and a Charter provision is necessary. YOUR EMERGENCY NEEDS ARE TOO VITAL TO BE LEFT VULNERABLE TO POLITICAL GAMES.
You hear the sirens every day — BUT HAVE YOU COUNTED THE FIREFIGHTERS? Fewer firefighters means greatly reduced firefighting capacity. FIRE DEPARTMENT STAFFING IS NOW AT AN ALL-TIME LOW AND CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO FALL FURTHER!
WE NEED A STRONG FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

John Flaherty
Battalion Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Past President, S.F. Fire Chiefs Assn.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

HIGH RISE BUILDINGS AND BART AND MUNI UNDERGROUND FACILITIES MAKE SPECIAL FIRE PROTECTION DEMANDS

Today, San Francisco has over 500 high rise buildings. Fires in these buildings require many firefighters because equipment must be carried by hand to the fire — often up many flights of stairs.

In 1988 in Los Angeles, a fire on three floors of a high rise building required 383 firefighters to bring it under control. In San Francisco, our entire on-duty force would be required, leaving the rest of the city completely unprotected. Mutual aid from neighboring communities would be totally inadequate to cover our needs.

BART and MUNI underground facilities present special fire and rescue problems. Large numbers of firefighters are required to fight these fires and perform rescue and ventilation operations.

In July 1989, Mayor Agnos forced reductions in truck company staffing — the key players in rescue and ventilation operations.

Now these aerial ladder teams can no longer function properly.

Building ventilation is delayed, greatly increasing the risk of deadly backdrafts.

The Department's daily staffing has fallen to 296 firefighters, the lowest in history, while fire, medical and other emergencies are higher than ever. Proposition F will bring SFFD staffing up to 320. This is critically needed to meet these ever-increasing demands.

In the past, some Fire Chiefs have thought that you could safely relocate or close a firehouse, but I now recognize that this is dangerous. The SFFD can now get to most emergencies within 3 minutes, but if we close a firehouse we lose that prompt response. With our rows of wood buildings, our large population of elderly citizens, we must get there quickly.

The SFFD is your lifeline. Protect it! I strongly urge all citizens to vote YES on F!

James P. Olson, President
San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

Any firefighter responsible for any racist act or statement on duty, after due process, should be disciplined. Repeat occurrences must result in severe penalties.

Expensive overtime can be largely eliminated by adding more firefighters.

Differences between the union and the mayor should be resolved through good faith negotiations, not through the election process. Maintaining high morale is the only way to insure efficiency.

The neighborhood service cuts need to be restored. Vote YES on F.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Becoming a victim in another major earthquake or runaway fire in one of San Francisco’s densely populated neighborhoods continues to be a hazard for all of us.

Nonetheless, because the Firefighters Union did not endorse him, Mayor Agnos has seen fit to reduce the staffing levels of the Fire Department in any twenty-four hour period from 315 to 296. The San Francisco Republican Party believes these cuts are penny-wise, pound-foolish, and politically motivated.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. DO NOT let the Mayor’s political vendetta jeopardize public safety.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley

William E. Grayson
Anna M. Guth
Tina H. Frank
Christopher L. Bowman
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross
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Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition F. This proposition, if passed, will require twenty-five extra fire fighters to be hired each day — five of these fire fighters will have no specific functions — their daily assignment will be at the discretion of the Chief of Department. It will also require that daily truck staffing be increased from five to six persons and the fireboat staffing be increased by another two fire fighters daily. These increases are unnecessary and are not required — fire suppression units are now staffed to provide effective and efficient fire service for San Francisco.

Proposition F will take management control and responsibility away from the Chief of Department by requiring organizational changes to be approved by the voters at a regular election. This would not allow the Chief, through the Fire Commission, to respond to the changing demands placed on the Fire Department. Fire protection decisions can’t wait until an election. To provide for and maintain the most cost effective and efficient fire department, I urge you to vote NO on Proposition F.

Frederick F. Postel
Chief of Department

Overtime pay is bleeding the Fire Department’s budget dry!
Over 92 percent of the budget goes for personnel costs. In 1988-89 uniformed personnel were paid salaries totaling $53,567,000 plus mandatory fringe benefits of $53,543,000 and still another $11,893,000 for overtime!

Proposition F would increase that bleeding by creating new positions not necessary for the safety of San Franciscans despite the scare statements made by the firefighters’ union.

Proposition F would cost $4,900,000 in overtime thereby siphoning away money needed to make major improvements!

We already have excellent protection but we want to upgrade it by developing a comprehensive earthquake program, by improving our response to emergency medical calls (over 4 1/2 times the number of fires) and by purchasing more modern fire equipment.

During the October quake 522 off-duty firefighters reported back immediately yet there were not enough engines and trucks for them; in fact, one old piece had to be taken out of the Fire Museum to help fight the Marina District fire.

Our firefighters work nine days out of 31 in shifts of approximately 24 hours on and 48 off.

Many are “double-dippers” holding down well paid outside jobs such as contractors, lawyers, plumbers and electricians. They still put in overtime because the Charter provides for such generous pay.

Overtime pay for a firefighter is $585 per shift, for a Captain $776 and for an Assistant Chief $1077! Last year the average firefighter’s cost to the City was $90,000, including salary, fringe benefits and overtime.

Do not pay out more money just for overtime.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

James Jefferson
President, Fire Commission
Frank Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted Soullis
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

San Francisco has the finest fire protection in California. Now is not the time to jeopardize it with Proposition F. Proposition F is an ill-advised and wasteful measure. First, it would wrest management of the Fire Department away from the Fire Commission and the Chief, where management properly and historically belongs. Management of the Fire Department should remain accountable to the citizens of San Francisco, through its appointed Fire Commission. This principle is violated when rigid language is placed in the Charter. Second, Proposition F would unnecessarily increase the Fire Department’s budget by approximately $4.9 million a year. The San Francisco Fire Department already has staffing levels on its fire engines and aerial ladder trucks that are equal to the best in California. To overstaff the engines and trucks would be counterproductive as well as wasteful, especially in a time of limited resources and ever-increasing demands for City services.

Let life and death decisions of fire protection in San Francisco remain in the control of the Fire Commission and the Chief.

Let the buck stop where it has always stopped — with the Fire Commission and the Chief. And let San Francisco’s first-rate fire protection continue. We can’t afford to play around with fire, or with Proposition F. A similar Proposition was defeated in November, 1987. Vote NO on this Proposition in 1990. Vote NO on Proposition F.

James D. Jefferson
President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Souls
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Vote No on Proposition F.

Proposition F has little to do with fire protection and earthquake preparedness and a lot to do with unnecessary Fire Department staffing.

Vote No on Proposition F. Don’t tie the hands of the Chief and Fire Commission, preventing them from managing the department and our tax dollars. Proposition F will take $6 million a year from health services, libraries, homeless programs and other vital city services. Why? Because Proposition F will require the city to pay more overtime to firefighters who already receive higher salaries than those in Los Angeles, San Jose, Long Beach or San Diego.

Employment of unnecessary personnel is called “featherbedding.” Proposition F is just that — at a cost of $6 million. San Francisco has the best fire protection services in the country. We already pay more per person for that service than any other city in California.

Stop a $6 million raid on the City Treasury. Vote No on Proposition F.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Like all San Franciscans, we want a safe and healthy city. But Proposition F could jeopardize our safety and health. By spending more than $7 million on unnecessary overtime, Proposition F will take money away from other vitally needed services like fire equipment, police protection, health care and children's programs.

The annual fire department budget is already $150 million. Firefighters are already getting a pay raise of almost 10%. That's more than most city workers — and most of us.

San Francisco already has more firefighters per thousand residents than any other major Western city.

Yet San Francisco has fewer fire and emergency alarms than other cities. In 1986, San Francisco had 78,000 emergency calls. Oakland had 95,000.

We appreciate the job that our firefighters do. But we cannot support this multi-million dollar attempt to win back overtime for just 18 firefighters per day.

Susan J. Bierman
Agar Jaacks
Mauri Schwartz
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Sunset Democratic Club
Margaret Brodkin, Director Coleman Advocates for Children
Carole Migden, chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

I respect and admire the work done by San Francisco's firefighters.

It's a dangerous job.

That's why they're paid more than firefighters in any other large city in California, even though our firefighters work 15 percent fewer hours.

But today our average cost per firefighter has hit $96,000 per year.

We have been reducing this amount — and improving fire service at the same time — by hiring more new firefighters and reducing costly overtime payments.

That overtime runs as much as $585 per day for a fourth-year firefighter, and up to $1077 per day at the higher ranks.

When they argue for Proposition F, the union avoids mentioning this fact. They raise a false alarm about closing down firehouses, when in reality we are adding new firefighters as quickly as we can train them.

Ninety new firefighters are being hired this year alone. We have full classes in the Fire Academy for the first time in years.

Prop F asks you, the voters, to put an unnecessary sixth firefighter back on every fire truck, in order to give current firefighters millions in guaranteed overtime.

There's no need for it. Even a one-alarm fire in San Francisco draws 30 firefighters in response.

It's easy, when you think about the heroic work firefighters do, to justify giving them whatever they ask for.

I made the same mistake myself three years ago, before I was mayor. As a State Assemblyman and a strong union supporter, I lent my name to a measure that was similar to Proposition F.

But no group, however much we appreciate their work, is entitled to millions of taxpayer dollars a year in guaranteed, unnecessary overtime — especially when they are trying to feather their own nests by keeping out women and minorities.

With all the pressing needs facing our city, we can't afford to give away $7 million and get nothing in return. Please vote No on Proposition F.

Mayor Art Agnos
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NEW CHARTER SECTION: 3.548
MINIMUM LEVELS OF FIRE PROTECTION FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Notwithstanding any other section of this Charter, the minimum levels of fire protection for the City and County of San Francisco shall be specified as follows:

A. The MINIMUM level of Fire Protection for the City and County of San Francisco, in fire suppression, effective July 1, 1990, except as specified in Section C shall be as follows:

1. Engine Companies: 41
   Truck Companies: 18
   Rescue Companies: 2
   Fireboat Companies: 1
   Battalion Districts: 10
   Divisions: 3
   Service Units: 1
   Bureau of Equipment: 2
   High Pressure System: 1
   Tank (staffed): 1
   (Jones St. Tank) (At Chief’s Discretion): 5

2. Fire station: The minimum number of stations shall be 41, at locations listed on the SFFD Station Directory for July 1, 1987.

B. MINIMUM daily staffing of Fire Companies and other Units:

1. Engine Companies: 1 Officer and 3 Firefighters
2. Truck Companies: 1 Officer and 5 Firefighters
3. Rescue Company: 1 Officer and 3 Firefighters
4. Fireboat Company: 1 Officer, 1 Pilot, 1 Marine Engineer and 2 Firefighters
5. Service Units: 1 Firefighter
6. Bureau of Equipment: 2 Firefighters
7. Battalion District: 1 Battalion Chief, 1 Chief’s Aide, 1 Assistant Chief, 1 Chief’s Aide
8. Division: 1 qualified person to operate gates, valves and communications equipment of the High Pressure System.
9. Jones Street Tank: Required minimum staffing shall be maintained on a constant basis, 24 hours per day. Sufficient personnel and positions shall be authorized and funded to maintain minimum required staffing levels established in this section. When assigned personnel are not available, then staffing shall be maintained by working of overtime.

C. CLOSURE AND RELOCATION OF FIRE STATIONS, DEACTIVATION OF FIRE COMPANIES OR OF UNITS REQUIRED BY THIS SECTION:

1. Fire Stations, Fire Companies or other Units required by this section may be closed or deactivated only when each of the following procedures is completed:
   a. It is recommended by the Chief of Department and approved for consideration by the Fire Commission.
   b. The Fire Commission shall hold at least two public hearings on the matter so that affected citizens may appear to express their views.
   c. At least one of the public hearings shall be held in the neighborhood of the Station, Company, or Unit to be closed or deactivated. Such meeting to be held at a time and place most suitable for maximum public attendance.
   d. Except as provided by this section, other facilities or units may be closed or deactivated by majority of the five members of the Fire Commission upon recommendation by the Chief of Department.
   e. Upon conclusion of public hearings and approval by a majority of the five members of the Fire Commission for the closure or deactivation of a Company or Unit, the Fire Commission shall forward its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors within 30 calendar days.
   f. Upon receipt of the Fire Commission recommendation, the Board of Supervisors may hold public hearings on the matter and they may approve or disapprove of the recommendation of the Fire Commission for closure or deactivation of a Station, Company or Unit. Such approval or disapproval shall be by majority vote of the Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors approves of the Fire Commission recommendation, then they shall direct the Clerk of the Board to have the matter put on the ballot of the next regular election for final determination by the voters of the City and County.

D. DEFINITIONS - EQUIPMENT

1. ENGINE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying hose and a pump to pump water of at least 1,500 gallons per minute.
2. TRUCK COMPANY: A tractor-trailer vehicle carrying ladders and rescue equipment with a 100-foot aerial ladder or equivalent device to reach upper floors of buildings.
3. RESCUE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying rescue equipment capable of heavy rescue and diving equipment for underwater rescue.
4. FIRE BOAT COMPANY: A boat equipped with pumps, hose, monitor nozzles and able to navigate San Francisco Bay for firefighting and rescue duty along the shorelines of the City and County.
5. SERVICE UNIT: A vehicle carrying spare supply of air and equipment for self-contained breathing apparatus and resuscitators.
6. HIGH PRESSURE SYSTEM PUMP STATION: A facility capable of pumping at least 10,000 gallons per minute from San Francisco Bay or other water source into the mains of the high pressure water system.
7. BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT: A vehicle capable of carrying equipment for emergency repairs or towing of fire apparatus under emergency conditions.
**PROPOSITION G**

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?

**Analysis**

by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Health Service System provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Supervisors may not continue to receive health insurance from the Health Service System after they leave the Board of Supervisors.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Board of Supervisors could allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

**A "YES" VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

**A "NO" VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System.

---

**Controller's Statement on "G"**

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

---

**How Supervisors Voted on "G"**

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

---

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G will allow former Supervisors to buy health insurance coverage from the City's Health Service system, when they leave office. THERE WILL BE NO COST TO THE CITY.

The Health Service System now provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Proposition G simply allows former Supervisors to buy continued health coverage in the City's Health Plan, at their own expense.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition G
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "G"
Former supervisors are either those who have decided not to run; or those the electorate voted out of office.
Even as it claims they will pay their own health plan benefits, why continue to have them in the system.

Cut bait.
Vote NO.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8,425 Persons Covered

Each plan may make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system by the dependents of members, retired city and county employees, temporary city and county employees, such other dependents of deceased and retired city and county employees as the board of supervisors may authorize by ordinance, teachers and other employees of the San Francisco Unified School District retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System and resigned employees of the city and county and resigned teachers and employees of the school district whose resignations occur after June 15, 1955, and within 30 days immediately prior to the date on which, but for their resignations, they would have become retired members of the said retirement system, on whose relinquishment of retirement allowances as permitted by the charter occurs after such date and resigned employees of the San Francisco Unified School District not otherwise included. A resigned employee or teacher is one whose employment has terminated other than by retirement, discharge or death or who has relinquished retirement allowances. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system to the aforementioned resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District is to enable them, subject to the health service board’s exercise of its power, to participate in the benefits of the system after transferring to the State Teachers’ Retirement System from the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for participation in the benefits of the system by the aforementioned resigned employees of the city and county and other resigned employees of San Francisco Unified School District is to permit the health service board to have power to treat them the same as it treats resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District.

As used in this section, and for the purpose of this section, the terms “city and county employees” and “employees of the city and county” shall include officers and employees of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco.

The board of supervisors may also provide by ordinance for the continuation in any plan by former supervisors who agree to and do pay the full cost of such benefit.

Moved since you last voted? Then you must re-register. Phone 554-4375.
PROPOSITION H
Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?

YES 290
NO 292

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers belong to the City's Retirement System. Under the charter, the Board of Supervisors may contract with the State's Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) to allow certain safety employees to be members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, if there is no additional cost to the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, if there would be no additional cost to the City.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want these employees to continue to be covered by the City's Retirement System.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This Charter Amendment would provide for safety retirement for eighteen civilian Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers employed by the San Francisco Fire Department, at no additional cost to the City.

Fire Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers are classified by the State of California as safety personnel and properly belong in a safety retirement program that is not offered by the City’s Retirement System for non-uniformed employees. Instead, the City contracts with the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) for its public safety officers who are not police officers or firefighters.

Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers, along with their counterparts in the uniformed firefighter ranks, provide the professional expertise necessary for the City’s fire prevention program. Proposition H provides a retirement plan for this small group of civilians equivalent to the retirement plan for their uniformed firefighter counterparts, at no additional cost to the City.

Voters approved similar measures in recent years that provided for safety requirement for probation officers, investigator groups and various other safety personnel.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

---

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition H
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.
8.506-2 Miscellaneous Safety Employees
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the board of supervisors or the community college board shall have the power to contract with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees’ Retirement System of the State of California to provide that the probation officers, airport police officers, district attorney and public defender investigators, coroner investigators, juvenile court counselors, and institutional police, fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers who are not members of the Section 8.588 plans, shall be members of the public employees’ retirement system, and the board of supervisors, the community college board and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such contract.
The power to contract created herein shall be limited to a contract with no net increase in cost to the city and county or the community college district.
Any person who shall become a member of the public employees’ retirement system pursuant to such contract shall have the right to be a member of the health service system and the health board shall make provision for the participation in the benefits of the health service system by such persons.

Out of town on June 5, 1990? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
Nearly 70,000 homes in the southern and eastern parts of the City have curbside recycling. By 1991, every resident will have curbside collection service.

Until curbside reaches your neighborhood, you can recycle at our many community recycling centers.

For a free Recycling Starter Kit and information on where to recycle call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL
554-6193
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

PROPOSITION I
Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits? YES 293 NO 295

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the State Retirement System are allowed to work for the San Francisco Unified School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. Retired San Francisco teachers in the City Retirement system are not allowed to do so.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow retired teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. While they are consultants they would not make retirement contributions or earn additional retirement credits.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the City's Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, costs could increase, the amount of which, being dependent upon the dollar amount and the number of personal service contracts executed, cannot be determined, but should not be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Jim Gonzalez and Richard Hongisto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is necessary to correct an inequity that exists between teachers in the State Teachers' Retirement System and those in the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. Teachers in the state system can retire up to three years early and supplement their reduced retirement income by serving as consultants to the school district developing curriculum, orienting new teachers, substituting for absent teachers, tutoring students, etc. The Charter denies the right to the four hundred teachers in the city retirement system to continue serving students and schools in these ways. Proposition I would correct this inequity by extending the same right to teachers in the city retirement system. Proposition I will save taxpayers' money by encouraging teachers at the top of the salary scale to retire early. New hires at the low end of the salary scale will earn little more than half as much as those at the top.

Proposition I will also improve education in San Francisco schools by continuing to take advantage of the experience and expertise of retired teachers. It will also help to solve the shortage of qualified substitute teacher.

Vote YES on Proposition I for equity, economy, and educational excellence.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition I
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition I
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will bring equity and fairness to retired teachers, save the taxpayers money and improve the educational system in San Francisco.

Assemblyman Willie Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John Burton
Supervisor Wendy Neider
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Jim Gonzalez
San Francisco Democratic Party
Fred Rodriguez, President of the Board of Education

United Educators of San Francisco, Joan-Marie Shelley
Judy Dellamonica
Joanne Miller, vice-president of the San Francisco Board of Education
Thomas Ammiano
Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council
Larry Martin, Transport Workers of America
Robert Barnes
James Wachob
Jose Medina
Harry G. Britt, President of the Board of Supervisors

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I
For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "malignant officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police department as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under Section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in Section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in Section 3.670 of the charter.

"Charter" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural; and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(b) Any member who completes at least 20 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 50 years, or at least 10 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 60 years, said service to be computed under Subsection (g) hereof, may retire from service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after reaching the age of 60 years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of two percent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of 65 years, if the allowance available to such member, pursuant to the provisions of Subsection (f) of this section, shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this Subsection (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this Subsection (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said Subsection (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of 60 years, after rendering 20 years or more of such service and having attained the age of 50 years, computed under Subsection (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under Subsection (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/4</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/2</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-3/4</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-1/4</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed 75 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or Subsection (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of 65 years may elect, without right of reversion, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system, and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of Sec-

(Continued on next page)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued)

In this charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $100 per month upon retirement after 30 years of service and after attaining the age of 65, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $100 per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculations of retirement allowances.

Any member who becomes incapacitated for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculations of retirement allowances.

Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duties by reason of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least 10 years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in Subsection (g) of this section, 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) of this section, effective for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds 40 percent of his average final compensation, otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were it not for such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age 60, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed 40 percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based upon the compensation earned by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one year immediately preceding his retirement. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied as full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

If a member shall die, before retirement, (1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection, (2) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of 12 months of compensation earned shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

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 at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired from service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If, at the date of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subdivision (2), there is one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children individually, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under Subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) shall be paid in lump sum as follows:

(A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.
(B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election, but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 years, may make the election herein provided before benefit has been paid under this Subsection (a), for and on behalf of such children, 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 (a), 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.

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 or to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redemption, withdrawal accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least 10 years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed $1,000, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service.

(Continued on next page)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued)

retirement, but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1-1/2 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 added thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

(g) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

(1) Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.

(2) Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitling him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contributions standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member, to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of Section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under Section 8.507.

(5) The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and service rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefor shall be required of the city and county.

(h) All payments provided under this section shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation paid to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to 7-1/2 percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of Subsection (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of the member on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members, and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this Subsection (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, whihm shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), Subsection (h), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement, and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year, and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this Subdivision (4), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) The city and county shall provide 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 (h), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(j) Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(l) Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsections (b), (c), (f), and (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and

(Continued on page 92)
PROPOSITION J
Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?

YES 296  NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Human Rights Commission was created by an ordinance. Under that ordinance, the Human Rights Commission has 15 members.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment that would make the existing Human Rights Commission a charter commission; it would reduce the number of members from 15 to 11.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you want to reduce its size to 11 members.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you do not want to reduce its size to 11 members.

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government in an amount not to exceed $4,200."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Thomas Hsieh.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Let us make human rights a fundamental part of the fabric of San Francisco.
San Francisco is the birthplace of the United Nations and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, our Human Rights Commission is not even a part of our constitution — the Charter.
Proposition J will make the Human Rights Commission a charter commission. Proposition J will take the position of the Human Rights Commission out of politics and ensures its place in the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Please vote in favor of Proposition J to recognize the importance of human rights to San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition J
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition J

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department and a candidate for Municipal Court Judge I urge you to vote for Ballot Measure J.

The Human Rights Commission has been a positive voice for 25 years. Thousands of San Franciscans have directly benefited from the Commission’s efforts. Its mandate will be greatly strengthened by extending Charter status through this measure.

Please join me and vote yes on J!

James Harrigan
For Municipal Court

---

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “J”

We have a Human Rights Commission NOW, appointed by the Mayor. A new one in the charter would have the same appointing officer.

We don’t need a confirmation of said committee. It will not take it out of politics. No reason for this.

Just another layer of government — for what.

Vote no on “J”.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: This entire section is new.

PART TWENTY-FOUR: HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
3.699-5 Commission; Composition
A human rights commission is hereby established. The human rights commission shall consist of eleven members broadly representative of the general public to be appointed by the mayor. Three of the members who are first appointed shall be designated to serve for terms of one year, three for two years, three for three years and two for four years from the date of their appointments. Thereafter, members shall be appointed as aforesaid for a term of office of four years, except that all of the vacancies occurring during a term shall be filled for the unexpired term. Members of said commission shall be compensated for each commission or committee meeting actually attended by said members in an amount as may be established and amended, from time to time, by ordinance of the board of supervisors, but not less than $50 per meeting provided, however, that no member shall be paid for attending more than two commission or committee meetings in any one calendar month.

---

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

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.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons

(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

8.584-10 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.584 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.584, he shall re-enter membership under Section 8.584 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.584. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for service or disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 60 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he held the position which he held at the time of his retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he held the position from which he was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
Seven Member Commissions

PROPOSITION K
Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?

YES 298
NO 299

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department, Fire Department, Social Services Department, Port of San Francisco, Public Utilities Commission, Board of Permit Appeals, Civil Service Commission, Airports Commission and Parking and Traffic Department are managed by a board or commission. Each of these boards and commissions has five members appointed by the Mayor.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K is a character amendment that would increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the size of these boards and commissions to stay the same.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $18,800 annually beginning January, 1991.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh, Bill Maher, and Wendy Nelder.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K expands the opportunity for San Francisco’s varied communities to participate in City government. Proposition K increases, from five to seven, the membership of the Board of Permit Appeals and seven City commissions: Police, Fire, Social Services, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports, and Parking and Traffic. It also includes the Port Commission, subject to amendment of state law to authorize such an increase.

Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities. Only five members of these crucial commissions is insufficient to address the diversity of concerns in our City; seven members will provide greater representation and greater leadership from a variety of communities. The expansion of the size of these commissions enhances the possibility for all San Franciscans to be part of decision-making and policy-making processes at every level.

The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions. Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor, but instead of the many under-represented voices in San Francisco.

Proposition K would make these commissions representative of the interests of more San Franciscans, while maintaining the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants. San Franciscans want accessible, responsive, and active commissioners. We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns, and Proposition K is a method for achieving these goals.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

You need a decoder ring to read the Supervisors’ argument in favor of creating 18 new commissioner slots. Here’s what the Board says, and here’s what they really mean.

The Board says: “Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities.”

The Board means: All you interest groups out there, it’s time to get yours.

The Board says: “The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions.”

The Board means: With 18 more political appointments, a mayor won’t offend as many supporters by passing them over for city jobs.

The Board says: “Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor.”

The Board means: Adding 18 new city commissioners isn’t really a boon to the incumbent mayor — unless he’s re-elected.

The Board says: “Proposition K would . . . maintain the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants.”

The Board means: Increasing commission memberships by 40% isn’t that big a deal.

The Board says: “We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns.”

The Board means: A fair hearing before city commissions isn’t enough; we want guaranteed results!

Let’s stop speaking in code and talk plainly. Proposition K is based on the notion that people should be treated as groups — not individuals — in the political process. That’s offensive, and so is Proposition K.

Please vote NO on K!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is a textbook example of what's wrong with contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K demeans us because it lumps city residents into groups, rather than respecting their rights as individuals.

Proposition K divides us because it stresses what such interest groups (the polite euphemism is "communities") disagree about, rather than what all San Franciscans share in common.

Proposition K debases us because it is premised on a "quota system" for city boards and commissions. There shouldn’t be "white seats" or "black seats", "gay seats" or "straight seats" on city commissions. There should be but two qualifications for service as a city commissioner: San Francisco residency and individual ability!

Vote NO on Proposition K!

San Francisco is indeed a polyglot and richly diverse community. City residents come from all corners of the country and the globe. Their political opinions range from radical to reactionary and all points in between.

It's impossible for each point of view, each ethnic group, each political persuasion, each neighborhood to be represented on city commissions. Increasing the membership on those bodies from five to seven persons is like buying a bigger umbrella in a hurricane. It won't make a bit of difference.

It is possible, however, for city commissioners from all walks of life to represent views and interests other than their own. It happens all the time in countless actions by city boards and agencies. And if we want to encourage consensus and better understanding among San Francisco's many "communities", we must resist attempts — such as Proposition K — to make the labels we all wear easier to read.

Three years ago, Mayor Agnos campaigned on the slogan, "One City, One Future". The supporters of Proposition K have failed to heed those words.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The opponents of Proposition K are clearly on the wrong page of the textbook of contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K values us because it gives city residents greater ability to be heard, individually and as a community.

Proposition K unites us because it reinforces what we all share in common: respect for democracy. If, as the opposition claims, the ability to have more access to representation is divisive, democratic ideals such as checks and balances must therefore also be divisive and undesirable.

Proposition K elevates us because it originates from that respect for democracy. This does not limit or allocate, but reasonably expands available seats on the commissions. Proposition K effectively dilutes the influence of special interests in favor of more broad-based views.

San Francisco is an extremely diverse city and that diversity should be reasonably represented. Democracy requires the opportunity for representation of all points of view. Good government demands that the number of appointed officials be limited so that debate can be functional. Proposition K addresses these two needs: increased citizen participation, and reasonable size to facilitate getting work done.

If you take the opposition's argument — that it is not meaningful to have representatives from different neighborhoods, ethnicities, political persuasions — to its logical extreme, you could have one member commissions achieving a consensus at the price of democracy.

Proposition K is good government, since it integrates the multiplicity of voices into a united future for the residents of San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition K!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
Seven Member Commissions

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

We need to create an open, democratic, and participatory local government.
This measure will encourage more participation.
Vote YES on K.

Individuals and community groups strongly support K. Increasing the membership on these bodies expands the opportunity to participate for all San Franciscans.
Vote YES on K!

Mayor Art Agnos
Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John L. Burton
State Senator Milton Marks
Fr. James Goode
Carole Migden
   Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Robert Barnes
   Political Action Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club

Catherine Baccari
Bob Dockendorff
   Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

Joel Ventresca
   Past President,
   Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
   Candidate for Supervisor

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Robert McCarthy
Ruth Picon
   President, Latino Democratic Club
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead, Pres.
   Bernal Heights Community Foundation
Jake McGoldrick
Arnie Scher
Natalie Berg
Sodonia Wilson,
   San Francisco Board of Education
Alma Jackson
Margaret Brady
Reverend Amos Brown
Yori Wada

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Vote No on Proposition K.

Proposition K unnecessarily tinkers with our commission system for managing city departments.

Many of the most important city functions — police and fire services, libraries and health care — are governed by five-member city commissions. Proposition K would increase the size of these commissions to seven members. The Planning Commission would be expanded to nine members.

For what reason? The supporters say that the commissions cannot reflect our diverse community unless we allow the mayor to appoint more commissioners. They miss the point of the commission system.

Commissioners are not advisors or members of a community-wide study panel. They are managers. They set city policy, recommend hundreds of millions of dollars in spending, and hire and fire key departmental personnel.

Preserve our system of citizen management. Don’t make city commissions debating societies.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Are not seven Deputy Mayors at the rate of $94,000 a year a sufficient number of political plums for the Mayor? Does he really need eighteen more commissioners to achieve good government in San Francisco?

Do not give the Mayor additional tools to promote his re-election efforts. The San Francisco Republican Party urges voters to Vote No on Proposition K.

San Francisco Republican Party
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Anna M. Guth
William E. Grayson
Honor H. Bulkley
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chung
Brian Mavrogeorge
Ronald G. Kershaw
Sam T. Harper
Jun Hatayama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

No sound arguments have been presented which support the need for Proposition K. Enlarging Boards and Commissions would increase city costs without improving productivity. Indeed, extra members may impede efficiency and result in protracted proceedings.

Don’t give the Mayor additional opportunities for patronage. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw
Brian Mavrogeorge
Paul Kavouksiorian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence
Martin Keller

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K
PROPOSITION K WILL ADD TO BUREAUCRACY

Proposition K will hinder quick and fair response to citizen concerns. Larger commissions do not mean better commissions; on the contrary, they mean a less efficient, more cumbersome process.

PROPOSITION K WILL NOT MAKE COMMISSIONS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INTERESTS OF SAN FRANCISCO

Present commissions serve a diverse San Francisco by appointment of individuals who reflect and possess sensitivity, respect for different backgrounds and points of views.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

Sharon Bretz
Susann L. Danielson
Jean Kalil
Victor Makras
Esther Marks
Beverly Prior

Larger commissions and larger support bureaucracy are not the answer to better representation. The answer is less political patronage and more appointments based on experience and knowledge. This proposal only makes government more cumbersome and less effective.

... Vote NO on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Proposition K is not about democracy. It is about patronage. It is about creating many new commission positions to hand out as political plums. To whom? For what? And why should the taxpayers be forced to pay for it?

No one, not even the author, Supervisor Ward, claims that it will improve the efficiency of the government, yet it will certainly add to the costs. The true costs will include trips, staff time, expenses, etc., with no discernible benefit to the public.

This measure will lead to longer meetings, more arguments, divisiveness and politics while providing less management oversight.

Proposition K is an insider’s game. They gain and the voters pay. It is a costly bad idea and should be soundly rejected by the voters.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Bill Maher

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "K"

If qualified commissioners were appointed who understood they represented ALL of San Francisco this charter amendment would not be necessary.

There are nine commissions listed for additional members — 18 more appointments. Just another avenue for political appointments.

Vote No on Proposition "K".

Marguerite Warren
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

PART FOUR: POLICE DEPARTMENT
3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, police force, an office of citizen complaints and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of five seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission to seven members, shall continue to hold their respective positions, subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the police department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the police commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-20 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The police commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

PART FIVE: FIRE DEPARTMENT
3.540 Fire Department

The fire department shall be under the management of a fire commission, consisting of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor; and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years of 1948, 1949, and 1950, respectively, two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The chief of department shall have power to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for fire-fighting purposes.

The commissioners shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the fire department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the fire commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-20 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter.

Positions of officers and employees of the fire department legally authorized shall continue, and the incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall continue as the officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments, and except as in this charter otherwise provided.

PART EIGHT: SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
3.570 Composition of Department; Commission

There is hereby established a social services department. This department shall consist of a social services commission of five seven members, a director of social services, and such employees and assistants as may be necessary to carry out the work and functions of said department.

The members of the social services commission shall be appointed thereto by the mayor and shall be selected for their respective positions on the basis of their interest in and understanding of the problems of public welfare. The members of said commission shall serve without compensation and no person shall be eligible to serve on said commission while holding a salaried public office, position or employment.

The term of office of the members of the said commission, subject to the provisions hereof relative to removal and the terms of the first members (Continued on next page)
bers of the commission, shall be four years.

The mayor shall appoint five seven members to said social services commission, one member to be appointed for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1938; one for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1939; one for a term to expire on the 15th day of January, 1940, and two for terms to expire on the 15th day of January, 1941; and two for terms to expire on the 15th day of January, 1996; and upon the expiration of the terms of each of said members of said commission so appointed, the mayor shall fill the vacancy arising by reason of the expiration of said term by the appointment of a member to said commission for a term of four years. Vacancies occurring in the membership of said commission shall be filled by an appointment to be made by the mayor for the unexpired term of said person in whose place said appointment is made; and when the term of any member of said commission shall expire, then said appointment shall be made for the full period of four years from the date of the expiration of the term. All vacancies shall be filled within 30 days of the occurrence thereof.

Members of the commission shall be subject to removal from office by the mayor for cause, but only upon written charges made and signed by the mayor, copy of said charges to be served upon the offending commissioner; and said charges shall be heard by the mayor and on said hearing of said charges the said commissioner so charged shall have the opportunity to appear and to be heard.

The commission shall be a policy-determining and supervisory body and shall have all the powers provided for in Section 3.500 of the charter.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART NINE: PORT COMMISSION

3.580 Commission; Composition

The San Francisco Port Commission shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, their appointment being subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors. Each of said members shall serve for a term of four years. Vacancies on the commission shall be filled by the mayor for the unexpired portion of the term. Initial appointive members of the commission shall consist of the incumbent members of the San Francisco Port Authority, who shall serve as commissioners for a term corresponding to the unexpired portion of their tenure as members of the port authority. Subject to amendment of state law to authorize an increase in membership, the port commission shall consist of seven members. The two additional members shall be appointed by the mayor after the eighth day of January, 1992. The initial term of office not to exceed four years shall be fixed by the mayor to insure that the term of office for a majority of the commission shall not expire in the same year. In addition, the director of finance and secretary of agriculture and services, or their designated representatives, shall be ex-officio members of the commission. Persons appointed to the port commission shall be subject to recall, suspension and removal in the same manner as an elected official.

The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3.590 Commission; Composition

A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers.

The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o'clock, on the 8th day of January, 1932, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of two other commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936. The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992. * On the expiration of these and successive terms, the mayor shall appoint their successors for four years. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS

3.650 Board Composition

The mayor shall appoint five seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $5,000 $7,000 per year. One such term shall expire at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934 and 1935, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936, and two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January 1996, and upon these and successive expirations the mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

3.651 Functions, Powers and Duties

Any applicant for a permit or license who is denied such permit or license by the department authorized to issue same, or whose license or permit is ordered revoked by any department, or any person who deems that his interests or property or that the general public interest will be adversely affected as the result of operations authorized by or under any permit or license granted or issued by any department, may appeal to the board of permit appeals. Such board shall hear the applicant, the permit-holder, or other interested parties, as well as the head or representative of the department issuing or refusing to issue such license or permit, or ordering the revocation of same. After such hearing and such further investigation as the board may deem necessary, it may concur in the action of the department authorized to issue such license or permit, or, by the vote of four five members, may overrule the action of such department and order that the permit or license be granted, restored or refused.

The board of permit appeals shall have and exercise the following powers:

(a) To hear and determine appeals where it is alleged there is error or abuse of discretion in any order, requirement, decision or determination made by the zoning administrator in the enforcement of the provisions of any ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors creating zoning districts or regulating the use of property in the city and county.

(b) To hear and determine appeals from the rulings, decisions and determinations of the zoning administrator granting or denying applications for variances from any rule, regulation, restriction or requirement of the zoning or setback ordinances, or any section thereof. Upon the hearing of such appeals said board may affirm, change, or modify the ruling, decision or determination appealed from, or, in lieu thereof, make such other additional determination as it shall deem proper in the premises, subject to the same limitations as are placed upon the zoning administrator by this charter or by ordinance.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SEVENTEEN: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county.

The civil service commission shall consist of five seven members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the 1st day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and, provided further, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall be as follows; one shall expire on June 30, 1996 and one on June 30, 1998, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. No less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this

(Continued on page 128)
Commissioner Residency Requirement

PROPOSITION L

Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Candidates for elective office and members of charter boards and commissions must be San Francisco residents and electors. For other boards, commissions and advisory bodies, the law creating them may set residency requirements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L is a charter amendment that would require the members of all boards, commissions and advisory bodies to be San Francisco residents and electors.

This rule would not apply where a non-charter board, commission or advisory body requires a person with specific qualifications, and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found. Also, this rule would not apply to the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Fine Arts Museums, the Asian Arts Commission, the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission and the elected members of the San Francisco Retirement Board and Health Service Board.

Proposition L would delete the current requirement that candidates and members of charter boards and commissions be residents and electors for a certain length of time before assuming office, which courts have found unconstitutional.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “L”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh and Bill Maher.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Commissioner Residency Requirement

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

This charter amendment provides that all individuals serving on city boards and commissions and committees with few exceptions, must be citizens of voting age of San Francisco.

Members of boards and commissions and committees often have policy making and regulatory responsibilities. Clearly, San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco. With a population of 750,000 residents, surely we have enough qualified and talented San Franciscans who can get the job done.

This charter amendment offers the appointing officer with some flexibility. If a qualified candidate for a public post requiring specialized skills cannot be found in our city, then, following such a declaration, the appointing officer may search elsewhere.

Let’s open up more opportunities for our residents to serve San Francisco. VOTE YES FOR THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERSHIP ON CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I was mistaken in one of my objections to Proposition L. Some years ago, a court decision invalidated the voter-adopted Charter requirement that a person be a San Francisco resident for five years before appointment to a city commission. I disagree strongly with that decision, for the reasons cited in my ballot argument appearing on the opposite page. The inoperative language remained in our Charter, however, and Proposition L disingenuously removes it — like pruning a dead branch from a tree.

But, there are still plenty of reasons to vote against Proposition L.

(1) Proposition L eliminates the requirement that a commissioner be an “elector” of San Francisco (a voter, meaning also a U.S. citizen) for at least one year. This Charter provision has not been altered by a court, but Proposition L would strike it from the books.

A person could move into town, register to vote, and be appointed that day to a city post.

(2) Proposition L exempts three city commissions — Health System, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board — from any residency requirement whatsoever.

(3) Proposition L would allow non-residents to serve on any board or commission created by the Board of Supervisors. In fact, Proposition L could even be interpreted to allow the appointment of non-citizens to such posts!

Don’t be misled or confused. If you want San Franciscans to make decisions about San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition L!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

If you want San Francisco residents to serve on all city commissions established by the charter, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you think San Franciscans should serve on boards and committees created by the Board of Supervisors, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you favor city residents serving on the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees, vote NO on Proposition L.

The Board of Supervisors says “San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco.” I agree completely. Trouble is, Proposition L weakens the existing residency requirement in our City Charter.

Charter Section 8.100 states that no person “shall be appointed as a member of any board or commission unless he shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years.”

Proposition L eliminates the five-year residency requirement! Proposition L also exempts from any residency requirement whatsoever members of the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees.

The idea behind the five-year residency rule is that city commissioners should have first-hand knowledge and personal experience of San Francisco’s people and neighborhoods, its problems and possibilities. City commissioners should not just rely on staff reports and statistical abstracts. Proposition L would destroy this sensible safeguard. Instead, a person could move into town and be appointed, that day, to a city post!

Finally, Proposition L purports to extend the Charter’s residency rules to advisory boards and committees established by the Board of Supervisors. But the residency requirement can be waived for a person “with specific experience, skills, or qualifications”. That’s a loophole big enough to drive a truck through!

San Franciscans should make decisions about San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition L.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for most advisory panels of the City.

Under Proposition L, panel members MUST be residents of San Francisco.

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for membership on the Health System Board, Retirement Board and War Memorial Board.

Under Proposition L, there is no change. Membership on the Health System Board and Retirement Board is by DIRECT ELECTION of city employees. The Health Fund and Retirement Fund are operated by and for city workers. Because employees are not required to live in the city, there are serious constitutional problems with denying a worker the right to be a candidate for trustee of a fund controlled by employees.

The way things are now, the courts have thrown out San Francisco’s five-year residency requirement. Reports the City Attorney:

“In the years since Charter Section 8.100 (residency rule) was originally adopted, the California courts have struck down all durational residency requirements applicable to candidates for elective or appointive office.”

Most Supervisors like the durational requirement. But even Supervisors cannot overrule the Supreme Court.

The bottom line: Proposition L does not cover everything. Just most things. It’s time San Franciscans were making the decisions about San Francisco. Proposition L is a major start in the right direction.

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE. YES ON PROPOSITION L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

San Franciscans deserve to be represented by commissioners who live within San Francisco, not by employees filling in for their ex-officio bosses. Vote for San Francisco commissions made of San Francisco voters.

... Vote Yes on Proposition L!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Don’t clutter the Charter with unnecessary provisions. Vote No on Proposition L.

Proposition L would require almost all commissions and advisory board members to be city residents. That makes sense — so much sense that, for most commissions, it is already the law.

This is one more example of a needless Charter amendment. If the Board of Supervisors wants to require members of any advisory body to be city residents, they can pass an ordinance to accomplish it. Adding an unnecessary provision to a Charter that is already too long and complicated is not the answer. Vote No on Proposition L.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.100 Qualifications
(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she is a resident of the city and county for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retiree of the city and county for a period of at least five years.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 7 through Tuesday, June 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. — 5 p.m.
Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease. Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals it's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be TOXIC FREE 554-4333

HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR YOUR HOME'S TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday
8 am. to 4 pm. 554-4333

San Francisco Household Hazardous Waste Program
PROPOSITION M
Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by the Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?

YES 302
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter requires some City boards and commissions, such as the Police and Fire Commissions, to have at least one woman member. However, the charter does not have a general policy on balancing the number of men and women on City boards and commissions.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a charter amendment that would create a City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex. This charter amendment does not apply to the Commission on the Status of Women.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller's Statement on "M"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "M"
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisors Bill Maher and Wendy Nelder.
Commission Gender Composition

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The 1990s are here — but you would never know it by the few women serving on City boards and commissions. In fact, of ten major commissions — Police, Fire, Airports, Ports, Public Utilities, Parking Authority, Social Services, City Planning, Elections, Housing Authority — women hold just 18 percent of the seats. And only one woman serves as a president of these commissions.

Women do not fare much better on other key commissions. For instance, women hold just two seats on the seven-member Recreation and Park Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission. Three women serve on the eleven-member Small Business Advisory Commission.

Despite the enormous influence and regulatory controls most commissions have over the lives of all citizens, women’s voices and leadership on city panels do not equal their numbers in society.

These gloomy statistics aside, women have begun to make gains during the past two years. Women are now being regularly considered and appointed to boards and commissions. But, clearly, much more needs to be done.

Proposition M will emblazon into the Charter a policy goal of gender equality on all boards and commissions. This amendment, authored by Supervisor Richard Hongisto, is a simple measure of justice.

Only the Commission on the Status of Women is excluded from the provisions of this charter amendment, since its sole purpose is to serve as an advocacy forum for women.

Increasingly, communities and groups are instituting gender parity provisions in their constitutions with much success. For instance, the Democratic Party has dramatically brought about near gender equality of delegates to its national and state conventions.

Let’s start the 1990s off with a renewed commitment to fairness and equality.

VOTE YES ON THE GENDER PARITY AMENDMENT.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument WasSubmitted Against Proposition M
No Rebuttals WereSubmitted On Proposition M

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M moves San Francisco into the 1990s. It is stunning to review the composition of our city boards and commissions and see just how few women are serving. Women comprise 18 percent of the seats on ten major commissions. This is an untold tragedy. Women have been making gains in recent time. We can do even better.

Proposition M is about fairness and equality. Iowa enacted a law in 1987 to require greater gender balance on all boards, commissions, committees, and councils.

Vote Yes for Gender Justice. Yes on Proposition M.

SF Chapter, National Organization for Women
Legal Advocates for Women
San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Creating political leadership opportunities for women will strengthen the public policy decision-making process.

Vote YES on M.

As a predominately lesbian and gay Republican volunteer organization we believe it is a travesty that after fifteen years of three liberal Democrat mayors only 38% of the city’s Commissioners are women. This negligence has prompted the need to enact gender-parity. We support Proposition M.

In the future, the provisions of Proposition M should be amended to apply to the Commission on the Status of Women. Women and men must actively dialogue so that our city begins to address the concerns of all.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw
Paul Kavouksarian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence

Judiciary Project/California
TJ Anthony
Mary C. Dunlap
Ruth Picon, President, Latino Democratic Club
Helen Grieco, Director, SF NOW
Laura Campbell
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Agar Jaicks, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Greg Day, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Jean K. Harris
Geraldine Johnson
Joyce Newstat, Chair, Lesbian Caucus, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
James Harrigan

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Requirement that any commission be comprised of a certain number of persons of any gender is as inappropriate as requiring a certain number of persons who have red hair or blue eyes. Please vote to maintain the mayoral prerogative to appoint the best San Franciscans for the job.

... Vote NO on Proposition M!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Vote No on Proposition M.
Like Proposition L, but only more so, Proposition M does not belong in the City Charter.
The power to make appointments to boards and commissions rests with the Mayor. Proposition M would write into the Charter a non-binding policy statement urging the Mayor to fill not more than 50% plus one of any commission with members of the same sex.
The City Attorney advised the Board of Supervisors that the Constitution prohibits the city from adopting a quota for male and female appointments. Instead, the Board of Supervisors proposes to clutter up the Charter with a non-binding, legally unenforceable policy statement.
If the Board of Supervisors wants to send a message to the Mayor it should be done by resolution, not costly and unnecessary Charter amendments.

Vote No on Proposition M.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “M”
There is nothing in the charter NOW that prevents the Mayor or Board of Supervisors to appoint more women to achieve gender parity now.

Why now does it have to be written in concrete.

Vote NO on “M”.

Marguerie Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION M

NOTE: Entire section is new.
3.503 Composition of Boards and Commissions.
It is the policy of the city and county, which shall be considered a goal when filling vacancies on boards or commissions appointed by the mayor, or otherwise provided by this charter, except for the Commission on the Status of Women, to achieve gender parity on these boards and commissions by limiting to a simple majority of board and commission membership the number of members who are of the same sex.

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 24.
MISSING SOMETHING IN YOUR LIFE?

If your life seems to be missing that special warmth that comes from having a pet, come and see us at the new San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department. We have a wide variety of dogs, cats and other animals available for adoption.

A waggly tail, a sweet meow or a gentle squeak - it'll make you glad to come home at night.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PROPOSITION N
Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter does not limit the number of consecutive terms a person may serve on the Board of Supervisors. A full term on the Board of Supervisors is four years.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a charter amendment. Under Proposition N, no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors. After two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, a person must wait four years before serving again. Any person appointed to the Board of Supervisors to complete more than half a four-year term would be considered to have served one full term. A member of the Board of Supervisors who resigned with less than half a four-year term remaining would be considered to have served a full term. This charter amendment would go into effect July 1, 1990. Each Supervisor holding office on that date would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when his or her current term ends.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the charter so that no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors and you want to prohibit persons who served two consecutive four-year terms from serving on the Board of Supervisors again until four years after their second consecutive term in office.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to limit Supervisors to serving two consecutive terms.

Controller’s Statement on “N”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How “N” Got on the Ballot
On January 25, 1990, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition N to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,151* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 45,408 of the signatures submitted were valid, 5,257 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is a non-partisan, reasonable, fair and democratic measure to reform our government and improve the present city-wide system for electing supervisors. Neighborhood, civic leaders, current and former elected officials, community activists, business owners, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, unionists, and minorities all support Proposition N.

Limiting politicians' consecutive terms is not radical or extreme. In fact, it helps to prevent political corruption and power grabbing. More than 150 cities, towns and counties in the United States have laws limiting politicians terms. Governors in 30 states can only serve two terms. San Mateo county limits supervisors terms and for more than 30 years San Francisco's mayors have been limited to two consecutive terms.

Proposition N is a very modest and reasonable proposal.

Proposition N does not recall or force any current member of the board from office. Proposition N allows supervisors whose terms expire in 1991 to serve until January 1995 if they are reelected. Supervisors whose terms end in 1993 may serve until 1997 if reelected. Former supervisors may run for office again after 4 years.

The current system favors incumbent politicians and denies experienced newcomers a fair chance to serve. Since 1973, only 3 newcomers have been elected to the city-wide board. 5 supervisors have already served 10 years. By 1995 most board members will have been in office 14 years or more.

We know that a lake or pond will stagnate unless its waters are replenished from time to time. So too will an elected body grow stale without a regular infusion of fresh faces and new ideas.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Richard Bodisco
Chairman, San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
Steve Jeong
Elisabeth E. Liu
Harold Hoogasian
Joseph L. Powell
Raymond Chalker
Robert A. Reveles
Robert C. Sanchez
Joel Ventresca
Barry Lasra
Daniel Willson

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N backers have misrepresented the facts to get you to vote for N. Since just 1982 three non-incumbent supervisors have been independently elected to the Board. Proposition N is not true reform — it only tinkers with the citywide election process. It is not democratic — it takes power away from the people. It is not a solution — it's an additional problem.

Supervisors are elected to carry out the will of the people. When they fail to serve, they are unelected — by vote of the people. Appointed department heads, who are not supposed to have their own political agendas, are balanced only by the Mayor's and the Board's overseeing eyes.

With the Mayor already limited to two terms, the Board must not consist only of rookies and lame ducks, or department heads can consolidate their power and bide their time, waiting until watchdog Supervisors are automatically thrown from office. Proposition N threatens accountability and increases the chances for bureaucratic corruption.

Uninformed actions are foolish actions — closely examine the facts, and you'll agree that blindly forcing change is a bad plan. If Proposition N passes, nothing can stop department heads from installing power bases immune to voter inspection. Voters have the right to choose — this measure permanently limits that right.

PROTECT YOUR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Two years ago, San Francisco voted on Proposition O, a recall of the Board of Supervisors thinly disguised as a ‘good government’ initiative. San Franciscans saw through this scheme, and sent the measure down to defeat.

Last year, the same group attempted to offer a similar proposal to the voters, but failed to collect enough signatures to qualify it for the ballot.

Now they’re at it again.

They say that Supervisors have lost touch with the people of San Francisco, and should automatically be thrown from office after they’ve served two terms — but by bringing up this rejected issue again and again, they’re proving that THEY are the ones who are out of touch.

San Francisco doesn’t need a two-term limit. When supervisors stop working for the people, they stop getting elected. If Board members are prematurely removed, more power falls into the hands of civil servants and department heads, who are unaccountable to the voters. These unelected officials who already hold great power must be balanced by supervisors free to do their jobs, or citizens lose their representation.

The diversity of our City is one of our greatest strengths. San Franciscans have always individually evaluated our city’s varied issues, judging each on its specific merits. The Board of Supervisors is similarly diverse, and should also be evaluated selectively.

Citizens should use the election process to tell their representatives when they’re not doing their jobs — not by acting blindly and installing an arbitrary time limit. San Franciscans are smart enough to tell the difference between voting an incompetent out of office and firing a valuable employee without cause.

Proposition N denies San Franciscans the right to vote for legislators of their choice, and that’s not fair.

Vote NO on Proposition N.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

---

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Let’s talk about what WE want City Hall to do for US, not the politicians.

Politicians will tell you anything to advance their political careers. They won’t tell you the TRUTH about the Two Term Limit.

The politicians say we failed to collect enough signatures last year to qualify for the ballot.

But here’s what their appointee, the city’s Chief Administrative Officer says:

“Last year’s Proposition removal was forced by an error, one which we admitted, apologized for and tried to repair...”

(Letter to Two Term Limit — Chairman — Richard Bodisco, dated February 7, 1990.)

We need new leadership in City Hall.

We have some hard and serious problems to solve in San Francisco and we can’t solve them with political rhetoric and name calling.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N removes experienced supervisors from the Board.

FACT:

Proposition N insures that San Francisco will always have 5 or 6 supervisors with seniority and experience on the Board. Proposition N also gives experienced and concerned citizens an opportunity to serve without needing to become professional career politicians.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N will take away your right to vote for a legislator of your choice.

FACT:

Proposition N gives you more choices because it removes the current system which favors incumbent politicians.

The politicians have spoken too long for themselves. It is time City Hall spoke for us.

Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Submitted by San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
Richard Bodisco
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

This citizen’s initiative is a good government reform measure which will guarantee change, encourage competition, improve the chances of electing new political leadership, and curtail the influence of special interests.

Vote YES on N.

SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

Change is the driving force in our economy, our lives ... and our government! Eight years on the Board of Supervisors is enough time to initiate changes espoused in any candidacy. Our City government is in desperate need of change. Vote for new life in San Francisco government.

... Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

The longer supervisors remain in office the more likely they become captives of special interests who bankroll their costly campaigns.

Entrenched incumbent politicians often end up working against the public interest, rather than for it.

Only two supervisors have been defeated at the polls since the end of 1980.

New faces, new ideas, new leaders, and new directions are needed at City Hall.

Vote YES on N.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

The Two-Term Limit is an idea whose time has come!

The United States Constitution limits the President to two terms in office. Similarly, the San Francisco Charter limits our Mayor to two terms.

Incumbent San Francisco Supervisors, however, continue to win re-elections year after year. This has made many of them less accountable to the voters.

Eight years is enough! Let’s bring new people, new ideas, and new energy to our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Citizens for a Better San Francisco

It works for executive offices, let’s put a limit on the terms of service for our supervisors. As Thomas Jefferson called it, “rotation in office”. Let’s have some healthy competition for these positions, let’s take advantage of the many experienced people around who are willing to serve. Let’s vote YES on Proposition N for reasonable reform.

John and Carol Maerzke

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will ensure that we have a Board of Supervisors of concerned citizens, not career politicians.

For almost forty years, San Francisco has limited its Mayor to eight years in office. Many cities around the Bay Area, such as San Jose, Richmond, Mountain View and Redwood City, limit terms in office for their city councils. Yet we have had supervisors serve up to 16 years in office. Why? Because by raising large sums of money and using the power of incumbency, supervisors face little chance of defeat when running for re-election.

Proposition N will not remove any member of the Board of Supervisors from office. It is a fair proposal that allows each current supervisor to run for one more four year term. But in the future, each supervisor will be limited to eight years in office.

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will give the city fresh leadership on the Board of Supervisors. It will open up the city's political processes, reversing the trend in recent years towards full-time professional politicians. Most importantly, it will mean that our elected representatives put the city's needs and interests ahead of their desire for re-election.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

I'm supporting Proposition N because of my concern about the status of women and children in San Francisco.

As a long time supporter and treasurer of a shelter for battered women in the City, I have had the opportunity to closely observe how our City government works. I think there are more important things than politics.

San Francisco needs leaders in government who will show more compassion and concern about peoples' lives as opposed to their reelection campaigns.

I don't feel that every member of the Board of Supervisors is bad, but the two term limit will improve the current system and help our Supervisors do a better job for us.

That is why I am voting YES on Proposition N.

Millie Favetti

Over the past 20 years women have made enormous gains in electoral politics. The situation is far, far from ideal but some positive changes have taken place. Therefore, we think it is important to encourage and support the entry of women into elective politics.

We're supporting Proposition N because it ensures that more women will have the opportunity to assume leadership roles in City government. The two year experiment with district elections produced more women supervisors than at any other time in San Francisco's history.

The gains women have made could be easily lost under the current city-wide system. Proposition N will prevent the clock from being turned back because it allows newcomers a fair chance to compete without always having to run against entrenched incumbents.

Proposition N is equitable and fair to everyone.

Join us and vote YES on Proposition N.

Helen Dawson
Miriam Smith

As a small business owner and long time resident of San Francisco, I'm supporting Proposition N because it makes good sense for our City.

Limiting Supervisors' terms will create a Board of Supervisors more accountable to the needs of San Franciscans. Under the current city-wide system, too many Supervisors see service on the Board as a career.

They worry more about keeping their seats than about doing the job they were elected to do. As a result, politics is all too often put ahead of the City welfare.

Let's get politics out of City Hall.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Zdenka Bodisco
Mike Salarno
Harold Hoogasian
Small Business Owners
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Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

We're supporting the Two Term Limit because San Francisco needs new political leadership. The Two Term Limit will open the "Door of Opportunity" for new candidates to serve on the Board of Supervisors.

The Two Term Limit will allow a new generation of civic leaders to represent our City. It is a fair and democratic way to reform the current system and to restore citizens' confidence in City Hall.

San Francisco’s government should reflect the diversity of the people who live here. This is the meaning of a Democratic and free system. The Two Term Limit insures that new people with new ideas will have a fair chance to serve the City.

Don't be fooled by arguments of professional, career politicians. The Two Term Limit is good for our community and it is good for San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Steve M. Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu

WHY DIDN'T WE GET TO VOTE ON THE TWO-TERM LIMIT LAST YEAR?

Because Louise Renne found a legal loophole to get the measure thrown off the ballot after the Registrar of Voters had certified that it qualified for submission to the electorate.

Never mind that when Renne violated a number of election laws several years ago she got everyone to overlook the "technicality."

But what do you expect?

This is the same Louise Renne who sued the Olympic Club because it had no female members conveniently "overlooking" the fact that her husband Paul belongs to the all-white, all-male San Francisco Golf Club.

Say "No" to Renne's legal machinations!

Vote "Yes" on "N."

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

WHAT ARE THEY AFRAID OF?

Why are the Supervisors and their contributors fighting the two-term limit so hard?

Why did City officials use a legal loophole to get this same measure thrown off the ballot last fall?

Are they afraid they won't be able to give away another city street worth $9 million to the Rockefellers for free like they did in 1987?

Are they afraid that the people might vote to turn them out?

Clean up City Hall! Yes on N!

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic Senate Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The Two-Term Limit is a reform whose time has come! At the Federal, State, and Local levels, political reformers agree that the powers of incumbency virtually preclude incumbents from being defeated at the polls, and that term limitation is the only way to ensure turnover in legislative bodies. Even Attorney General John Van de Kamp has proposed a twelve-year limit for State legislators.

Since the return to City-wide elections in 1980, only two incumbent Supervisors have been defeated at the polls. They were replaced by Wendy Nelder and Angela Alioto — the daughters of a former Police Chief and Mayor, respectively. Because of this trend, Supervisors have become burned-out, complacent, less accountable to the voters, and more beholden to the special interests who contributed to their re-election campaigns.

Proposition N would limit San Francisco supervisors to two consecutive terms of office, just like the mayor. It's a modest reform that deserves your vote.

Proposition N would not force any incumbent out of office. All current supervisors could run for one more term after their present term expires. And after four years, they could run again and hold office for two more terms.

The President of the United States has been limited to two consecutive terms of office since 1951. The Mayor of San Francisco has been limited to two consecutive terms since 1953. San Mateo County has a term limit for its board of supervisors. Proposition N is not a new or radical idea; it's an overdue reform for a stagnant system.

The founders of our city charter envisioned supervisors as part-time citizen legislators, not full-time professional politicians. Proposition N respects and revives that tradition.

A bit of fresh air never hurt anybody — even two-term supervisors!

Please vote YES on Proposition N.

Harold M. Hoogasian
Christopher L. Bowman

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

The current system of electing supervisors in San Francisco badly needs reform. But Proposition N is not the answer. The Board of Supervisors is not accountable to the people, largely because of the pernicious influence of large monetary contributions. A two-term limit would only exacerbate the problem. All supervisors would either be rookies or lame ducks, resulting in a tremendous shift of power to the bureaucracy, without lessening the powerful influence of money in campaigns.

Dennis Antonice
Robert Barnes
Ron Braithwaite
Supervisor Harry Britt
Gordon Chin
Brother Kelly Cullen
Catherine Dodd R.N.
Noah Griffin

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Geraldine M. Johnson
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leslie Katz
Tony Kilroy

Myra G. Kopf
Steven M. Krefting
William J. Brandy Moore
Jim Morales
Connie O'Connor
Ruth Picon
Mauri Schwartz
Yori Wada

Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead
Harold T. Yee
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943 and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and a public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, 11 members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected to a term of four years, from the commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms. Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms. Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to
Hypodermic Syringes

PROPOSITION O
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?

YES 309
NO 310

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law regulates the sale, distribution and use of hypodermic syringes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “O”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

“Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “O” Got on the Ballot
On September 15, 1989 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,173 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,774 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.
Hypodermic Syringes

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

The connection between AIDS and unclean needles is unchallenged. Virtually every authority on the subject agrees that sharing needles increases the chances of contracting AIDS. San Francisco has an estimated 13,000 IV drug users, each of whom is at risk of contracting AIDS and spreading it to their sexual partners or their unborn children. Tens of thousands of people are being directly threatened with contracting AIDS because it is illegal to obtain clean, safe needles.

Some groups are trading clean needles with addicts for their dirty ones. This removes contaminated needles from circulation and can dramatically cut the infection rate among drug users and their partners. But these groups face up to a six months in jail and a $1,000 fine. One member of this group, who lost her mother to AIDS, contracted through a dirty needle, said, “I lost a parent to this because this bureaucracy sits around and talks while lots of people are dying.” Dr. John Newmeyer of the Haight Ashbury Free Medical Clinics said, “People are dying because of our institution’s resistance to AIDS risk reduction methods.”

In an attempt to stop this disease from being spread to drug users and their partners AIDS prevention workers are risking legal persecution. Jerry DeJong, who works with substance abusers and is a member of the Mayor’s Narcotic’s Task Force, said “... with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives.” But in a sane, free society it shouldn’t be necessary to break the law to save lives.

The only way this deadly policy can be changed is for the state legislature to change the law. These State laws should be repealed.

Pamela Willard Pickens
Secretary San Francisco Libertarian Party

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition O
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition O

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Dr. John Watters of the Urban Health Study says that, "The middle class have access to clean needles." Poor people can't get clean needles, because they are illegal. Black and Latino IV drug users have a more difficult time finding clean needles and are thus more likely to be infected with AIDS. Because minorities are more likely to be infected with AIDS a higher proportion of their sexual partners or unborn children are being infected. AIDS is likely to become the leading cause of death in young Blacks and Latinos if things continue as they have. Legal clean needles will help save their lives.

Christina Groth

The San Francisco Department of Health estimates that there are 13,000 IV drug users in the city. If clean needles remain unavailable to them the AIDS infection rate can easily reach over 60%. If these 60% infect just two other people either through shared needles or sex, the total number of infected people can reach 23,400. San Francisco can't afford the financial burden it is under today from AIDS cases. Prevention through clean and legal needles can save us millions of tax dollars without costing us a cent. Legal needles make financial sense.

Isaac Klein

The San Francisco Chronicle has reported on the use of needles for IV drug use in Scotland. The newspaper said that in Edinburgh police launched a crackdown on the availability of clean needles. Within 18 months of the crackdown 50% of all IV drug users were infected with AIDS. Soon their sexual partners and unborn babies were infected with the disease. But 30 miles away in Glasgow the police took no action against the availability of clean needles and only 4 to 7 percent of needle users were infected. Dr. Roy Robertson, Edinburgh's leading authority on AIDS said, "Making needles available to addicts is not the only answer to the problem of AIDS among drug users but certainly, it has to be part of the solution." VOTE YES!

George Meyer

WHAT IS CANADA DOING RIGHT?
In Canada, fewer than 1% of AIDS cases are from needles!
In the United States, about 50% of new cases now involve needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners and babies, (up from about 20-30% in the beginning of the epidemic).
What is Canada doing right?

The AIDS epidemic has hit here many times worse than there. Why?
In Canada, drug-users can buy sterile needles in drugstores.

GRASSROOTS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

SURGEON GENERAL KOOP ON CLEAN NEEDLES

"One of the strongest advocates of making needles legal is Surgeon General Koop who addressed that issue last November (1987):

"I'm asked about clean needles everywhere I go. I've always said the same thing. If clean needles will do anything to contain a part of the epidemic, we should not have any foolish inhibitions about so doing."

(S.F. Sentinel 1/22/88)

Wm. Schwartzman, M.D.

Clean needles cause no diseases.
Legal needles are clean needles.
Vote Yes.

William Schwartzman, MD

DOES THIS INITIATIVE "CONDONE DRUGS"?

If you vote Yes, that could be interpreted as condoning drugs. But if you vote No, that could equally well be interpreted as condoning the spread of AIDS (and hepatitis, and many other diseases).

The present state law is like the "death penalty" — not just for drug abusers, but also their spouses, their babies, transfusion recipients and others. Who can "condone that"?

GRASSROOTS

The AIDS epidemic was caused by a combination of germs, working together to collapse the immune system.
N.Y.'s health department has concluded that the HIV epidemic already existed among New York addicts in the 1970's.
That epidemic existed only because New York has laws against addicts buying clean needles.
If we keep these deadly laws, no one can predict what future epidemics might result.

GRASSROOTS

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES ENCOURAGES STERILE NEEDLES

The National Academy of Sciences, the country's most prestigious scientific organization in 1986, issued a major study titled "Confronting AIDS". Many lives could have been saved if California had promptly implemented the conclusion drawn by America's leading scientists:

"IT IS TIME TO BEGIN EXPERIMENTING WITH PUBLIC POLICIES TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF STERILE NEEDLES AND SYRINGES BY REMOVING LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS TO THEIR POSSESSION AND USE."

Wm. Schwartzman, MD
Wm. Steinsmith, MD

The issue is not "free needles".
Some of us believe that mass giveaways of clean needles is best. Others of us believe it would be enough if doctors and pharmacies were allowed to sell needles, as with diabetes.
Legal needles are as cheap as ballpoint pens, so cheap that price would be no barrier.
This initiative takes no position on "free needles" programs, only for legalization — a prerequisite for either approach.

GRASSROOTS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPPOSITION O

Under present California law, even doctors aren't allowed to provide needles except for approved purposes. So far "stopping AIDS" is not an approved purpose.

Under "legalization", needles are a medical question, not a police question. A doctor's prescription could still be required, as with diabetes. Whatever controls are adopted, needles will be better controlled under legalization than they are now.

William Steinsmith, M.D.

Dr. Don Francis, an epidemiologist with the Centers for Disease Control said, "We can't overstate the threat of AIDS among addicts in the minority population in the inner city." Dr. Francis says that there is no evidence that legal, clean needles increase the use of drugs. The only thing stopping clean needles is the law. It's time for Sacramento to repeal the law and save lives.

Will Wohler

According to the New York Times a new, rare virus known as HTLV-II is spreading through the IV drug community because of needle sharing. Spread in the same manner as AIDS, this virus "could cause leukemia or other serious diseases and may exact a rising toll in future years." Surveys have found that 20% of addicts in New Orleans were infected and in San Francisco a preliminary survey of blood donors showed this new disease has a higher rate of incidence than the AIDS virus. Because it can take as long as 20 years to develop no one can know for sure how many people have been infected. Clean, legal needles will stop the transmission of this disease. VOTE YES!

John Wisman

Clean needles save the lives of innocent victims of AIDS. Not everyone who gets AIDS because people share needles is an addict. Some are small babies. The Centers for Disease Control says 314 babies were born in 1988 with AIDS because their mothers used infected needles. Dr. James Buehler of the CDC said "We need to do what we can to prevent the sharing of dirty needles. Sharing dirty equipment is the worst problem." In California it is illegal to obtain clean needles so addicts share. Because they share, babies are born with AIDS. Save lives. Legalize needles. VOTE YES!

Mark Pickens

Illegal needles, which force IV drug users to share unclean needles, is now the cause of over one-third of all AIDS cases in the United States according to the federal government's Centers for Disease Control. In 1988, 10,747 people contracted AIDS because of sharing unclean needles. Some of these people never used needles themselves. 226 were men who had sex with women who used needles, 623 were women who had sex with men who used unclean needles and 314 were unborn babies. Over 1,000 people who don't use drugs were infected because clean needles are illegal. VOTE YES FOR LEGAL, CLEAN NEEDLES!

Pamela Williard Pickens

Proposition O was endorsed by the Central Committee of the Democratic Party of San Francisco on March 21, 1990. VOTE YES!

John Wisman
Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 0

Clean, legal needles will save lives. Jerry DeJong of the Mayor's Narcotics Task Force said, "The bottom line is that this is not a moral or legal issue. Unfortunately with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what's sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives." Something is very wrong when its illegal to save lives; and that wrong must be corrected. Tell Sacramento that we want to legalize saving lives. We need clean, legal needles now!

Ron Dorsey

Illegal needles are the primary means of spreading AIDS to minority communities. Most of the IV drug users and their partners who have been infected with AIDS are Black or Latino. Most of the babies born with AIDS because of needle sharing by their mothers are also Black and Latino. Blacks and Latinos are now more likely than ever before to become infected with AIDS because clean needles are illegal. Legal, clean needles will slow down the infection rate and decrease the number of deaths in minority communities. Illegal needles hurt Blacks and Latinos more than they hurt others. Support legal needles.

Jim Peron

Prof. Ethan Nadelman, in the Washington Post, reported that "The governments of England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, the Netherlands and several other countries have actively attempted to limit the spread of AIDS by removing restrictions on the sale of syringes . . . ." Dr. Nadelman notes that there is growing evidence that legal needles do not increase the use of drugs but they do save lives.

George O'Brien

A former prosecutor of high-level drug dealers, Ben Clark, said in The Daily Recorder, a law newspaper, that legal restrictions on clean needles "have had the disastrous effect of forcing drug users to share syringes. Over half the addicts in New York State are infected with AIDS, and the rate of infection among intravenous drug users in Illinois is growing dramatically."

While some people may say addicts deserve to die, Clark notes, "... the issue is not simply whether society should sit back and watch addicts kill themselves off. AIDS transmitted by needles does not stay within the druggie population. Unborn children of AIDS-infected female users may become infected. The sex partners of persons with AIDS are exposed to the disease. Needle-sharing prostitutes interact with the drug-free heterosexual community on a daily basis." Clark says that clean, legal needles have never been proven to increase drug use but they do save lives. VOTE YES!

Sam Grove

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION O

There is no scientific evidence that unlimited and uncontrolled availability of hypodermic syringes/needles will stop the spread of AIDS. Proposition “O” would open the floodgates to the purchase and distribution of hypodermic syringes, without prescription, in drug stores, supermarkets and in the streets without medical supervision under the guise of stopping the spread of AIDS. Addicts will continue to commit crimes to pay for the dope since possession and sale of drugs, such as crack cocaine and heroin, will still be illegal.

Latest statistics show that over 80 percent of inmates in our already overcrowded jails are there for illegal drug offenses.

Who will protect the public against the careless disposition of these used needles by addicts?

Black communities in San Francisco are under siege from the sale of illegal drugs and the crime this produces. Approval of Proposition “O” by the voters permitting use of un.prescribed legal needles and illegal drugs could leave the City open to millions of dollars in lawsuits for unsupervised use of a medical procedure by intravenous drug addicts from death and other causes.

WE URGE A “NO” VOTE ON PROPOSITION “O”. It should not be City policy to support the removal of all restrictions in the distribution, sale and use of hypodermic syringes.

Rev. Amos Brown
Hon. Naomi Gray
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Senator Quentin Kopp
Dr. Raye Richardson
Lulann McGriff
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Melvin Miles
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION O

We, the people of the City and County of San Francisco, California, call upon the California State Legislature to eliminate all sanctions, criminal, regulatory, or civil, on the manufacture, use, sale or other distribution of hypodermic syringes. We do this to reduce the spread of AIDS and other diseases.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION K (Continued from page 100)

charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of $100.

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such a time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission after the regular daily working hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

This amendment shall become operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY: AIRPORTS COMMISSION
3.690 Commission; Composition

An airports commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on September 1, 1996. On the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

All rights, claims, actions, orders, obligations, proceedings and contracts relating to the airport department under the public utilities commission existing prior to the effective date of these amendments shall not be affected by the adoption thereof, and shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the airports commission.

This amendment shall be operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY-TWO: PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION
3.698 Commission — Composition

A parking and traffic commission and the department of parking and traffic are hereby established. The parking and traffic commission shall consist of five seven members. If not in conflict with state law, members of the parking and traffic commission shall serve ex-officio as members of the parking authority.

The term of each member shall be for four years; provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section shall, by lot classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided further, that terms of the two commissioners created by the amendment of June, 1990 shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 5th day of December, 1992; and on the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month. Any person may serve concurrently as a member of the San Francisco parking authority and the parking and traffic commission.
Did you know that you can vote before Election Day? Vote absentee in person at City Hall (Room 158) starting May 7 or by mail — fill out the application on the back cover.
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IS GOING TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON ELECTION DAY A PROBLEM?

If you are unable to go to your polling place to vote on Election Day (Tuesday, June 5, 1990), you may vote by absentee ballot in one of two ways:

1. **Vote at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.** Starting on May 7 through June 5, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., you can vote in Room 158 at City Hall.

2. **Vote by mail.** Complete the application for an absentee ballot on the back cover. Tear or cut off the back cover, fold it in half with the address of the Registrar of Voters on the outside, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated, and mail the form.

Voters who have specified disabilities may apply to be a **permanent absentee voter.** Please refer to page 24.
VOTE!

Polls are open from 7 am to 8 pm
See the label on the back cover for the location of your polling place.

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there is still a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:30 a.m. to about 9:00 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name __________________________
Address ___________________________ Apt. #________
Telephone No. (required) __________________________
Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □
Availability:
   I want to work in the following area(s): __________________________
   Second choice locations (if any) __________________________
Signature __________________________
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 5, 1990 election. The Pamphlet includes:
1. a Sample Ballot (i.e., a copy of the ballot you see at your polling place or the one you receive when you vote .......................... Page 5-21
   absence) ................................................................
2. the location of your polling place .............................. (see label on the back cover)
3. application for absentee ballot ................................ back cover
4. definitions of words you need to know .......................... 22
5. information for disabled voters; and application for permanent absentee voter status .................. 24
6. rights of voters ....................................................... 25
7. statements from the candidates who are running for office .................................................. 26-34
8. information about each proposition, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and
   against the proposition, and the legal text ................................................................. 37-128
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algun error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

A 第一步
清雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

B 第二步

C 第三步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

D 第四步

STEP 2
BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

STEP 3
HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

STEP 4
AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del “Votomatic” y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOBERNADOR</th>
<th>EILEEN ANDERSON</th>
<th>CHARLES PINEDA JR.</th>
<th>FRANKLIN R. GERATY</th>
<th>FRANK L. THOMAS</th>
<th>LYDON BYRNE</th>
<th>DIANNE FEINSTEIN</th>
<th>CHARLES A. MAHON III</th>
<th>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</th>
<th>MARK CALNEY</th>
<th>F. FRANK WONG</th>
<th>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</th>
<th>VICEGOBERNADOR</th>
<th>LEO T. MC CARTHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eileen Anderson</td>
<td>Administrator; Army Veteran / Administrador; Veterano del Ejército</td>
<td>Retired Intelligence Agent / Agente Jubilado de Espionaje</td>
<td>Farmer-Electrician-Rancher / Granjero-Electricista-Ranchero</td>
<td>Entrepreneur / Empresario</td>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>Attorney General, California / Procurador General, California</td>
<td>Attorney General, California / Procurador General, California</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Systems Engineer / Ingeniero en Sistemas Jubilado</td>
<td>Political Science Teacher / Profesor de Ciencias Políticas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor of California / Vicegobernador de California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote por Uno
Vote for One
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>民主黨</th>
<th>共和黨</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECRETARIO DE ESTADO</strong> 州務卿</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretary of State</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MERVIN EVANS</strong> Business Development Consultant Consultor de Desarrollo Empresarial 商業設施顧問</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARCH FONG EU</strong> California Secretary of State Secretario de Estado de California 州務卿</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTRALOR</strong> 市計官</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controller</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAY DAVIS</strong> Controller of the State of California Contralor del Estado de California 知州主計官</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TESORERO</strong> 財政部長</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasurer</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KATHLEEN BROWN</strong> Corporate / Bond Counsel Asesora Legal Empresarial / Bonos 依託律師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WESLEY SANDERS, JR.</strong> Municipal Treasurer Tesorero Municipal 市庫房·地方財政</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA REINER</td>
<td>District Attorney of Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS</td>
<td>Insurance Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY COLLIS</td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL PRESS</td>
<td>Consumer Advocacy Commentator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY BOURHIS</td>
<td>Insurance Consumers Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL BLANCO</td>
<td>Living Trust Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY MURPHY</td>
<td>Certified Insurance Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER A. ZELMAN</td>
<td>Director, Consumers' Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, CONSEJO ESTATAL DE COMPENSACIÓN / Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS JOHN PAPAN / Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD TABASH / Lawyer, Business Consultant / Abogado, Consultor de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAD SHERMAN / CPA/Taxpayer’s Representative / Contador Público Titulado / Representante del Contribuyente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BALDWIN / Governing Board Member, Moorpark Sch. Dist. / Miembro del Consejo Gobernante Distrito Escolar de Moorpark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH G. COLMAN / Equalization Member’s Deputy / Asistente de un Miembro de Compensación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIL G. POLLACK / Tax Compliance Specialist / Especialista en Acatamiento Impositivo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS / United States Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY PELOSI / Member of Congress, 5th Congressional District / Miembro del Congreso, Distrito 5 del Congreso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE SENATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR STATE SENATOR IN THIS DISTRICT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No existe contienda para el puesto de Senador Estatal en este distrito)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>本區無人参選州參議員</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOCRATIC PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL / Member of the State Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKIE SPEIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. FIGONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAITLIN F. CURTIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB GEARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH A. TROCHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL HARDEMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXA SMITH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPERINTENDENTE ESTATAL DE INSTRUCCIÓN PÚBLICA
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

BILL HONIG
State Superintendent of Public Instruction / Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Pública
132

MARK ISLER
Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios
134

CAROL S. KOPPEL
Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador
135

SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ
College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria
137

JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #3
Superior Court Judge, Office #3

ALEX SALDAMANDO
Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal
141

J. DOMINIQUE OLOCOMENDY
Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal
143

JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #5
Superior Court Judge, Office #5

CARLOS BEA
Incumbent / Titular del Cargo
147

KAY TSENNIN
Attorney / Abogada
149

JUEZ DE LA CORTE SUPERIOR, DEPARTAMENTO #15
Superior Court Judge, Office #15

JEROME T. BENSON
Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior
153

DONNA HITCHENS
Attorney / Abogada
155
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>WILLIAM J. O'CONNOR</td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>Vote for Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTAMENTO #1</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney / Law Teacher/ Abogada / Maestra de Derecho</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TANG</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney / Fiscal Asistente del Distrito</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES HARRIGAN</td>
<td>Sheriff’s Department’s Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DE LA CORTE, MUNICIPAL</td>
<td>JEROME A. DE FILIPPO</td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>Vote for Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTAMENTO #3</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LILLIAN K. SING</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASESOR</td>
<td>RONALD G. KERSHAW</td>
<td>Mayor / Alcalde</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Real Estate Portfolio Manager / Administrador de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Mayor / Alcalde</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogado; Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Mayor / Alcalde</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor / Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAUL SCHWENGER</td>
<td>Mayor / Alcalde</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Assessor / Asesor Asistente</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENSOR PUBLICO</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>Mayor / Alcalde</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

107

HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

YES 185
NO 187

108

PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst's estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

YES 189
NO 190

109

GOVERNOR'S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION, LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor's time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 192
NO 193

110

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS, LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

YES 195
NO 197

111

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing, for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

YES 200
NO 203
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 SI  
ACTA DE BONOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990. 
Este acta dispone una entidad de bonos por ciento cincuenta millones de dólares ($150,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para un programa de vivienda que incluyan: (1) relieves de emergencia y abarajamiento en áreas urbanas para familias o individuos sin vivienda. (2) viviendas de arriendo para familias o individuos que necesiten asistencia en sus gastos de vivienda. (3) reasentamiento de personas en áreas urbanas para familias o individuos que necesiten asistencia en sus gastos de vivienda. (4) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de arriendo ya existentes. 

187 NO  

189 SI  
ACTA DE BONOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS Y PARA AIRE LIMPIO DE 1990. 
Este acta dispone una entidad de bonos por ciento ciento millones de dólares ($1,000,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de derechos de vía, desaparición de tierras, adquisición de bienes raíces para ferrocarriles, etc. 

190 NO  

192 SI  
REVISIÓN DE LEGISLACIÓN POR EL GOBERNADOR, FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN, ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. 
Este acta revisará la legislación actual y establecerá fechas de vencimiento para la misma. Se eliminarán las leyes que el gobernador considera innecesarias. 

193 NO  

195 SI  
EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. 
Esta enmienda constitucional eximirá de impuestos a las personas severamente incapacitadas. 

197 NO  

200 SI  
ACTA PARA EL DESCONECTAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DESBARRANOS DE 1990. 
Este acta establece un programa de desconectamiento del tráfico para todo el estado y permitirá el día a día la limitación en los desbarraos de los gobiernos y locales para reducir el número de accidentes de tráfico. 

203 NO  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>STATE OFFICIALS. ETHICS. Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES 211</td>
<td>NO 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MURDER OF A PEACE OFFICER. CRIMINAL PENALTIES. LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE AMENDMENT. Redefines, expands “peace officer” definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>CRIMINAL LAW. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>RAIL TRANSPORTATION. BOND ACT. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226</td>
<td>NO 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>WILDLIFE PROTECTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230</td>
<td>NO 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>贷成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>贷成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>贷成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>贷成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>贷成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>贷成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>贷成</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNCIONARIOS ESTATALES, ÉTICA.** Establecen leyes de ética estatal adicionales. Crea una Comisión para que fije la compensación de los funcionarios estatales efectos. Ordena que las tasas y colegiaturas sean públicas, impacto fiscal: Se desconocen los costos al estado que dependan de los niveles de salarios y beneficios establecidos por la Comisión. Relativamente menores costos estatales por la mantención de la Comisión y por poner en vigor la medida.


**ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO, PENAS, ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA.** Redefine y expide la definición de "oficial del orden público" que impone para penalizar, impacto fiscal: Ciertos estatutos desconocidos como resultado de que se expida la definición cubierta por la circunstancia especial en asesinatos en primer grado.

**DERECHO PENAL, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA.** Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a los derechos otorgados por la Constitución federal; efectúa cambios estatutarios. Impacto fiscal: Se desconoce el impacto fiscal de la medida. La medida efectúa significativos cambios en el sistema de justicia penal. Se desconoce cómo se pondría en ejecución y se interpretaría la medida. Podría haber extremo un impacto fiscal menor en los gobiernos estatales y locales o podría haber un mayor impacto fiscal.

**TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL, ACTO DE BONOS, ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.** Autoriza la emisión de bonos de obligación general por $1,000,000,000 principalmente para proporcionar sistemas de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscal: La amortización durante los siguientes 20 años requeriría del Fondo General alrededor de $2 mil millones para el capital y $1.6 mil millones para el interés (costo anual promedio sería $180 millones).

**PROTECION DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE, ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.** Transfieren $30 millones del Fondo para Conservación de Ámbitos Naturales, principalmente para adquirir árboles. Prohibe agarrar al puma. Impacto fiscal: Las transferencias anuales calculadas serían de $18 millones provenientes de la sobresta al cítrico y productos de tabaco; $12 millones del Fondo General, a menos que la Legislatura elija otras transferencias. Un millón de dólares en costos anuales por manejo de propiedades.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

118
LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.

119
REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. STATUTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria, 1992 election for all legislative seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.

120
NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the Youth Authority facilities through new construction.

121
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of facilities of California’s public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July 1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other health or safety improvements.

122
EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.

123
1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars ($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

236 SI 赞成

LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCION, ETICA, ENMENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujete la redistribución de distritos a las 236 partes de la volatilidad legislativa y aprobación de los votantes. De erea en Comité de Ética Legislativa, Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en las partes por redistribución podrían ser compensadas punitivamente o en un término de los costos de la elección misma. El costo de la redistribución es probablemente menor.

238 NO 反对

REDISTRIBUCION POR COMISION, ENMENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Sujete la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La limitación en el financiamiento podría reducir los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo los altos impuestos.

240 SI 赞成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el ampliación en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

242 NO 反对

243 SI 赞成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de las universidades de educación superior pública de California, las 20 recibos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes "Hastings," la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recibos de la Universidad Estatal de California, aprobadiz de la Legislativa del Estado de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusivo. El uso de los fondos autorizados bajo esta acta incluye, pero no se limita a, la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejoras para la salubridad y seguridad.

245 NO 反对

248 SI 赞成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, edificios y prueba de sísmica, reparación, reemplazo y restauración de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que son inseguros principalmente en cuanto a los peligros relacionados con terremotos.

250 NO 反对

254 SI 赞成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejoras de escuelas públicas.

256 NO 反对

258 SI 赞成

ACTA DE BONOS PARA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar los desembolsos de capital para construcción o mejoras de instalaciones del sistema de correcciones.

259 NO 反对
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### A
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

- **YES 263**
- **NO 265**

### B
Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

- **YES 269**
- **NO 272**

### C
Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

- **YES 277**
- **NO 278**

### D
Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

- **YES 280**
- **NO 281**

### E
WITHDRAWN

### F
Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

- **YES 284**
- **NO 285**
**BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE**

**CUIDAD Y CONCADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990**

**PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONCADO DE SAN FRANCISCO**

---

**263 SI**

**265 NO**

**269 SI**

**272 NO**

**277 SI**

**278 NO**

**280 SI**

**281 NO**

**ELIMINADA**

---

**284 SI**

**285 NO**

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote 1</th>
<th>Vote 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City’s Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290</td>
<td>NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293</td>
<td>NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298</td>
<td>NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305</td>
<td>NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309</td>
<td>NO 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolución</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Proponente</td>
<td>Propuesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad, en caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlo del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Se permitirá que los maestros jubilados dentro de la ciudad de la Ciudad celebren contratos con consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291 NO</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de cinco a once miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 NO</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permitidos de cinco a seis miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Será necesario que los miembros de las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que los inscriban como en miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesorantes de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos asesorantes, o sí en los casos en que se requiera una persona con experiencia, la ciudad o el consejo de comisiones de la ciudad de San Francisco sea cumpla con estos requisitos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294 NO</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Se formará la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de cinco a once miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 SI</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tránsito, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Permitidos de cinco a seis miembros?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Será necesario que los miembros de las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean residentes de la Ciudad y que los inscriban como en miembros de otros consejos, comisiones y cuerpos asesorantes de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejos asesorantes, o sí en los casos en que se requiera una persona con experiencia, la ciudad o el consejo de comisiones de la ciudad de San Francisco sea cumpla con estos requisitos?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — If you do not wish to go to your polling place to vote, you may vote by mail or by going to the Registrar’s Office in City Hall in person. This is called absentee voting.

BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest.


CHARTER BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (PROPOSITION J, K, L) — Boards and commissions created by the Charter, either directly or indirectly.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITION O) — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

DEFERRED CAPITAL MAINTENANCE (PROPOSITION B) — Major building repair projects that have been postponed.

ELECTOR (PROPOSITION L) — A person who is eligible to register to vote.

FINANCE (PROPOSITION C) — Various ways to pay for something over time. This may include raising money or offering something in trade.

FISCAL YEAR (PROPOSITION A, D) — The twelve months from July 1 to June 30 make up a fiscal year. The City budgets revenues and expenses on a fiscal year basis.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INITIATIVE (PROPOSITION F, O) — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE (PROPOSITION D, J) — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters. For such a law to be passed by the Board of Supervisors, a majority, (or in some cases, three-fourths) of the Supervisors must vote to approve the law at two consecutive meetings.

OUTSTANDING PRINCIPAL (PROPOSITION A, C) — The actual amount of borrowed money, not yet paid back. Principal does not include interest charges.

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A person who has turned in the required papers and signatures with the Registrar of Voters to run for an office as a write-in candidate. The name of this person will not be on the ballot. Voters who want to vote for this person can do so by writing the name of the person on the inside of the grey envelope given with the ballot.

SPECIAL PROPERTY TAX [MELLO-ROOS DISTRICT] (PROPOSITION B) — A flat tax on a parcel of land, which is not based on the property’s value. The special tax would be in addition to current property taxes. This tax requires a two-thirds majority vote.

STAFFING LEVEL (PROPOSITION F) — The number of employees on duty at any one time.

TAX EXEMPT DEBT (PROPOSITION C) — Money borrowed by the City which is paid back with interest. The lenders are not taxed on the money earned from these loans.

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now," "The Proposal," "A Yes' Vote Means," and "A No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of dates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters' rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.
**VOTER SELECTION COUPON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNOR</td>
<td>(Check Ballot for the number of candidates to vote for)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT. GOVERNOR</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARY OF STATE</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROLLER</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURER</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE COMMISSIONER</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, BOARD OF EQUALIZATION</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 15</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 3</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC DEFENDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS**

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, and Molly Wood

Board of Supervisors appointees: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gillham, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
APPLICATION TO BE A PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

The physically disabled may apply to be permanent absentee voters. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, you will automatically receive an absentee ballot every election until you move or re-register.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the form below and return it to the Registrar of Voters. Room 158, City Hall, San Francisco, 94102. Each time you move or re-register to vote, you must apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases you do not need to re-apply.

I hereby apply for “Permanent Absentee Voter” status in San Francisco by reason of:

____ Lost use of one or more limbs.  __  Lost use of both hands.

____ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g. cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair).

____ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease.

____ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities.

____ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

____ PLEASE SEE EXPLANATORY LETTER ATTACHED.

Name

FIRST  MIDDLE  LAST

Residence Address

STREET

#  APT.#

Mailing Address

STREET

#  CITY  ZIP CODE

(if different than residence address given above)

I declare under penalty of Perjury that the above is true and correct:

Date __________________ Signature __________________

(Return only this page; do not return the whole book)
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens over 18 years old who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 8, 1990.

Q — I moved before May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 8 and June 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — If you are registered as a member of a political party you may choose a candidate for:
Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner,
Member-State Board of Equalization (District 2), Member-State Assembly, State Senator if you live in Senate District 8, United States Representative, and members of the County Central Committee.

Non-partisan offices are:
Superintendent of Public Instruction, Superior Court Judge, Municipal Court Judge, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 5, 1990. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let us know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help you.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don’t know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you. Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any test?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to my polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 5 by:
• going to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall from May 7 through June 5, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday;
• mailing in a request for an absentee ballot. You may send in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. The application must be received by the Registrar of Voters before May 29, 1990.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include:
• your home address
• the address to which you want the ballot mailed
• your printed name and your signature.
Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSessor
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is paid $98,670 a year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is paid $102,882 a year.
The Public Defender represents the following persons unable to pay for their own lawyer: 1) persons accused of crimes, 2) juveniles in legal actions, and 3) persons in mental health hearings.
Candidates for Assessor

PAUL E. SCHWENGER

My address is 16 Ord Court, Apt. #4
My occupation is Deputy Assessor
My age is 53
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan, Mission High School graduate, and San Francisco State University graduate. I have been a Deputy Assessor for San Francisco for the past 22 years. I have been awarded the SRPA, Senior Real Property Designation, which is one of the highest awards for professional appraisers. My 22 years of experience will enable me to effectively represent homeowners' and renters' concerns before State Legislative Committees. I will analyze property values to make sure business pays its fair share and I will oversee the operations of the Assessor's office in an experienced and professional manner.

Paul E. Schwenger

The sponsors for Paul E. Schwenger are:

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: With 28 years of public service, I am the only candidate with real management experience.
As Sheriff of San Francisco, I managed 399 employees; as Police Chief, 2,500; as New York Prison Commissioner, 13,000.
While this would be the largest managerial responsibility faced by the other candidates, it would be my smallest.
I want to be your assessor so I can make it a model agency. I know government and real estate. I am dedicated to public service and to lower taxes for you.
Mayor Agnos agrees I am the rational choice.
I would appreciate your vote.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Assessor

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Attorney/Supervisor
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have absolutely no ownership or income interests in real property which create any conflict of interest as Assessor.

As attorney for 25 years, Supervisor for three terms, and past President of the Board, I have a proven record of unique, practical accomplishments.

Just as I’ve fought for reduced local government spending, I’ll work for new statewide lower assessment formulas with the same energy that created the nationally copied No-Smoking Ordinance; the Police Fingerprint Computer which reduced our crime rate; laws allowing earthquake victims to quickly replace damaged buildings.

My goal is to achieve fair, reduced property assessments.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:
Alfred S. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Chief of Police.

RONALD G. KERSHAW

My address is 3533 21st Street
My occupation is Real Estate Portfolio Manager
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are: B.S. Accounting, Brigham Young University 1975
MBA Real Estate, Golden Gate University 1986
Eleven years experience in all aspects of property management, appraisals, renovation and property sales
Currently responsible for supervising a real estate portfolio of $150,000,000
Past President SF Chapter, Institute of Internal Auditors
Currently, President, Log Cabin Club of San Francisco
San Francisco homeowner and resident since 1975.
San Francisco needs a fiscal conservative who is the only qualified candidate to become the City’s new Assessor.

Ronald G. Kershaw

The sponsors for Ronald G. Kershaw are:

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 40th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender represents people in trouble who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. The responsibility must be performed ethically, competently, and efficiently. During three terms in office, with the help of a superb staff of men and women, that duty has been fulfilled with compassion, dignity, and with the highest professional standards of the American legal system.

In the next term, I pledge to continue to carry out the special trust of this office: to guarantee that everyone in this City has the full benefit of our Constitution and is treated with fairness and with justice.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

ALEX SALDAMANDO

My address is 700 Arkansas Street
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: In my 11 years presiding as a Municipal Court Judge, I have worked to protect the citizens of San Francisco. I have delivered justice swiftly and firmly, in a fair and impartial manner. As a Superior Court Judge, I would bring the same approach to felony criminal cases and complex civil disputes. I am currently President of the California Judges Foundation. My background includes experience as a prosecutor and a public interest lawyer. A graduate of the University of California (Berkeley) and Hastings College of Law, I live with my wife and two children on Potrero Hill.

My sponsors include: Judge Ira Brown, Jr.; Judge John Dearman; Judge Isabella Grant; Judge Ed Stern; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Lillian Sing; Former Judge Charles Renfrew; Mayor Art Agnos; Former Mayor Dianne Feinstein; Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi; Assemblyman Willie Brown; Assemblyman John Burton; Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Harry Britt; Supervisor Jim Gonzalez; Supervisor Terence Hallinan; Supervisor Willie Kennedy; School Board Member Rosario Anaya; School Board Member Libby Denebeim; School Board Member Fred Rodriguez; Commissioner Paul Melbostad; Larry Mazzola, President, Local 38; Thelma Shelley, Director, Performing Arts Center; Benny Yee; Stan Smith, Building Trades Council; and Police Commissioner John Keker.

J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY

My address is 340 Magellan
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a Municipal Court Judge since 1974, native Californian, resident San Francisco since 1937; attended local schools, N.D.V., St. Ignatius, USF and USF School of Law; married Patricia M. Berti, admitted State Bar 1960, devoted thirty years to public service; adjunct Professor of Law, USF; participant, member and/or lecturer for many organizations — Salesians Boys Club, 44 years — Municipal Court Speakers Bureau — California Judges Association — California Center for Judicial Education and Research — San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project; Supervising Judge, Preliminary Courts, Presiding Judge, Assistant Presiding Judge, Court Administrative Committee member eight years; honored by: San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Irish-Israeli-Italian Society, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, Lawyers Club, USF School of Law and USF Law Society for outstanding community service.


Alex Saldamando

J. Dominique Olcomendy

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
KAY TSENIN

My address is 637 Steiner Street
My occupation is Attorney and Counselor at Law
My age is 43 years
My qualifications for office are: B.A., San Francisco State University (Dean's List), graduate, University of San Francisco School of Law. Attorney for sixteen years specializing in civil litigation. Pro-Tem Municipal Court Judge in San Francisco for five years.
Born in China, moved to San Francisco as a child, graduate of George Washington High School.

Broad Community service includes founding of environmental law societies while in law school, Vice President for Legal Affairs for California National Organization for Women (NOW), Board Member for the Russian American Credit Union and San Francisco Trial Lawyers and Board Advisor for the Legal Advocates for Women. Vice-President, Alamo Square Neighborhood Association.

Strong commitment to equal justice for all without prejudice or bias. The following San Franciscans support me because they feel that the Superior Court needs a judge with my background, legal expertise and perspective on the law:

Sheriff Mike Hennessey, Supervisor Harry Britt, Dr. Leland Yee, Attorney Paul Melbostad, Jean Harris, Calvin Welch, Attorney Sue Hestor, Attorney Mary C. Dunlap, Roberto Esteves, Bob Ross, Matthew Rothschild, Pat Norman, Jonathan Bulkley, Susan P. Kennedy, Adrian Bermudez, Lawrence Brinkin, John H. Cushner, Attorney Anne Kirushkin, Eugene Kirushkin, N. Arden Danekas, Laura E. McBride, Donna Yutzy, Gale Armstrong.

Kay Tsenin

CARLOS BEA

My address is 2727 Pierce Street
My occupation is Judge Superior Court #5
My qualifications for office are: I am a Superior Court Judge in San Francisco and author of articles in several professional journals, such as California Trial Lawyers and Defense Research Institute's. Am recognized by the State Bar for pro bono work with members of the Hispanic Community. Have served two terms as a member of the Board of Visitors, Stanford Law School. Was a panelist and lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar. Was an adjunct professor, Hastings College of Law and Stanford Law School. I graduated from Stanford Law School and have been an attorney in San Francisco since 1959.

Sponsors include: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Ollie Marie-Victoire, all the judges of the Superior Court, Angela Alioto, Ernest Chuck Ayala, Willie Brown, Jr., John Burton, Jim Gonzalez, Quentin Kopp, H. Jesse Arnelle, James Herman, Mary Noel Pepys, Robert McDonnell, G. Joseph Bertain, Edward McFetridge, Zeppelin Wong, Paul Renne, Leo Murphy, Jr., Gina Moscone, James Brosnahan, Barbara Caulfield, Robert Morales, Paul Haerle, Michael Hardeman, Howard Nemerovski, Edwin Heafey, Jr., Larry Mazzola, Vincent Friia, Putnam Livermore, William Coblentz.

Carlos Bea

Kay Tsenin
DONNA HITCHENS

My address is 468 30th Street
My occupation is attorney
My age is 42 years
My qualifications for office are: Over the past thirteen years, I have represented clients in San Francisco courts, taught law to San Francisco students and served on the Boards of Directors of private and public agencies designed to further the cause of justice in our city.

My experience as a mediator, counselor and advocate demonstrates my willingness to pursue alternative dispute resolutions. Judicial leadership and integrity are standards that the community should demand. My record attests to my ability to meet those standards.

• J.D. UC Berkeley 1977
• Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates, a public interest firm specializing in sex discrimination cases. 1978 – 1984
• Co-founder, Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom
• Staff Counsel, ACLU, 1984 – 85
• Partner, Hitchens & Brenner. Small Business, non-profit corporations, civil rights and family law. Presently
• Former chair, San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women.
• Member, Board of Directors, Pacific Primary Preschool.

SUPPORT: Assemblymember John Burton; Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisors Nancy Walker, Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, and Terence Hallinan; Judge Lillian Sing, Judge Mary Morgan, and Judge Herbert Donaldson; Commissioners Jim Jefferson, Adrian Bermudez, Jr., James Morales, Paul Melbostad, Richard Grosboll, and Leni Marin; Hon. Libby Deneibeim; Hon. Leland Yee; Carol Migden; Will Leong; Catherine Dodd, R.N.; Jeff Mori, and Mauri Schwartz

DONNA HITCHENS

JEROME T. BENSON

My address is 187 Robinhood Drive
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the Superior Court
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are:
• 23 years public service in the courtroom protecting victims, litigants and the community.
• 7 years as Chief of the Criminal Division in the District Attorney’s Office including:
  • 65 felony jury trial prosecutions for murder, rape, child abuse, drugs, white-collar fraud.
  • Stanford Law School graduate 1964.
  • Chairman, State Bar of California Subcommittee on Jury Instructions (Criminal).
• Member, Project Safer California.
• Fair and equal application of the law without regard to race, sex, or economic status.
• I am a native San Franciscan and homeowner living with my wife and two daughters near Miraloma Park.
• My judicial office is dedicated to fair rulings, hard work, human sensitivity, and legal equality.

CITYWIDE SUPPORT:
State Senator Quentin Kopp; Justice Harry Low; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Public Defender Jeff Brown; Sheriff Michael Hennessey; Former Chief of Police Alfred Nelder.

SUPERVISORS:
Angela Alioto, Tom Hsieh, Wendy Nelder;

JUDGES:
John Ertola, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Ina Gyemant, Paul Alvarez, Isabella Grant;

LABOR:
Mike Hardeman, Stan Smith, Kevin Ryan;

ATTORNEYS AND COMMUNITY:
William Coblenz; Harold Dobbs; Charles Breyer; Airport Commission President Morris Bernstein; Wayne Friday; Benny Yee; Louis Giraudo; Doris Thomas; Christopher Bowman; Haddie Redd; Elizabeth Aguilar-Tarchi; Ron Huberman;

JEROME T. BENSON
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #1

JAMES HARRIGAN

My address is 494 Mangels St.
My occupation is Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department.
My age is 42.

My qualifications for office are: I live in Glen Park with my wife, Serena Lee, and our three children.
I received my law degree with academic awards and Law Review distinction in 1975 from Golden Gate University, San Francisco.

I have completed more than 80 jury and court trials in Municipal and Superior Court, representing thousands of citizens and victims of crime in civil and criminal cases in private practice, as a public defender, and as Legal Counsel to the Sheriff.

My expertise includes: employment law, labor relations, criminal, landlord/tenant, and constitutional law. As Counsel to the Sheriff, I resolve the legal affairs of a major law enforcement agency. My work brings me before the civil and criminal justice system each day.

“James Harrigan is by far the best qualified candidate. No other candidate has his broad range of experience: public service and private practice; law enforcement and defense law; extensive courtroom experience and administrative expertise. I strongly urge your vote for James Harrigan.”

— Sheriff Michael Hennessey

I have not listed my sponsors. I firmly believe the voter’s decision should be based on one’s qualifications and experience — not on political connections.
I pledge equal application of the law. I ask for your support.
Thank you.

James Harrigan

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Ave.
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My qualifications for office are: What I am in life, I owe to my family and to an excellent education: M.A., counseling, Stanford University; B.A., psychology, University of San Francisco; Juris Doctorate, Hastings College of Law. I began practicing law in 1982 and have been an assistant district attorney since 1983: with experience in criminal prosecution and family law enforcing child support. I have served 10 years on the College Board; my colleagues elected me president three terms because of my firm but fair judgment. My duties include equitably settling conflicts, grievances and contracts. In my years of public service, compassion, integrity and common sense have always guided my decisions; and as a judge that will continue to be the case.

My supporters:
Justice Harry Low
Judges: Isabella Grant, Lenard Louie, David Garcia, Larry Kay, Mary Morgan, Bill Mallen, Herbert Donaldson.
District Attorney: Arlo Smith
Public Defender: Jeff Brown
Senators: Milton Marks, Quentin Kopp
Attorneys: Charlie Clifford, Harriet Ross, William Coblenz, Cedric Chao, Roberta Achtenberg
BART Director: Mike Bernick
Commissioners: Rosario Anaya, Tim Wolfred, Chuck Ayala, Naomi Gray.
Supervisors: Thomas Hsieh, Angela Alioto
Walter Johnson; Alex Esclamado; Reverend Amos Brown; Carole Migden;
UC Regent Yori Wada.

Julie Tang

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
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ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I'm honored that MAYOR ART AGNOS and 8 PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION — who know my courtroom experience and qualifications in civil and criminal law — endorse me.

As a lawyer in private practice 18 years, mother of 2 children, married 19 years, I care about the strength and integrity of San Francisco's courts.

A judgship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred community trust — not a consolation prize for a restless politician. A lawyer lacking courtroom experience is unqualified to be judge.

In HUNDREDS of court appearances and trials, as chair of the Bar Association Criminal Justice Advisory Council, as a San Francisco Delinquency Prevention Commissioner, and as a Hastings Law School teacher, I have demonstrated a longstanding commitment to professional excellence.

Community and law enforcement leaders who acknowledge my legal service and endorse me:
SPEAKER Willie Brown
SUPERVISORS Nancy Walker, Bill Maher, Harry Britt, Terence Hallinan
JUDGES Dorothy vonBeroldingen, John Dearman, Edward Stern
COURT COMMISSIONER George Colbert
SENATOR Milton Marks
SCHOOL BOARD JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Libby Denebeim, Myra Kopf
POLICE COMMISSIONER John Keeker
FIRE COMMISSIONER Sharon Bretz
SHERIFF LIEUTENANT Connie O'Connor
POLICE OFFICERS VICE PRESIDENT Paul Chignell
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY Charles Wood
BUSINESSMAN Mel Swig
PUC COMMISSIONER Rodel Rodis

ELLEN CHAITIN

WILLIAM J. O’CONNOR

My address is 3615 Buchanan St. #206
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I am the most qualified candidate for this office. I have had judicial experience, serving as Municipal Court judge pro temp for over five years, and have been commended by the Presiding Judge for the quality of my service. I have been a journeyman lawyer for 15 years, with both criminal and civil experience, and have done over 30 jury trials.

With Amnesty International and Church representatives, I have been an International Trial Observer.

I have been a Board Member of the Elizabeth Frye Center and the Irish Forum, and a volunteer on the Bar Association’s free legal services panel.


William J. O'Connor

Ellen Chaitin

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
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LILLIAN K. SING

My address is San Francisco Municipal Court,
400 Van Ness Ave.
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the San Francisco
Municipal Court
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: I am an incumbent judge, and
have been a judge since 1981. I am the first Asian-American
woman judge in the history of Northern California. In 1988, I
was awarded Trial Judge of the Year by San Francisco Trial
Lawyers Association, one of the highest awards a Bar Associa-
tion can bestow. Last year, I was unanimously elected as Munici-
pal Court’s Presiding Judge. As Presiding Judge, I implemented
the Pro Tem Judge Program, drastically reduced backlog in
civil/criminal cases, brought Trial Court Funding to San Fran-
cisco, spearheaded San Francisco’s first judicial forum “Access
To Justice" attended by 680 people. I served as a faculty member
with the California Center for Judicial Education/Research
which trains all new judges in California and am a faculty judge
with the National Institute for Trial Advocacy which trains trial
lawyers. In 1988 I lectured throughout China on the U.S.
Legal/Judicial System.

Join San Francisco judges led by Presiding Judges Choppelas,
and Marie-Victoire, Mayor Art Agnos, President Harry Britt,
and the entire 11 Board of Supervisors, Assembly Speaker Willie
Brown, Assemblyman John Burton, Senator Milton Marks, For-
mer Police Chiefs Nelder/Cahill, DA Arlo Smith, PD Jeff
Brown, Sheriff Michael Hennessey and retain me as judge.

Lillian K. Sing

JEROME A. DEFILIPPO

My address is 1534 38th Avenue
My occupation is Attorney at Law
My qualifications for office are: A third generation San Fran-
ciscan. I have practiced law in The City since 1973, served as
the Legal Officer of the San Francisco Police Department and a
Deputy City Attorney. I am committed to the impartial applica-
tion of our laws in all judicial proceedings. Having served twenty
years as a Police Officer attaining the position of Lieutenant, I
am well aware of the frustrations each of us feel by the impact
of crime in our City. If elected, I am committed to the imposition
of the maximum sentence allowed by law for persons convicted
of violent crimes or narcotic sales.

Partial list of sponsors follows:

   Ann Alberigi, Catherine Archbold, Alfred Arnaud, Martin
   Bastiani, Chief Thomas Cahill, Ann Carrick, Peter Cimarelli,
   Hon. Antoine Cincotta, Clement Collins, Jean DeFilippo, Cantor
   Martin Feldman, Nancy Feldman, H. Welton Flynn, John
   Fracchia, Carol Fujikawa, John Gallagher, Judith Gallen, Kath-
   leen Gee, Dr. William Gee, Susanna Lee, Margaret Leong,
   Maureen Mahoney, Carmelita Mathis, Phyliss Moylan, James
   Pagano, Renzo Panelli, Timothy J. Riordan, Rollin Schroth, Joan
   Swendsen, Spiron Tenes, Paul Vigo, Rita Young

Jerome A. DeFilippo
Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against these measures. All arguments, “official” and paid, are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None of them has been checked for accuracy by this office or any other city official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

“Official Arguments”

There is one “official” argument for and one against each measure, and they are published at no cost. “Official” arguments are selected by the Registrar of Voters in accordance with the priorities set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code as summarized below:

For:
1. Person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee supporting the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Against:
1. For a referendum, person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee against the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Rebuttals

Authors of official arguments may each prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. As with official and paid arguments, rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Each rebuttal follows immediately after its corresponding official argument.

Paid Arguments

All paid arguments are accepted for publication upon (1) deposit of an amount equal to $50 plus $1.50 per word, (2) submission of a petition containing valid signatures of registered voters in lieu of the printing fee at the rate of two signatures for each dollar of the fee, or (3) a combination of a printing fee and signatures which together equal the number of signatures and/or amount of money required to qualify the argument for publication.

For each measure, paid arguments follow after the official arguments and rebuttals. All paid arguments supporting a measure are printed together followed by all paid arguments against that same measure. Paid arguments within each group (e.g. all paid arguments in favor of Proposition Z) are not printed in any particular order. Rather they are arranged so that each page is fully utilized.

There is one ballot measure for which paid arguments were not accepted. The School Facilities Safety Special Tax measure is being proposed under state law; only one argument for, one argument against, and respective rebuttals for this measure are allowed.

Again, arguments and rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked by this office or any other city official or agency.
PROPOSITION A

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many City buildings were damaged by the October 17, 1989 earthquake and many may not survive another strong earthquake. Many City buildings contain asbestos and many are not accessible to disabled persons. Many City buildings do not meet current health, safety and building codes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $332,400,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This total would be reduced by the amount of grants the City receives from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the State of California for earthquake repair and hazard reduction. No more than $65,000,000 of bonds could be sold in any fiscal year.

This money would be used to pay for safety improvements to some City buildings, including repairing earthquake damage, making the buildings better able to survive earthquakes, removing or reducing the danger of asbestos in these buildings, making them more accessible to the disabled and bringing them up to current codes.

The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds for not more than $332,400,000 to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue bonds to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that the approximate costs would be as follows:

- Bond redemption: $332,400,000
- Bond interest: 244,314,000
- Debt service requirement: 576,714,000

The bond authorization limits the issuance of bonds to no more than $65 million per year. Assuming a single sale on a 20 year basis at current interest rates with no reduction for possible FEMA or State funding, annual debt service on each $65 million increment would amount to $5,638,750, which amount is equivalent to one and forty-eight hundredths cents ($0.0148) in the current tax rate."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 26, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A the earthquake repair and protection measure.

Proposition A provides $332.4 million to repair earthquake damaged city buildings and to seismically reinforce many of them so that they would not sustain as much damage (or worse) during a future earthquake. This improves public safety while it also protects the investment we are making in repairs.

Your “Yes on A” vote will provide for:

Repairs of earthquake damage, asbestos removal and handicapped accessibility work in over 200 earthquake damaged city buildings.

Seismic strengthening of the Civic Center complex including City Hall, the Veterans Building, Opera House, Department of Public Health and Civic Auditorium.

Seismic strengthening for the Palace of Fine Arts/Exploratorium, nine additional branch libraries, two additional police stations, two jails and the services building at San Francisco General Hospital.

Replacement of the broken and earthquake damaged water and sewer lines at the Zoo.

Proposition A represents a prudent investment which would protect many irreplaceable public buildings from major damage or collapse in a future earthquake.

In order to keep property taxes from rising more than 2-3¢ per $100 of assessed value, Proposition A will not allow more than $65 million in bonds to be sold in any one year. It further requires that any Federal or State earthquake relief money we receive to repair these buildings reduce the amount of bonds sold. This assures that local taxpayers will not be required to pay for repairs that can be made using Federal/State emergency relief assistance.

Vote Yes on Proposition A to protect city buildings and increase public safety in a next major earthquake.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition A
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition A
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

When future earthquakes strike, our libraries need to be safe. Proposition A will provide funds to help earthquake proof our library system. 

Vote YES on A.

This bond issue will help to ensure the seismic safety of the Palace of Fine Arts, home of the Exploratorium which is visited by over 600,000 people a year. Prop A represents a prudent investment to improve public safety and protect irreplaceable public buildings. We urge all citizens to vote “Yes” on Proposition A.

Replacement of the earthquake-damaged, underground, 50-year-old water, gas and sewer lines at the San Francisco Zoo is critically needed for the safety and well-being of the animals. It will significantly improve public services to the 1.2 million children and adults who visit annually. The Zoological Society will endeavor to raise funds to renovate and build new above-ground facilities to supplement the $26 million included in the bond issue for the Zoo. Help make the Zoo a true sanctuary.

David E. Anderson
Zoo Director

Phil Arnold
Assistant General Manager
Recreation & Park

William Brewster Ely IV
Headmaster, Town School

Mary Burns
General Manager
Recreation & Park

Margaret K. Burks
Executive Director, Zoological Society

Jack W. Castor
Animal Keeper Shop Steward, Local 858

Todd Cecil
Children’s Zoo Keeper

Sherry Chiesa
President, Local 2

Robert Todd Cockburn
Executive Director, Clean Water Program

Rosemary Davidson
Urban School

Dolores A. Donovan
Animal Control & Welfare Commission

Keith G. Eickman
Recreation & Park Commissioner

Roy Eisenhardt
Director, California Academy of Sciences

Becky Evans
Conservation Activist

Norman Gershenz
Director, Ecosystem Survival Plan

Arthur J. Goodwenaen
Board Member, SPEAK

John E. Hafernix Jr.
Professor Biology, SFSU

Roger Hoppes
Director, Children’s Zoo

Michael Housh
Assistant to the Mayor

David J. Howe
Animal Keeper

Mark Hurley
Animal Control & Welfare Commission

Norma J. Kristovich
Zoo Docent Council

Connie Lurie
Vice Chairman, Zoological Society Board

Michael Mellor, President
Friends of the San Francisco Public Library

Exploratorium
F. Van Kasper, Chairman
William K. Coblentz, Vice Chairman
C. Richard Kramlich, Vice Chairman
G. Steven Burrill, Treasurer

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Zoological Society Board

Frances May McAteer
Recreation & Park Commissioner

Amy Meyer
People for GGNRA

Andrew Nash
President, San Francisco Tomorrow

Trent W. Orr
Recreation & Park Commissioner

Elizabeth D. Rieger
Zoo Volunteer

Fred A. Rodriguez
School Board Member

Carroll Soo-Hoo
Zoo Benefactor

Stephen V. R. Spaulding
Zoological Society Treasurer

James J. Walsh Jr.
Citizens Advisory Committee on Wastewater Management

Connie O’Connor
President, Recreation & Park Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Public Safety Improvement Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We must rebuild and repair our infrastructure. The October 17 quake was a warning. More resources going to earthquake preparedness programs today will save lives in the future. Vote YES on A.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

We urge everyone to vote Yes on Proposition A. The people of San Francisco have a $3.5 billion investment in public buildings. This bond issue will be used to fund repairs to many of our facilities damaged in last October's earthquake, including City Hall, General Hospital, neighborhood libraries, police stations and cultural buildings. It will also provide monies necessary to make life-safety improvements to other city buildings.

Your Yes Vote on Proposition A will protect lives and property in the event of another major earthquake at a very small cost to businesses and homeowners. Because bonds to finance repairs will be sold over 6 - 10 years, replacing older bond issues as they are paid-off, the result will be an almost unchanged tax rate. In fact, the City's independent budget analyst found that the tax bill for an average homeowner will increase by less than $5.00 a month.

Proposition A is a small price to pay to preserve our investment in the city's valuable public facilities. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

We ask that you join with us in Voting YES ON PROP. "A". Your "Yes on A" vote will provide funds to protect the two remaining Police Stations which are not yet earthquake safe or provided for in previous bond issues.

In an emergency we can do our jobs only if our own police facilities are earthquake resistant and if we can get to those places in the City which most need our services. That is why it is important to us that as many City buildings as possible are made earthquake resistant. The less damage and street obstruction that results from a future earthquake, the better we can get to these parts of the City where we are most needed. The safer the public buildings in the City are made, the better we will be able to serve the rest of the City if we ever have to face a major earthquake emergency.

For security vote "Yes on A".

Michael Keys President
San Francisco Police Officers' Association

The damage done by the October 17th earthquake to San Francisco's most important public buildings is considerable. To correct that damage and prepare for the future vitality of our City demands the kind of response represented by Proposition A. This proposition carefully earmarks funds to upgrade buildings such as City Hall, the War Memorial Opera House, and the Department of Public Health offices which are treasures that can never be replaced or reproduced. They not only need to be repaired, but strengthened structurally and improved, to meet today's building codes. The Federal Government will pick up some of the damage, but much more will be needed if these vital components of our City's daily life are to be improved and made ready for the next major quake. Proposition A requests a large sum, but this is a time when we as a City have to agree to such a request. We strongly urge your support of Proposition A.

American Institute of Architects/San Francisco Chapter

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We ask you to join us in voting “Yes on A”.

The primary purpose of Prop “A” is to protect lives and public buildings from the effects of the next earthquake. As San Franciscans we all share the responsibility of having to do all we can to avoid the loss of life, the suffering and the huge costs which another, perhaps stronger or longer quake would bring. Thus we see Proposition “A” as a necessary, prudent investment in all our future.

We have a special reason to support “Prop A” and to ask you to vote YES ON “A” as well. That special reason is the fact that 20 of the buildings which will be repaired or strengthened against future earthquakes if Prop “A” passes will also be made fully accessible to the disabled. We want our City’s buildings to be repaired, to be made safe and to be made accessible to all San Franciscans.

Vote “Yes on A”.

Kathy Uhl, Executive Director,
Independent Living Resource Center
Michael L. Comini, Executive Director,
Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition “A”.

Many city buildings were damaged in the October 17 earthquake. If these buildings are repaired and strengthened the Fire Department will be much safer when responding to future emergencies.

Please help the Fire Department do its job safely and effectively by voting “Yes” on Proposition “A”.

James D. Jefferson, President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn, Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bretz, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Soulis, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Frederick F. Postel, Chief of Department

We urgently request that you vote “Yes on A”.

The War Memorial complex of buildings, dedicated to San Francisco’s veterans, are one of our city’s treasures, irreplaceable architecturally and economically. They are central to our history and we owe it to ourselves to make sure they are made as fully earthquake-resistant as possible.

The October 17 earthquake was a warning which we must heed. Proposition “A” is a prudent and necessary response. It will protect our treasured buildings and, even more importantly, it will protect the lives of those who use them and the memories of those whose lives they commemorate.

Harold F. Jackson, Chairman, American Legion War Memorial Commission
Claude M. Jarman, Jr., Vice-President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Mark Ryscer, Executive Director, Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage

Save lives.
Support earthquake safety.
Vote YES on Propositions A and B.
Also vote YES on Proposition N. Limit San Francisco Supervisors to two-year terms.

Terence Faulkner
Republican State Assembly Candidate
San Francisco Republican Party Chairman (1987-89)

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Candidate
Past San Francisco Democratic Party Secretary
Max Woods
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic County Central Committeewoman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for your safety. Let us learn from the October 17th earthquake. 15 seconds of moderate shaking resulted in the need for $32 million in repairs to city buildings in the Civic Center alone. We need to be better prepared. We need to reduce known safety hazards. Please, vote YES on Proposition A.

Ken Dowlin, City Librarian
Steve Coulter, Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson, Library Commissioner
Lonni Chin, Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil, Library Commissioner
Dennis Normandy, Library Commissioner
Roselyne Swig, Library Commissioner

Help the City of San Francisco and the Zoo rebuild. The animals will benefit, too! Vote YES on A.

Susanne Barthell,
Zoo Advisory Committee member,
Zoo Volunteer
Sophie Papageorge,
Zoologist
Jorge L. Garcia, D.V.M.,
Zoo Medicine Specialist
John J. Alcara,
Retired Zookeeper
Ron Joan Howard,
Educator
David J. Howe
Animalkeeper
Terrence J. Mayes
Linda Caratti
Animalkeeper
Anthony Sharp
Animalkeeper
Martin E. Dias
A.K.A. Big Bison, Animalkeeper
Jack W. Castor
Lion House, Animalkeeper
Sandra Keller
Director, Citizens for a Better Zoo

Proposition A will help restore structural safety to the San Francisco County Jails in San Bruno, which were built in 1934 and are badly in need of repair. This is the oldest operating jail in California and sits near the San Andreas fault.

For the safety of City employees and county jail inmates, please vote YES on Proposition A.

Michael Hennessey
San Francisco County Sheriff
Deputy Albert Waters, President
San Francisco Deputy Sheriff’s Association

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION A

This bond issue is iffy.
It should have been presented to the voters as two separate bond issues.
One for $75 million — earthquake repairs to be partly refunded by F.E.M.A. for our present estimated damages. Another for $257.4 million to take care of our needed capital improvements so neglected by this and past administrations.
Vote NO and get one issue back on the November ballot.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1990, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, TO PAY FOR THE COST OF PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION, ASBESTOS ABATEMENT, PROVIDING ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED, ALL RELATED TO PUBLIC SAFETY TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING RELATED ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION NEEDED OR CONVENIENT FOR THE FOREGOING PURPOSE; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT NO MORE THAN $65,000,000 OF SAID BONDED INDEBTEDNESS SHALL BE INCURRED IN ANY SINGLE FISCAL YEAR AND FURTHER, THAT THE AUTHORIZATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $332,400,000 WILL BE REDUCED BY THE AMOUNT OF THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEDERAL OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND THE CONTROLLER TO MONITOR THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEDERAL OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION; FINDING THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES THAT CANNOT BE PAID OUT OF SUCH ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE THEREOF ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECIPTING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF THE ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 5th day of June, 1990, for the purpose of submitting to the voters of said city and county a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the herein-after described municipal improvements in the amount and for the purposes stated:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, to pay for the cost of public safety improvements to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled, all related to public safety to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including related acquisition, construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purpose; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual post-audit receipt of Federal or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction, authorizing and directing the Chief Administrative Officer and the Controller to monitor the issuance of bonds and the actual post-audit receipt of Federal or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction, finding that the estimated cost to the City and County of San Francisco of said municipal improvements is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County of San Francisco and will require expenditures that cannot be paid out of such annual income and revenue therefrom allowed therefor by the annual tax levy; reciting the estimated cost of such municipal improvements; fixing the date of the election and the manner of holding the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified. Said estimate of cost as set forth in said resolution are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. Authorizing and directing the Chief Administrative Officer and the Controller to monitor the issuance of the bonds and the actual post-audit receipt of Federal or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction and to take any appropriate action so that the bonds issued will not duplicate Federal or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 4. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 5. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 5, 1990, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election shall be the same as herein before 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 for said General Election and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 31, 1990.

Section 6. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $352,400,000 for the purpose of constructing buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided,

(Continued on next page)
however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.”

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word “YES” on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word “NO” on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special election, each voter to vote for any said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word “YES” to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word “NO” to the right of said proposition.

Section 7. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as “serials,” and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 12 per centum per annum, payable semiannually, provided, that interest for the first year after the date of any of said bonds may be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 8. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a

sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 9. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 10. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.
PROPOSITION B

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269  NO 272

Analysis
by City Attorney

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Some School District buildings were damaged by the earthquake. Some District buildings do not meet present earthquake and fire standards.

The State Mello-Rosie law allows the Board of Education to submit to the voters a measure authorizing a special property tax to pay for repairs and other improvements to school buildings.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize a special property tax to pay for costs of repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety. Some of the money would also be used for deferred capital maintenance. The repairs and maintenance would be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis. Since no money would be borrowed, there would be no interest costs to pay.

The tax would last for 20 years. The tax on single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels could be no more than $46 for each of the first six years and no more than $32.20 for each of the last 14 years. The tax on other types of parcels could be no more than $23 for each dwelling unit for each of the first six years and $16.10 for each dwelling unit for each of the last 14 years. Dwelling units occupied by persons 65 years of age or older would be eligible for a exemption from this tax. The measure would also set an annual appropriations limit of $12 million.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to authorize this property tax to pay for repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety and you want to authorize this annual appropriations limit.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to authorize this tax.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed special tax levy be approved, in my opinion, it would increase revenues for the San Francisco Unified School District, net of estimated senior citizen exemptions, by approximately $8 million per year for the first 6 years and $5.6 million per year for the next 14 years, based on the current assessment roll of the City and County. The approximately $127.2 million generated over a 20 year period by this special tax levy would be restricted for use by the District for the repair, restoration, replacement, seismic upgrading and capital maintenance of School District facilities."

How "B" Got on the Ballot

On February 13, the Board of Education voted 5-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Board members voted as follows:


NO: Leland Yee.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When the earthquake struck last fall, our school buildings suffered. Sustaining major damage and at special risk in the future are our buildings that were not earthquake proofed in the 1970's. In that category are our child care centers serving our youngest students. Also, in the fall of 1988 the City Fire Marshall inspected our schools and reported that the majority of our school buildings do not meet fire safety standards. Our 63,000 students and the community groups that meet at our schools in the evenings and on weekends must have buildings that can withstand earthquakes, and meet fire safety standards.

Proposition B will authorize a tax to provide for: repairing earthquake damage at 131 sites including the reconstruction of John O'Connell High School, seismic improvement of nine Children's Centers, correction of fire code and safety violations at 97 sites and seismic improvement of John Swett, Jean Parker and Bessie Carmichael Elementary Schools and Parkside Curriculum Center. In addition, there will be funds for deferred capital maintenance.

Two years ago the citizens of this City voted to support major repairs for our school buildings. Now we must protect that investment by repairing the present earthquake damage and seeing that all our schools can withstand future earthquakes, be as safe as possible in case of fire and be well maintained into the next century.

Civic organizations who have joined in supporting Proposition B include: San Francisco League of Women Voters, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SF/PTA, Parents' Lobby, San Francisco Labor Council, United Educators of San Francisco, and Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth.

Submitted by Superintendent Ramon C. Cortines, San Francisco Unified School District, and Fred Rodriguez, President, Board of Education.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition B
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California
February 13, 1990
(For Board Meeting February 13, 1990)


REQUESTED ACTION:
WHEREAS, the Board of Education (the "Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "District"), did, on January 9, 1990, adopt its Resolution of Intention (the "Resolution") to form Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "Community Facilities District"), and levy a special tax therein, pursuant to Chapter 2.5 of Part I of Division 2 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 53311) of the California Government Code, commonly known as the "Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982," as amended, (the "Act"); and
WHEREAS, a copy of the Resolution (which sets forth a description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, the name of the Community Facilities District and the types of facilities proposed to be financed by the District (the "Facilities")), providing that, except where funds are otherwise available, a special tax sufficient to pay for all Facilities and the financing thereof (to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District) is proposed to be levied within the proposed Community Facilities District specifying the rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the proposed Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, and setting a hearing thereon, is on file with the Clerk of this Board and is incorporated herein by this reference; and
WHEREAS, notice of said hearing was duly published as required by law, as evidenced by the affidavit of publication on file with the Clerk of this Board; and
WHEREAS, on February 13, 1990 this Board held the noticed public hearing as required by law relative to the proposed formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and
WHEREAS, prior to the noticed public hearing a report (the "Report") containing a description of the Facilities and an estimate of the cost of providing the Facilities, including the estimated fair and reasonable cost thereof, was filed with this Board as a part of the record of said hearing; and
WHEREAS, at the public hearing all persons desiring to be heard on all matters pertaining to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution, including all interested persons or taxpayers for or against the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent of the Community Facilities District, or the furnishing of specific types of public facilities, were heard and considered, and a full and fair hearing was held thereon; and
WHEREAS, at the public hearing evidence was presented to this Board on the matters before it, and this Board at the conclusion of the hearing was fully advised as to all matters relating to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and
WHEREAS, written protests against the establishment of the District, the furnishing of specified type or types of facilities within the Community Facilities District as listed in the Report, or the levying of the special tax have not been filed with the Clerk of this Board by fifty percent (50%) or more of the registered voters, or six registered voters, whichever is more, residing within the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District, or the owners of one-half (1/2) or more of the area of land in the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District and not exempt from this special tax;
NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District, in regular session assembled on February 13, 1990, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE, DETERMINE AND ORDER as follows:
Section 1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.
Section 2. Written protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, or the extent hereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are insufficient in number and in amount under the Act, and this Board hereby further orders and determines that all protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are hereby overruled.
Section 3. As proposed in the Resolution, a community facilities district is hereby established pursuant to the Act, designated "Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District."
Section 4. The map and legal description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, filed with the Clerk of this Board on January 24, 1990, are hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the boundaries of the Community Facilities District.
Section 5. The Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District, set forth in Exhibit "B" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, shall be the Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District.
Section 6. As provided in Exhibit "B", it is the intention of this Board, subject to the approval of the qualified electors of the Community Facilities District, to levy a special tax sufficient to acquire, construct and improve the Facilities including administrative expenses to be incurred by the District and the Community Facilities District in connection therewith; said tax to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District.
The rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax, in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, is described in Exhibit "A" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.
Section 7. The description of the proposed voting procedure, as set forth in the Resolution, is hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the voting procedure to be used in these proceedings.
Section 8. The special tax has not been precluded by majority protest pursuant to Section 53324 of the Act.
Section 9. The Facilities to be funded from the special tax are identified in Exhibit "B" hereto.
Section 10. In accordance with Section 53340.1 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit for the District, are cast in favor thereof, this Board shall designate the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District as the office, department or bureau which will be responsible for annually preparing the current roll of special tax levy obligations by assessor's parcel number on nonexempt property within the District and which will be responsible for estimating future special tax levies pursuant to Section 53340.1 of the Act. The name, address, and telephone number of the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District, and the person responsible for administering the District, is as follows:
Director of Fiscal Services
Fiscal Services Department
San Francisco Unified School District
135 Van Ness Avenue, Room 215
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 241-6480
Section 11. In accordance with Section 53328.3 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the (Continued on next page)
consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, the Clerk of this Board shall record the notice of special tax lien provided for in Section 3114.5 of the Streets and Highways Code. Upon recordation of the notice of special tax lien pursuant to Section 3114.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, a continuing lien to secure each levy of the special tax shall attach to all non exempt real property in the Community Facilities District, and this lien shall continue in force and effect until the special tax obligation is permanently satisfied and the lien cancelled in accordance with law until collection of the tax by this Board ceases.

Section 12. A boundary map of the Community Facilities District has been recorded pursuant to Sections 3111 and 3113 of the Streets and Highways Code at Book 39, Page 182-183 in the Book of Maps of Assessment and Community Facilities Districts in the Office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 13. All prior proceedings taken with respect to the establishment of the District were valid and in conformity with the requirements of the Act.

Section 14. In accordance with Section 53325.7 of the Act, the annual appropriations limit of the District, as defined by subdivision (b) of Section 8 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution, is hereby preliminarily established in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year, and said annual appropriations limit shall be submitted to the voters of the District as hereafter provided. The proposition establishing said appropriations limit shall become effective if approved by the qualified electors voting thereon and shall be adjusted in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 53325.7 of the Act.

Section 15. The Board hereby calls an election and submits the question of levying the special tax, and the establishment of the annual appropriations limit for the District in connection therewith, to the qualified electors within the District, at an election to be held on Tuesday, June 5, 1990, all in accordance with and subject to the Act, the terms of which shall be applicable to such election.

Section 16. The Board hereby further directs that the election at which the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith is submitted to the qualified electors within the District shall be consolidated and shall be combined in one ballot proposition, all as provided by the Act; and the Board further directs that notice of the consolidated election on the combined proposition of authorizing the levy of the special tax and of establishing an appropriations limit be published as required by law.

Section 17. If two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax are cast in favor of levying the tax, as determined by this Board after canvass of the returns of such consolidated election, the Board may levy the special tax within the territory of the District in the amount and for the purposes as specified in this resolution. The special tax may be levied only at the rate and may be apportioned only in the manner specified in this resolution, subject to the Act, except that the special tax may be levied at a lower rate.

Section 18. The Clerk of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution, a certified map of the boundaries of the Community Facilities District, a sufficient description to allow the election official to determine the boundaries of the District, and the assessor’s parcel numbers for the land within the District to the Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco within three business days after the adoption of this resolution.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 13th day of February, 1990.
President of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District

ATTEST:
Clerk of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District
Recommended by:
Ramon C. Cortines
Superintendent of Schools

EXHIBIT A
RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT BASIS OF SPECIAL TAX LEVY
The annual special tax shall be levied on each separate parcel within Community Facilities District No. 90-1, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco County, California (“CFD 90-1”) as shown on the San Francisco County Assessor’s records, subject to the maximum rates specified below, as established by the Board of Education (“Board”) of the San Francisco Unified School District (“District”).

DETERMINATION OF PARCELS SUBJECT TO SPECIAL TAX
The records of the County Assessor of San Francisco County shall be used to determine the parcels subject to the special tax. The basis for determining the parcels will be the Secured Property Tax Roll. The land use code contained in the Secured Property Tax Roll, in combination with records maintained by the Assessor of the number of dwelling units on each residential parcel in CFD 90-1, will be the basis for assigning the appropriate tax rate to each parcel. If the District determines that the records maintained by the Assessor are incorrect with respect to one or more parcels, the District will assign the appropriate land use code and dwelling unit count based on its review of the property. All special taxes shall be based on parcels established in the County Assessor’s records as of March 1 of each year and all land use categories shall be based on building permits and other relevant development approvals granted by the City and County of San Francisco or any successor jurisdiction as of June 1 of each year.

Using the records of the County Assessor, the District shall prepare a list of the parcels subject to the tax. The District shall establish the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.
1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which, supported publicly-owned and non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that leasehold/possessory interests shall be taxed.
2. From the parcels remaining identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor’s data, and the District’s review of building permits issued, and other changes in development status:
   a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
   b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
   c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
   d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on that parcel will be classified based on the uses that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX
The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:
1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.00 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:
1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $32.20 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CFD 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CFD 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination (Continued on next page)
ministration of the parcels subject to the tax and their special tax assignments.

SENIOR CITIZEN EXEMPTION
A property owner may apply for a Senior Citizen Exemption which would provide an exemption from the special tax for the applicable tax year on dwelling units occupied by senior citizens, if the following conditions are met:

1. The applicant must show evidence that the dwelling unit is owned or rented by a citizen who is at least 65 years of age.

2. The applicant must show evidence of ownership of the property subject to the Exemption.

3. The Senior Citizen Exemption must be applied for annually.

4. If the applicant is a landlord, then he or she must certify that the entire tax exemption will be reflected only in the rent for the exempted dwelling unit(s).

EXHIBIT B
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO.

90-1 — Description of Facilities to be financed:
(i) Repair, restoration, and/or replacement of District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), to the extent that (A) such repair, restoration, or replacement is outside the scope of work approved by federal and state agencies for assistance from such agencies; (B) costs incurred in such repair, restoration, or replacement are ineligible for federal or state assistance; or (C) insufficient federal or state funds are appropriated, obligated, or approved to pay for repair, restoration, or replacement which would otherwise be eligible for federal or state assistance. Pending receipt by the District of disaster assistance from federal and/or state agencies, the Community Facilities District may advance funds to the District to pay costs eligible for federal or state disaster assistance; provided that upon receipt by the District of federal or state disaster assistance relating to such costs, the District shall promptly reimburse the Community Facilities District for any such advances.
(ii) Seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other District facilities.
(iii) Correction of fire safety violations of District facilities.
(iv) Deferred capital maintenance of District facilities. Incidental expenses, including the cost of planning and designing the Facilities and the cost of environmental evaluations thereof; all costs associated with the creation of the proposed Community Facilities District, the determination of the amount of and collection of taxes, the payment of taxes, and costs otherwise incurred in order to carry out the authorized purposes of the Community Facilities District; and any other expenses incidental to the construction, completion, and inspection of the Facilities and permitted under the Act.
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PROPOSITION C

Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277  NO 278

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City obtains computers, telephone systems and other equipment by paying for it all at once or by leasing it until it is paid for, which is called "lease financing." The City may not enter into long-term leases for financing equipment unless (1) the voters approve it, or (2) the lease requires the Board of Supervisors to approve the payments each year. When the Board of Supervisors must approve the lease payments each year, interest rates are higher than when the lease payments are not subject to annual approval. Also, interest rates charged by for-profit companies are generally higher than interest rates charged by non-profit corporations.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment. Under Proposition C, the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval, could authorize the lease financing of equipment without the lease payments being subject to annual approval. A non-profit corporation would be created to buy the equipment and would issue tax-exempt debt to pay for it. The City would lease the equipment from the non-profit until it was paid for. The total principal of the debt issued by the non-profit corporation could not be more than $20 million in the first year. This limit on the outstanding principal would increase five percent each year. The Board could approve this type of lease financing only if the Controller certified that the interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application, costs could be increased or decreased in presently indeterminate but probably not substantial amounts."

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would allow the City to lease finance needed equipment at the lowest possible interest rates. The City would establish a non-profit corporation, which would buy equipment approved by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors and lease it to City departments.

The charter currently requires the voters to approve lease financing if done through non-profit corporations. Financing through a non-profit is the less expensive method because interest rates are tax-exempt. The City has had to occasionally use the more expensive method because it is not always possible to delay purchasing critical equipment until an election is held.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Saves the City money by allowing current and future leases for equipment to be financed at lower interest rates (currently 6% to 7%) than must now be used with private corporations (ranging 9% to 16%).

By simply refinancing existing leases, the City could save over $500,000.

Additional money could be saved on any future leases.

Gives the City the option to pay cash for equipment or to finance it expeditiously at a low cost to the City.

Allows quicker replacement of inefficient and outdated equipment, which will reduce maintenance costs, decrease downtime, and increase productivity for equipment which has outlived its economic useful life.

Provides restrictions to insure prudent use of this financing mechanism.

Requires the Controller to certify that the lease is the least costly financing method.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition C
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition C

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

7.309 Voter Approval of Lease Financing

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purposes of this section, "lease financing" occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.

Remember to VOTE on Election Day, Tuesday June 5, 1990. Your polling place is open from 7:00 in the morning to 8:00 in the evening.
Recycling is not only easier than you might think, it's a simple way you can do your part for environmental conservation—and feel good about it, too.

All you need is an ordinary brown paper bag.

Each time you set up your kitchen garbage, place an extra brown bag or two out for recycling. Then every day just drop your newspaper into a recycling bag—a week’s worth of papers fits perfectly (and your newspapers will stop piling up on the floor!).

When you’re finished with an aluminum soda or beer can simply pop it in a separate bag. The same goes for bottles: just put them in a bag, labels and all. Then when you’re on the way to the supermarket or heading out for the day, drop off the bags at a Recycling Center near you. Or, you can tie your newspaper with string and the garbage company will collect it free of charge.

That’s it. When you think about it, isn’t recycling almost as easy as not recycling?

And it really is the right thing to do.

For a free Recycling Guide and a list of Recycling Centers near you, call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL
554-6193
PROPOSITION D

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no special City fund to pay for neighborhood beautification projects or graffiti clean-up. Money can be spent for this purpose only when the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors approve it in the City's budget.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is an ordinance that would create a "Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund" ("the Fund") to pay for cleaning up graffiti on public buildings and beautifying the neighborhood.

The Chief Administrative Officer would manage the Fund. Businesses could pay up to one percent of their payroll or business taxes into the Fund. Grants or money donated for graffiti clean-up would be deposited in the Fund. The goal of the ordinance is to produce for the Fund $1,000,000 each year, adjusted annually for inflation. The Controller would change the percentage of taxes businesses could pay into the Fund to produce $1,000,000 in the fund each fiscal year.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this fund.

Controller’s Statement on "D"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, General Fund revenues could decrease by as much as $1.4 million in fiscal 1990 and as much as $1 million per year, adjusted for inflation, thereafter."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D asks the voters to make the revitalization of our neighborhoods and the wiping out of graffiti a top city priority without raising taxes.

Proposition D will permit those employers currently eligible in San Francisco to earmark up to 1% of their payroll or gross receipts tax bill to establish The Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

The fund will be used to award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city. The Budget Analyst has estimated that approximately one million dollars would be available every year.

Proposition D creates a unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers to keep our city attractive. It will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting and graffiti clean-up.

Also, Proposition D will fund public information and education campaigns to combat litter, and instill in our youth the old-fashioned virtue of respect for public and private property.

The fund created by Proposition D will be administered by the Chief Administrative Officer with public input from environmental organizations and neighborhood committees.

Proposition D was authored by Supervisor Jim Gonzales and has been submitted to the voters with the support of the Sierra Club, San Francisco Beautiful, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

According to their ballot argument, the Board of Supervisors wants to create a “unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers” to reduce graffiti. What’s stopping them from doing that now?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

The supervisors also say they want to provide “seed money” for planting trees and improving street lighting. Well, why haven’t they placed items in the city budget to do so?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

In their rebuttal argument, the supervisors claim that “many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle.” Whose fault is that, if not their own?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

Finally, the supervisors have the temerity to state: “With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark” funds for graffiti. What would be “fair” is if San Francisco businesses paid lower taxes. But no one should be “earmarking” tax dollars except elected representatives of the people!

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

There’s no question that graffiti is a serious problem demanding serious solutions. But what good is it to divert $1,000,000 a year from other city programs? That’s robbing Peter to pay Paul! It’s bad government!

Why do we need Proposition D? We don’t.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

I know something about graffiti.
I wrote the city ordinances prohibiting the sale of spray paint and large, felt-tip pens to minors. I also authored the state law to allow police officers greater latitude in arresting juveniles who deface public transit vehicles. This year, I’m pursuing a bill to revoke for one year the driver’s license of any person convicted of graffiti vandalism.

Proposition D is not about graffiti or “neighborhood beautification”. It’s about diverting millions from the city’s General Fund. It’s about depriving existing city programs of critically needed revenue. Proposition D is a financial shell game.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Proposition D would allow any city business to designate up to 1% of its payroll tax check for deposit in a special fund. According to the supervisors’ Budget Analyst, Proposition D could divert up to $1,440,260 from the General Fund in the program’s first year.

Thereafter, annual diversions would approximate $1,000,000, plus inflation.

That’s over $1,000,000 per year which cannot be spent on police services, fire protection, libraries, and public health.

As you can plainly see from my legislative record, I’m no soft touch when it comes to graffiti prevention and clean-up. But Proposition D is the wrong approach. “Special funds” and “segregated accounts” have no place in our city budget.

Graffiti programs deserve adequate city funding, and the Board of Supervisors and Mayor should move promptly to appropriate such funds in the next regular budgetary cycle.

The voters, meanwhile, should move promptly to reject Proposition D on June 5th!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We need a city plan that invests in the quality of our neighborhoods . . . Now. It’s obvious laws banning the sale of spray paint and felt pens have done nothing to stop the sprawl of graffiti or create a climate of cooperation between city officials and neighborhood groups to find real solutions.

Proposition D is about beautifying our neighborhoods consistently. Proposition D is about wiping out graffiti permanently. With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark a mere one-hundredth to be poured back into the neighborhoods.

Out of a greater than two billion dollar annual budget, the city can afford a guaranteed million dollars to help keep our city beautiful, clean, and graffiti-free. Year in and year out, many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle. Proposition D will provide a solid foundation for the revitalization of our neighborhoods, which no one can tamper with and that requires no new taxes.

Over the last few years, individual Supervisors have spent many weekends planting trees and removing graffiti with neighborhood groups. Working with groups such as SF ALIVE, San Francisco Conservation Corps, 24th Street Revitalization Committee and the West Portal Merchants Association to make our neighborhoods shine has taught us one thing . . . neighborhood environmentalists and city departments working together as partners will be a winning combination for San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

When City Hall and neighborhood organizations work together, problems can be solved. Vote YES on D.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

There is a reason that the San Francisco Beautiful, the Sierra Club and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, along with dozens of neighborhood groups support placing PROPOSITION D on the ballot.

San Franciscans are united in wanting to preserve and enhance our city’s attractiveness and keep San Francisco one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

Our Supervisors put PROPOSITION D on the ballot for your approval because they realize that a more attractive city starts with people like you and me and our neighbors who truly care about San Francisco.

YES ON PROPOSITION D creates a working partnership between our neighborhoods and city government;

YES ON PROPOSITION D means a more beautiful city and enhancement of your neighborhood and mine;

YES ON PROPOSITION D accomplishes this with NO NEW TAXES, allowing large employers to earmark up to 1% of their current payroll tax for beautification and graffiti cleanup;

YES ON PROPOSITION D pays for neighborhood-generated projects, giving residents a say in how these reserved funds are spent;

YES ON PROPOSITION D is the first step to guaranteeing more beautiful and attractive neighborhoods.

Join your neighbors, business owners and environmentalists by voting YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Al Pross, Chair
COMMITTEE FOR BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBORHOODS

The quality of life in our neighborhoods will truly become a top city priority with the passage of Proposition D.

• Proposition D will provide over a million dollars a year from the business community to stop neighborhood decay (through a voluntary checkoff on their payroll or gross receipts tax bill).
• Proposition D will award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city.
• Proposition D will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting, and graffiti clean-up.
• Proposition D will fund an educational campaign to teach our youngsters a new respect for public and private property.
Let’s protect our city’s special livability. Let’s foster civic pride. Let’s invest in the long term health of San Francisco’s residential neighborhoods. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Supervisor Jim Gonzales

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Graffiti is a blight on the beauty of San Francisco. We strongly encourage the continued generosity of grants and donations to eradicate this problem. However, during the current deficit-ridden period, it is irresponsible for the City to direct at least $1,000,000 a year from the General Fund for this purpose.

The San Francisco Republican Party urges you to vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H.Bulkley
William E. Grayson

Anna M. Guth
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “D”

Why add more government to your taxes. $1 million per year to be funded from Payroll taxes which has a sunset clause to expire in 1990.

Then who pays the tab? You do.

If the police would assert their powers and nab the violators, instead of the City offering to pay to clean up their “works of art” this ordinance would not be necessary.

Vote NO on Proposition D.

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION D

[Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund]

AN ORDINANCE, ADDING SECTIONS 10.98 AND 10.98-1 TO THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO ESTABLISH A NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND AND SPECIFYING THE PURPOSES THEREFOR AND AMENDMENT III, SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, BY ADDING ARTICLE 12B-1 THERETO, TO PROVIDE THAT ANY BUSINESS WHICH OWES A PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX OR BUSINESS TAX MAY ELECT TO DESIGNATE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE TAX FOR DEPOSIT IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND.

NOTE: All sections are new.

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Sections 10.98 and 10.98-1 thereto, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.98. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: FINDINGS AND INTENT.

(a) Findings.

The proliferation of graffiti on public buildings and other public property has created a blight which offends both residents of and visitors to San Francisco. The removal of such graffiti will enhance the beauty of the city in which we live and encourage others to visit and to relocate here. Removal will thus both reflect and renew our civic pride and contribute to our economic viability. Providing a source of funds for the promotion of neighborhood beautification projects will support the efforts of local residents and businesses to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and the local economy, and assist in reducing the amount of graffiti in San Francisco.

(b) Statement of Intent.

The Board of Supervisors wishes to address the above concerns by establishing a neighborhood beautification and graffiti clean-up fund which will promote neighborhood beautification projects, including projects designed to improve the environmental quality of neighborhoods, and finance the clean-up of graffiti on public property.

SEC. 10.98-1. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: ESTABLISHMENT; ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS; DUTIES.

(a) Establishment of Fund. There is hereby established a special fund for the purpose of receiving all donations of money which may be collected by the City and County of San Francisco for the purposes enumerated in Section 10.98(b). Monies deposited in the fund shall only be expended for the purposes enumerated therein, provided that such expenditures shall include reimbursement to City and County departments for expenses incurred in the administration of the fund. The special fund shall be known and designated as the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

(b) Acceptance of Gifts. All donations of money which may be offered to the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund are hereby accepted for such purposes. Any grants, gifts and bequests from private sources for this purpose shall be deposited into said special fund.

(c) Duties of the Chief Administrative Officer.

1. The Chief Administrative Officer, or his or her designee, shall be responsible for the administration of the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund, and shall have all such authority as may be reasonably necessary to carry out those responsibilities.

2. The Chief Administrative Officer shall promulgate such rules and regulations as he or she may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Section and Section 10.98. Before issuing or amending any rules and regulations, the Chief Administrative Officer shall provide a thirty (30) day public comment period by publishing noticed in an official newspaper of general circulation in the City of the intent to issue or amend the rules and regulations. The rules and regulations shall be approved by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. Such rules and regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the qualifications of applicants and factors to be considered in the award of grants to fund programs to help remove graffiti and promote neighborhood beautification projects, including preference for the following projects: youth programs and innovation, projects that are neighborhood generated, and projects designed to benefit areas of San Francisco that are economically disadvantaged.

3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall submit a semi-annual report to the Board of Supervisors setting forth an accounting of the amounts disbursed and the uses for which said funds were made.

(d) Budgetary and Fiscal Provisions of the Charter. The monies in this fund are subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter and may be expended only when authorized by appropriation ordinance of the Board of Supervisors.

(e) Interest. Interest earned from the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund shall become part of the principal thereof, and shall not be expended for any purpose other than that for which said fund is established.

(f) Accumulation of Monies in Fund. The balance remaining in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Charter Section 6.306 and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said fund for the purposes recited herein.

Section 2. Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code is hereby amended by adding Article 12B-1 thereeto, to read as follows:

ART. 12B-1

NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND TAX

OPTION.

SEC. 1030. Initial Option. Commencing in tax year 1990, any business, as defined in Section 1002.1 of this Code, that is subject to the Payroll Expense Tax or the Business Tax may elect to designate up to one per cent (1%) of its tax liability for deposit in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

SEC. 1031. Amount of Fund Annually. It is the intent of the voters of the City and County of San Francisco that one million dollars ($1,000,000.00), derived from tax proceeds designated by the taxpayers pursuant to Section 1031, shall be deposited annually into the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund. The Controller shall annually adjust this figure for inflation to reflect changes in the most recently available U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose Metropolitan Area, or its successor index.

SEC. 1032. Subsequent Option. For each tax year after 1990, the Controller shall determine the amount of fund revenues actually generated in the prior year, including the interest thereon and the balance, if any, remaining at the close of the tax year. On the basis of the prior year's experience of taxpayer contributions and total revenues generated by the payroll expense and business taxes, the Controller shall calculate a percentage ceiling of total tax liability which taxpayers may designate for deposit in the fund the following tax year. The Controller shall set the percentage ceiling so that the revenues produced thereby are most likely to generate a total of one million dollars (adjusted for inflation) in the fund for the forthcoming tax year. The Controller shall transmit his or her calculation to the Board of Supervisors, which shall adopt a new tax designation ceiling, if necessary, in advance of the tax year to enable the Tax Collector to perform his or her collection duties.

SEC. 1033. Severability. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this initiative ordinance or any part thereof. The People of the City and County of San Francisco hereby declare that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective. In addition, the voters declare their intention that should any portion of this initiative ordinance or all of it be declared invalid in whole or in part, such invalidity shall have no effect upon the continued validity of the Payroll Expense Tax and Business Tax.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PROPOSITION F

Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

YES 284
NO 285

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Fire Commission has the authority to decide the number and staffing of fire companies and the number and location of fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors may change the number of firefighters. The Fire Commission may close or move fire stations or reduce the number of fire companies if it decides they are no longer needed. A fire company typically consists of a fire engine or other emergency vehicle and the firefighters needed to operate it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would specify a minimum number of fire stations and fire companies and minimum levels of staffing for those fire companies. Proposition F would increase the number of firefighters assigned to some types of fire companies. This means that the number of firefighters on duty at all times would increase from 297 to 322. Where necessary, Proposition F’s minimum level of staffing would be met by firefighters working overtime. Overtime pay for firefighters is one and one-half times their normal salary.

Proposition F would limit the power of the Fire Commission, Mayor and Board of Supervisors to set the number of fire stations and staffing levels.

Before closing any fire station or reducing the number of fire companies or units required by Proposition F, the measure would require (1) a recommendation by the Fire Chief; (2) approval by the Fire Commission, after public hearings; (3) approval by the Board of Supervisors; and (4) approval by the voters.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current salary rates and staffing levels of the Fire Department, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $4.9 million per year.”

How “F” Got on the Ballot

On March 2, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition F to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,485* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 21 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 56,364 of the signatures submitted were valid, 15,879 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WHAT IS PROP F?
PROPOSITION F IS A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WILL ESTABLISH A MINIMUM LEVEL OF FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS FOR SAN FRANCISCO. IT GIVES THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE FIRE CHIEF THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MANAGE THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITIZENS.

SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT BECAUSE IT WILL:
(1) GUARANTEE THAT THE PRESENT 41 FIRE STATIONS STAY OPEN
(2) GUARANTEE FULLY-STAFFED FIRE TRUCKS AT ALL TIMES
(3) GUARANTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BEFORE ANY FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED
(4) GUARANTEE THAT YOUR FIREBOAT WILL BE STAFFED WITH A FIREFIGHTING CREW OF TWO
THE 7.1 QUAKE OF OCTOBER 17 WARNED US AGAIN — WE MUST BE PREPARED!
ITEM A — MAYOR AGNOS CUT THE FIRE DEPART-

MENT ON-DUTY STAFFING BY 19 PERSONS A DAY IN 1989.
PROP F RESTORES THOSE CUTS.
ITEM C — PROP F DOES NOT REQUIRE “GUARANTEED OVERTIME” AND, IN FACT, BY JULY 1992 NO OVERTIME WILL BE NEEDED FOR THE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS OF PROP F.
(Overtime is now caused by large numbers of vacant positions. New hiring will eliminate all vacancies and overtime by July 1992. Prop F will safeguard this full-staffing.)

PROP F IS A COMMON SENSE MEASURE TO GIVE ADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION TO ALL CITIZENS.
VOTE YES ON F!

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F;
COMMITTEE FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTH-
QUAKE PREPAREDNESS
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

It is clear that Proposition F is not a Fire Safety Issue. It is clearly an issue to guarantee overtime.
1. This Mayor and Board of Supervisors have never closed a single fire station and have no intention to close firehouses.
2. Most major cities in America considers five firefighters per truck to be fully-staffed. More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire.
3. Proposition F will not restore cuts in firefighters. We are mandated by law to provide 90 new firefighters this year. Proposition F only guarantees overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day, $3.5 million per year.

Our firefighters do a tough job! But we compensate them well! We need new equipment — not more overtime. Following the earthquake, a fire truck had to be taken from the fire museum to fight fires. Let’s not waste money which could be used for new firefighting equipment.
San Francisco voters rejected a similar proposal in 1987 and it should be rejected again in 1990.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will waste millions of your tax dollars. Just look at the facts.

Fact: Proposition F does not hire new firefighters. The Federal Consent Decree already sets hiring standards — 90 new firefighters will be hired this year without Prop. F.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that Assistant Chiefs and Battalion Chiefs will continue to have chauffeurs.

Fact: Proposition F is not needed to save fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors have no intention of closing any fire stations.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that 18 current firefighters will get daily time-and-a-half overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day... or more than $3.5 million extra per year.

Fact: Proposition F is not a fire safety issue. Virtually every major American city deploys five or fewer firefighters on fire trucks. A sixth firefighter is featherbedding, not firefighting.

More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire. That's enough people to raise ladders, ventilate rooftops and carry out lifesaving tasks.

Fact: Our firefighters do a tough job. But they are well compensated already and do not need additional guaranteed overtime... especially when there are so many other pressing needs in San Francisco.

Fact: Firefighters in San Francisco are currently paid $300 more per month than the average salaries of firefighters in the four largest California cities. But the other firefighters work 15 percent more hours than San Francisco.

Fact: San Francisco firefighters already receive 23 percent more vacation, sick and holiday leave than other city workers. A recent study by the Controller shows that increased overtime results in increased sick leave and disability.

Study the facts and you'll agree. Proposition F is nothing more than $7 million per year in unnecessary guaranteed overtime.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

FACT: PROP F does:

• Guarantee that the 90 new firefighters cannot later be eliminated by politicians.

• Require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people before cutbacks can be made to the minimum staffing.

FACT: The Mayor DID cut back Fire Department staffing in August 1989 from 315 to 296.

FACT: Assistant and Battalion Chiefs DO NOT have "chauffeurs." They DO have an operations and communications assistant.

FACT: Prop F IS needed to guarantee public review and input before any fire station can be closed.

FACT: SIX fire stations have been closed by the Mayor's office since 1972 without any public review.

FACT: Prop F DOES guarantee that the 19 on-duty firefighters cut by the Mayor in 1989 will be restored. When sufficient new firefighters are hired, NO OVERTIME will be required.

FACT: PROP F IS A FIRE SAFETY ISSUE!

FACT: San Francisco firefighters ARE REQUIRED to work overtime because previous policies of politicians allowed large numbers of vacant positions to occur.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters DO NOT get a paid health plan for dependents, nor do they get longevity pay or other benefits enjoyed by firefighters in the four largest California cities.

FACT: ALL city employees, including firefighters, receive EXACTLY THE SAME vacation, sick and holiday leave. This is a city Charter requirement.

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F

JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN

JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I STRONGLY SUPPORT PROP F!
Prop F will benefit all the people of San Francisco. Over 71,000 voters from every part of the City signed the petition to put Prop F on the ballot. They expressed enthusiastic support for a stronger Fire Department.

The City is becoming increasingly built-up, causing greater congestion. This means that fire hazards are increasing and adequate fire protection will be even more important to us than ever. The October 17th earthquake was an urgent reminder of how fragile our city is and how important our Fire Department is to all of us.

When you, the people, call for help, whether it is for a medical emergency, a rescue, or fire, the firefighters come.

PROP F MAKES SENSE FOR ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!
It allows you to participate in fire safety decisions that affect your neighborhood.

Our neighborhoods are the “heart” of San Francisco. OUR FAMILIES, HOMES, CHURCHES, FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS NEED SATISFACTORY FIRE PROTECTION.

PROP F WILL MAKE SAN FRANCISCO A SAFER PLACE TO LIVE IN.

VOTE YES ON F!

Bill Maher, Member
Board of Supervisors

---

I STRONGLY SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
They provide vital services to our citizens. Last year, our firefighters answered a record-breaking 58,000 alarms and saved thousands of lives. The greatest number of calls came from the Tenderloin, the Inner Mission, the Fillmore, Civic Center/Hayes Valley, Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley. I WANT TO BE SURE YOU GET THE HELP YOU NEED — WHEN YOU NEED IT!

Over the past 20 years, unlike other city departments, Fire Department staffing has been slashed by 40%! THREE FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT AGREE THAT THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY ARE TOO FEW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS! THEY AGREE THAT NO MORE FIREHOUSES SHOULD BE CLOSED.

We NEED Proposition F. It will:
• Put firefighters back on the ladder trucks
• Put firefighters back on our fireboat
• Bring daily staffing up to an adequate level
• Guarantee that any proposed closings of fire companies will be subject to a public review and vote by the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people
• Guarantee the SFFD the funding it needs

THE COST OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT IS ONLY 2 CENTS A DAY FOR EACH OF US! That 2 cents could easily save a life — maybe yours, or that of a loved one. PROP. F WILL BENEFIT ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

---

I STRONGLY SUPPORT IMPROVED FIRE PROTECTION IN SAN FRANCISCO!
I SHARE THE CONCERNS OF THE 71,000 VOTERS WHO PUT THIS PROPOSITION ON THE BALLOT. Fire Department daily staffing has been forced so low that our safety is threatened. WE MUST KEEP OUR FIREFHOUSES OPEN AND FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED.

In addition to fighting fires, our firefighters perform many services for our elderly, disabled and low-income families that no one else does. FIREFIGHTERS RESPONDED TO OVER 58,000 EMERGENCIES LAST YEAR, INCLUDING 26,000 MEDICAL CALLS.

We depend on our firefighters to protect our families, homes, and businesses. Our narrow streets, steep hills and rows of wood frame buildings make firefighting very difficult. SAN FRANCISCO HAS SPECIAL FIREFIGHTING AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL NEEDS! We are different from other California cities with their wide streets, flat terrain and detached buildings!

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING FOR PROPOSITION F.
THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL BENEFIT ALL OUR CITIZENS.

WENDY NELDER, Member
Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

STOP REDUCTIONS IN CITY FIRE PROTECTION! VOTE YES ON F!

Over 71,000 San Francisco voters from every neighborhood, ethnic group and economic level joined to put PROPOSITION F on this ballot. They were concerned because politicians have reduced daily staffing to a dangerous all-time low while emergency calls reached an all-time high of 58,000 last year. People want their neighborhood firehouses to stay open and their fire engines, aerial ladder trucks and fireboat fully staffed to meet their emergency needs. They want a Charter amendment to take politics out of fire safety decisions.

Remember October 17? We learned that we need a strong Fire Department to fight fires, perform rescues and coordinate civilian volunteers. When both bridges are down, we need a strong SFFD!

THIS IS A COMMON SENSE PROPOSITION — IT IS SUPPORTED BY 3 FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT!

Join your friends and neighbors! VOTE YES ON F!

John L. Molinari
Former member of the Board of Supervisors

ONLY YOU CAN STOP FURTHER DANGEROUS CUTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

Over the years, the San Francisco Fire Department has assisted hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans in time of great personal need. The people understand how important the SFFD is in their lives, and OVER 71,000 OF THEM SIGNED THE PETITION TO PLACE PROPOSITION F ON THE BALLOT. The citizens want to be heard!

SFFD EMERGENCY RESPONSES ARE INCREASING DRAMATICALLY EVERY YEAR! Fiscal year totals have gone from 28,000 in 1970 to over 58,000 in 1989, while politicians have slashed daily on-duty staffing from 482, when I was Fire Chief, to today’s all-time low of 296. Department resources are being stretched thinner and thinner despite greater and greater needs. THIS DANGEROUS TREND MUST BE STOPPED!

The Department must be able to meet the complex and highly varied needs of today’s San Francisco. These include fighting structural fires, providing medical assistance, performing cliff and water rescues, responding to BART and MUNI fires and accidents, controlling hazardous materials emergencies, assisting victims of industrial accidents, and responding to many other emergency needs.

Many seniors, low income families and handicapped people rely on the SFFD to help them. THE PERSONAL ATTENTION THAT THE SFFD PROVIDES CAN NEVER BE CONVERTED TO SELF-SERVICE OR AUTOMATED! Firefighters, not machines, put out fires, perform rescues and meet all the other emergency needs of our city. You need these firefighters! THE NEXT CALL HELP MAY BE YOURS!

The need for Fire Department services crosses all social, ethnic and economic strata. We can all get behind this quality of life issue. Proposition F will strengthen your Fire Department and take politics out of fire safety.

William F. Murray
Chief of Department, SFFD, Retired

VOTE YES ON PROP F!

It takes teamwork to put out a fire. Without it, lives and property can be lost. Without it, firefighters can pay a hard price, for their lives, when in danger, may depend on having a buddy to lend a hand or go for help. As much a part of their job as hose, ladders, and water is that firefighters work in pairs when possible. It can be critical where dense smoke obscures vision or — as so many San Francisco neighborhoods well know — when trying to maneuver on a steeply pitched roof.

Current staffing of aerial ladder trucks leaves one firefighter without a buddy, the team short one vital hand. Proposition F will restore the balance that a fire — and time-tested system needs.

It also will mean two firefighters ready to move out with the fireboat when it has a job to do. Because they weren’t readily available, the fireboat was delayed in pumping bay water to put out the disastrous Marina fire after last October’s earthquake.

That’s why I’m voting “Yes” on Prop F and am urging all San Franciscans to do the same.

Edward J. Phieps
Chief of Department, SFFD (Retired)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I OWE MY LIFE TO THE QUICK AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS STATIONED AT MY LOCAL FIREHOUSE

Over 26,000 San Franciscans received emergency medical assistance last year by the SFFD. Many lives were saved because firefighters were on the scene in 3 minutes of less. The neighborhood firehouse is an essential part of San Francisco’s complex fire protection system.

The October 17th earthquake and the great Marina fire showed us how vital it is to have our Fire Department maintained at an adequate level. There were no firefighters on board the Fireboat Phoenix when it arrived in the Marina, and for over 1 1/2 hours firefighting and search and rescue operations were hindered by a lack of firefighters, as well as by a lack of water. UNDERSTAFFING CAN CAUSE FIRE DEATHS.

Proposition F will answer these critical needs by restoring funds for adequate staffing of fire companies, including the fireboat, and it will require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission and Board of Supervisors before any further cutbacks in fire protection can be made.

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING YES ON F!

John Barbagelata

PENNY-POWER! LOOK — HOW CAN YOU BUY SOMETHING PRICELESS FOR ONLY PENNIES A DAY?

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F!

FOR ONLY 2 CENTS PER DAY, YOU WILL:

- KEEP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIREHOUSE OPEN
- KEEP FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED
- KEEP YOUR FIREBOAT IN SERVICE AND STAFFED WITH FIREFIGHTERS
- GUARANTEE THAT NO FIREHOUSES OR FIRE COMPANIES WILL BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT
- REMOVE POLITICS FROM FIRE SAFETY

THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL COST EACH OF SAN FRANCISCO’S 732,000 RESIDENTS JUST PENNIES A DAY:

YEAR 1 — COST $5.3 MILLION = 2 CENTS PER DAY!
YEAR 2 — COST $2.8 MILLION = 1 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 3 — COST $0.8 MILLION = 1/2 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 4 — NO ADDITIONAL COST!

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE POLICY YOU WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON’T MISS THE CHANCE!

VOTE YES ON F!

W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

WE STRONGLY SUPPORT PROPOSITION F!

No one worries more about costs than working people. For their hard-earned dollars, breadwinners demand value in return.

Value is what Proposition F is all about. It restores adequate staffing of engine and ladder truck companies, staffs the fireboat, and assures that you and I will have a voice in any proposed closing of a fire company or firehouse.

Proposition F is an insurance policy that is clearly a benefit to all San Franciscans. And, there is no question that the benefits greatly exceed the cost — to each of us, just 2 cents a day for the first year, 1 cent a day for the second year, and no cost thereafter.

Without adequate fire protection, San Francisco has too much to lose.

VOTE YES ON F!

Walter L. Johnson
San Francisco Labor Council
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
They provide absolutely essential services for our citizens, and no one else can do their job! We have 500 high rise buildings, BART and MUNI tunnels, and large business, school and hospital complexes where firefighting requires many firefighters.

On October 17, we were lucky! It was just a warning. The present 296 firefighters on duty each day is too low to meet our daily and our disaster needs!

Let's all get behind Proposition F! It will assure stability in Department funding, guarantee adequate staffing for our firehouses and apparatus, and permit long-range planning and improvements. Our firefighters need your vote!

James A. Hood
Chairman
San Franciscans for Fire Safety

VOTE YES ON F!
San Francisco is a fragile city. Over 90% of all structures are of wood frame construction. Your homes are built in solid blocks of wooden buildings. This situation presents the possibility of a disastrous fire or conflagration occurring, especially following an earthquake. The fire department is the lifeline for all of us who live in this city. The earthquake on October 17th and the great fire in the Marina show how important the fire department is to San Francisco.

Politicians are using shrill rhetoric and other offensive tactics in an attempt to mislead the public as to what the real meaning of Prop F is. Do not be misled! Prop F provides three main points:

- Establishes the present 41 neighborhood fire stations as a minimum standard
- Puts a firefighting crew on the fireboat
- Requires public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors and the citizens before a fire station can be closed or relocated.

These are common sense measures that provide a minimum level of public safety for our families and city.

Please join me, and the 70,000 other San Franciscans who signed the petitions to put Prop F on the ballot, and vote yes on “F”!

Frank T. Blackburn
Assistant Fire Chief

VOTE YES ON F!
Fire protection is vital for our families and businesses.
Prop F will stabilize protection and prevent further cuts in the Fire Department.

Protect our city. Vote Yes on F.

Robt. E. Donohue
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
Charles D. Cresci
Deputy Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Charles H. Lee
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T TAKE YOUR FIREFIGHTERS FOR GRANTED!
San Francisco firefighters answered a record 58,000 calls for help last year. Of these, 26,000 were for medical emergencies. Heart attacks, auto accidents, building collapses, childbirths were just a few. BUT EVERY YEAR THERE ARE FEWER AND FEWER FIREFIGHTERS TO HELP YOU! In 1970 there were 482 firefighters on duty each day — in 1990 there are only 296! Six firehouses and 12 fire companies have been closed.

FIRE SAFETY DECISIONS MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE HANDS OF POLITICIANS! Only a Charter amendment will assure that your Fire Department is adequately staffed to meet San Francisco's special needs — now and in the future. FOR JUST 2 CENTS A DAY, WE CAN KEEP OUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS OPEN AND OUR FIRE APPARATUS ADEQUATELY STAFFED.

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE WE WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON'T MISS THE CHANCE! VOTE YES ON F!

Walter G. Jebe
John J. Figone
Caesar A. Churchwell
Alessandro Baccari
Virgil Caselli
Marsha Garland
Tom Creedon
Ed Farrah
Michael Salarino

NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS

Pride, trust, reliance. They're all wrapped up in a San Francisco institution. The neighborhood fire station turns out to be more — it's a rock, an anchor, a point of reference in people's lives.

City residents have said so loud and clear in endorsing Proposition F. Besides setting a minimum number of firefighters to be on duty each day, the June ballot measure guarantees a public hearing in the area concerned and a vote of the people, if needed, before any fire station may be closed.

Seventy thousand people petitioned to put F on the ballot. Their reasons all had a common core. It's not THE fire station but OUR fire station, they said — a place to expect and get help in a fire or medical emergency, a place the local community can turn to and rely on if the earth shakes, buildings fall, and other resources break down.

Neighborhoods and fire stations. The one requires the other, San Franciscans say.

John W. Flaherty
Mark L. Kaplan
Robert L. Barisone
Elvera Jane Barisone
William A. Roberts Jr.
Maureen Porter
William Porter Jr.
Homer G. Miles
Dorothy L. Miles
Peter C. Gardner
Joan M. Gardner
John Daly
Lucia R. Flaherty
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T BE MISLED BY MAYOR AGNOS! PROP F IS A LIFE AND DEATH ISSUE!
FIRE, INSURANCE AND EARTHQUAKE EXPERTS AGREE: SAN FRANCISCO FACES THE HIGHEST RISK OF CONFLAGRATION OF ANY CITY IN THE UNITED STATES!
FIRE RISK IS HIGHER THAN IN 1906!
SAN FRANCISCO'S FIRE PROTECTION NEEDS ARE DICTATED BY THE NATURE OF OUR CITY, with its:
- Blocks and blocks of adjoining wood frame buildings
- Steep hills
- Narrow streets
- Traffic congestion
- Network of overhead electrical, trolley and telephone lines
- Prevailing winds
- 500 high rise buildings
- High density residential areas
- Large population of seniors and low-income families
- High vulnerability to severe earthquake damage
- Isolation from outside help in time of disaster
SAN FRANCISCO IS IN TROUBLE BECAUSE THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY. Former SF Fire Chief Emmet Condon in his book "Denial of Disaster":
"THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT IS BELOW THE DAILY MANNING LEVEL THAT ANY EXPERIENCED

CHIEF OFFICER KNOWS IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SERVICE TO THE CITY." Condon continues:
"I WOULD AGREE THAT THE HAZARD OF FIRE TO THE CITY AFTER A SIMILAR DISASTER TODAY IS MUCH GREATER THAN IN 1906." And,
"SYNTHETIC MATERIALS HAVE GREATLY INCREASED THE FIRE RISK IN MODERN BUILDINGS AND WILL MAGNIFY THE FIRE PROBLEM IN THE MULTIPLE FIRES THAT WILL BREAK OUT AFTER A SERIOUS EARTHQUAKE."
At least 400 of the city's 500 high rise buildings do not have modern life-safety systems! HIGH RISE FIRES CAUSE A HUGE DRAIN ON FIRE DEPARTMENT RESOURCES.
PROP F IS STRONGLY SUPPORTED BY INDIVIDUALS; CITIZEN, BUSINESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS; FIRE SAFETY EXPERTS, AND A BROAD SPECTRUM OF KNOWLEDGEABLE CIVIC LEADERS.
There is no significant opposition to Prop F.
PROTECT YOURSELF, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR FRIENDS — YOU HAVE A LOT TO LOSE! VOTE YES ON F!

GERRY LONG
Concerned Citizen

WHY VOTE YES ON F? WHY A CHARTER AMENDMENT?
City politicians have been consistently unresponsive to your fire safety concerns. It is the duty of the City to provide its citizens with adequate fire protection and earthquake preparedness. Instead, Fire Department staffing has been cut to a dangerous level. THE POLITICIANS SAY, "TRUST US!"
We can see that this has not worked, and a Charter provision is necessary. YOUR EMERGENCY NEEDS ARE TOO VITAL TO BE LEFT VULNERABLE TO POLITICAL GAMES.
You hear the sirens every day — BUT HAVE YOU COUNTED

THE FIREFIGHTERS? Fewer firefighters means greatly reduced firefighting capacity. FIRE DEPARTMENT STAFFING IS NOW AT AN ALL-TIME LOW AND CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO FALL FURTHER!
WE NEED A STRONG FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

John Flaherty
Battalion Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Past President, S.F. Fire Chiefs Assn.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

HIGH RISE BUILDINGS AND BART AND MUNI
UNDERGROUND FACILITIES MAKE SPECIAL
FIRE PROTECTION DEMANDS

Today, San Francisco has over 500 high rise buildings. Fires in
these buildings require many firefighters because equipment must
be carried by hand to the fire — often up many flights of stairs.

In 1988 in Los Angeles, a fire on three floors of a high rise
building required 383 firefighters to bring it under control. In San
Francisco, our entire on-duty force would be required, leaving the
rest of the city completely unprotected. Mutual aid from neighboring
communities would be totally inadequate to cover our needs.

BART and MUNI underground facilities present special fire and
rescue problems. Large numbers of firefighters are required to fight
these fires and perform rescue and evacuation operations.

In July 1989, Mayor Agnos forced reductions in truck company
staffing — the key players in rescue and ventilation operations.
Now these aerial ladder teams can no longer function properly.

Building ventilation is delayed, greatly increasing the risk of
deadly backdrafts.

The Department’s daily staffing has fallen to 296 firefighters, the
lowest in history, while fire, medical and other emergencies are
higher than ever. Proposition F will bring SFFD staffing up to 320.
This is critically needed to meet these ever-increasing demands.

In the past, some Fire Chiefs have thought that you could safely
relocate or close a firehouse, but I now recognize that this is
dangerous. The SFFD can now get to most emergencies within 3
minutes, but if we close a firehouse we lose that prompt response.
With our rows of wood buildings, our large population of elderly
citizens, we must get there quickly.

The SFFD is your lifeline. Protect it! I strongly urge all
citizens to vote YES on F!

James P. Olson, President
San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

Any firefighter responsible for any racist act or statement on
duty, after due process, should be disciplined. Repeat occurrences
must result in severe penalties.

Expensive overtime can be largely eliminated by adding more
firefighters.

Differences between the union and the mayor should be resolved
through good faith negotiations, not through the election process.
Maintaining high morale is the only way to insure efficiency.

The neighborhood service cuts need to be restored.
Vote YES on F.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Becoming a victim in another major earthquake or runaway fire
in one of San Francisco’s densely populated neighborhoods con-
tinues to be a hazard for all of us.

Nonetheless, because the Firefighters Union did not endorse him,
Mayor Agnos has seen fit to reduce the staffing levels of the Fire
Department in any twenty-four hour period from 315 to 296. The
San Francisco Republican Party believes these cuts are penny-
wise, pound-foolish, and politically motivated.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. DO NOT let the Mayor’s political
vendetta jeopardize public safety.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley

William E. Grayson
Anna M. Guth
Tina H. Frank
Christopher L. Bowman
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition F. This proposition, if passed, will require twenty-five extra fire fighters to be hired each day — five of these fire fighters will have no specific functions — their daily assignment will be at the discretion of the Chief of Department. It will also require that daily truck staffing be increased from five to six persons and the fireboat staffing be increased by another two fire fighters daily. These increases are unnecessary and are not required — fire suppression units are now staffed to provide effective and efficient fire service for San Francisco.

Proposition F will take management control and responsibility away from the Chief of Department by requiring organizational changes to be approved by the voters at a regular election. This would not allow the Chief, through the Fire Commission, to respond to the changing demands placed on the Fire Department. Fire protection decisions can’t wait until an election. To provide for and maintain the most cost effective and efficient fire department, I urge you to vote NO on Proposition F.

Frederick F. Postel
Chief of Department

Overtime pay is bleeding the Fire Department’s budget dry! Over 92 percent of the budget goes for personnel costs. In 1988-89 uniformed personnel were paid salaries totaling $53,567,000 plus mandatory fringe benefits of $53,543,000 and still another $11,893,000 for overtime!

Proposition F would increase that bleeding by creating new positions not necessary for the safety of San Franciscans despite the scare statements made by the firefighters’ union.

Proposition F would cost $4,900,000 in overtime thereby siphoning away money needed to make major improvements! We already have excellent protection but we want to upgrade it by developing a comprehensive earthquake program, by improving our response to emergency medical calls (over 4 1/2 times the number of fires) and by purchasing more modern fire equipment.

During the October quake 522 off-duty fire fighters reported back immediately yet there were not enough engines and trucks for them; in fact, one old piece had to be taken out of the Fire Museum to help fight the Marina District fire.

Our firefighters work nine days out of 31 in shifts of approximately 24 hours on and 48 off.

Many are “double-dippers” holding down well paid outside jobs such as contractors, lawyers, plumbers and electricians. They still put in overtime because the Charter provides for such generous pay.

Overtime pay for a firefighter is $585 per shift, for a Captain $776 and for an Assistant Chief $1077! Last year the average firefighter’s cost to the City was $90,000, including salary, fringe benefits and overtime.

Do not pay out more money just for overtime. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

James Jefferson
President, Fire Commission
Frank Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted Souls
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

San Francisco has the finest fire protection in California. Now is not the time to jeopardize it with Proposition F. Proposition F is an ill-advised and wasteful measure. First, it would wrest management of the Fire Department away from the Fire Commission and the Chief, where management properly and historically belongs. Management of the Fire Department should remain accountable to the citizens of San Francisco, through its appointed Fire Commission. This principle is violated when rigid language is placed in the Charter. Second, Proposition F would unnecessarily increase the Fire Department’s budget by approximately $4.9 million a year. The San Francisco Fire Department already has staffing levels on its fire engines and aerial ladder trucks that are equal to the best in California. To overstaff the engines and trucks would be counterproductive as well as wasteful, especially in a time of limited resources and ever-increasing demands for City services. Let life and death decisions of fire protection in San Francisco remain in the control of the Fire Commission and the Chief.

Vote No on Proposition F.
Proposition F has little to do with fire protection and earthquake preparedness and a lot to do with unnecessary Fire Department staffing.

Vote No on Proposition F. Don’t tie the hands of the Chief and Fire Commission, preventing them from managing the department and our tax dollars. Proposition F will take $6 million a year from health services, libraries, homeless programs and other vital city services. Why? Because Proposition F will require the city to pay more overtime to firefighters who already receive higher salaries than those in Los Angeles, San Jose, Long Beach or San Diego.

Employment of unnecessary personnel is called “featherbedding.” Proposition F is just that — at a cost of $6 million. San Francisco has the best fire protection services in the country. We already pay more per person for that service than any other city in California. Stop a $6 million raid on the City Treasury. Vote No on Proposition F.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Like all San Franciscans, we want a safe and healthy city. But Proposition F could jeopardize our safety and health.

By spending more than $7 million on unnecessary overtime, Proposition F will take money away from other vitally needed services like fire equipment, police protection, health care and children’s programs.

The annual fire department budget is already $150 million. Firefighters are already getting a pay raise of almost 10%. That’s more than most city workers — and most of us.

San Francisco already has more firefighters per thousand residents than any other major Western city.

Yet San Francisco has fewer fire and emergency alarms than other cities. In 1986, San Francisco had 78,000 emergency calls. Oakland had 95,000.

We appreciate the job that our firefighters do. But we cannot support this multi-million dollar attempt to win back overtime for just 18 firefighters per day.

Susan J. Bierman
Agar Jaicks
Mauri Schwartz
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Sunset Democratic Club
Margaret Brodkin, Director Coleman Advocates for Children
Carole Migden, chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

I respect and admire the work done by San Francisco’s firefighters.

It’s a dangerous job.

That’s why they’re paid more than firefighters in any other large city in California, even though our firefighters work 15 percent fewer hours.

But today our average cost per firefighter has hit $96,000 per year.

We have been reducing this amount — and improving fire service at the same time — by hiring more new firefighters and reducing costly overtime payments.

That overtime runs as much as $585 per day for a fourth-year firefighter, and up to $1077 per day at the higher ranks.

When they argue for Proposition F, the union avoids mentioning this fact. They raise a false alarm about closing down firehouses, when in reality we are adding new firefighters as quickly as we can train them.

Ninety new firefighters are being hired this year alone. We have full classes in the Fire Academy for the first time in years.

Prop F asks you, the voters, to put an unnecessary sixth firefighter back on every fire truck, in order to give current firefighters millions in guaranteed overtime.

There’s no need for it. Even a one-alarm fire in San Francisco draws 30 firefighters in response.

It’s easy, when you think about the heroic work firefighters do, to justify giving them whatever they ask for.

I made the same mistake myself three years ago, before I was mayor. As a State Assemblyman and a strong union supporter, I lent my name to a measure that was similar to Proposition F.

But no group, however much we appreciate their work, is entitled to millions of taxpayer dollars a year in guaranteed, unnecessary overtime — especially when they are trying to feather their own nests by keeping out women and minorities.

With all the pressing needs facing our city, we can’t afford to give away $7 million and get nothing in return. Please vote No on Proposition F.

Mayor Art Agnos

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.
The Proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

NEW CHARTER SECTION: 3.548:
MINIMUM LEVELS OF FIRE
PROTECTION FOR THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Notwithstanding any other section of this
Charter, the minimum levels of fire protection for
the City and County of San Francisco shall be
specified as follows:

A. The MINIMUM level of Fire Protection for
the City and County of San Francisco, in fire
suppression, effective July 1, 1990, except as
specified in Section C shall be as follows:

1. Engine Companies: 41
   2. Truck Companies: 18
   3. Rescue Companies: 2
   4. Fireboat Companies: 1
   5. Battalion Districts: 10
   6. Divisions: 3
   7. Service Units: 1
   8. Bureau of Equipment: 2
   9. High Pressure System
      Tank (staffed): 1
      (Jones St. Tank): 1
   10. Assigned Firefighters:
       (At Chief’s Discretion): 5

B. MINIMUM daily staffing of Fire Compa-
nies and other Units:

1. Engine Companies: 1 Officer and 3
   Firefighters
2. Truck Companies: 1 Officer and 5
   Firefighters
3. Rescue Company: 1 Officer and 3
   Firefighters
4. Fireboat Company: 1 Officer, 1 Pilot,
   1 Marine Engineer and 2 Fire-
   fighters
5. Service Units: 1 Firefighter
6. Bureau of Equipment: 2 Firefighters

7. Battalion District: 1 Battalion Chief,
   1 Chief’s Aide
8. Division: 1 Assistant Chief,
   1 Chief’s Aide
9. Jones Street Tank: 1 qualified person
   to operate gates, valves and commu-
   nications equip-
   ment of the High
   Pressure System.

Required minimum staffing shall be main-
tained on a constant basis, 24 hours per day.
Sufficient personnel and positions shall be au-
thorized and funded to maintain MINIMUM re-
quired staffing levels established in this section.
When assigned personnel are not available, then
staffing shall be maintained by working of
overtime.

C. CLOSURE AND RELOCATION OF FIRE
   STATIONS, DEACTIVATION OF FIRE
   COMPANIES OR OF UNITS REQUIRED
   BY THIS SECTION:

1. Fire Stations, Fire Companies or other
   Units required by this section may be closed or
   deactivated only when each of the following
   procedures is completed:
   a. It is recommended by the Chief of Depart-
      ment and approved for consideration by the Fire
      Commission.
   b. The Fire Commission shall hold at least two
      public hearings on the matter so that affected
      citizens may appear to express their views.
   c. At least one of the public hearings shall be
      held in the neighborhood of the Station, Com-
      pany, or Unit to be closed or deactivated. Such
      meeting to be held at a time and place most
      suitable for maximum public attendance.
   d. Except as provided by this section, other
      facilities or units may be closed or deactivated by
      majority of the five members of the Fire Com-
      mission upon recommendation by the Chief of
      Department.
   e. Upon conclusion of public hearings and
      approval by a majority of the five members of the
      Fire Commission for the closure or deactivation
      of a Company or Unit, the Fire Commission shall
      forward its recommendation to the Board of Su-
      pervisors within 30 calendar days.
   f. Upon receipt of the Fire Commission rec-
      ommendation, the Board of Supervisors may
      hold public hearings on the matter and they may
      approve or disapprove of the recommendation of
      the Fire Commission for closure or deactivation of
      a Station, Company or Unit. Such approval or
      disapproval shall be by majority vote of the
      Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors
      approves of the Fire Commission recommenda-
      tion, then they shall direct the Clerk of the Board
      to have the matter put on the ballot of the next
      regular election for final determination by the
      voters of the City and County.

D. DEFINITIONS — EQUIPMENT

1. ENGINE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying
   hose and a pump to pump water of at least 1,500
   gallons per minute.
2. TRUCK COMPANY: A tractor-trailer ve-
   hicle carrying ladders and rescue equipment with
   a 100-foot aerial ladder or equivalent device to
   reach upper floors of buildings.
3. RESCUE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying
   rescue equipment capable of heavy rescue and
   diving equipment for underwater rescue.
4. FIRE BOAT COMPANY: A boat equipped
   with pumps, hose, monitor nozzles and able to
   navigate San Francisco Bay for firefighting and
   rescue duty along the shorelines of the City and
   County.
5. SERVICE UNIT: A vehicle carrying spare
   supply of air and equipment for self-contained
   breathing apparatus and resuscitators.
6. HIGH PRESSURE SYSTEM PUMP STA-
   TION: A facility capable of pumping at least
   10,000 gallons per minute from San Francisco
   Bay or other water source into the mains of the
   high pressure water system.
7. BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT: A vehicle
   capable of carrying equipment for emergency
   repairs or towing of fire apparatus under emer-
   gency conditions.
Former Supervisor Health Benefits

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?

YES 288
NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Health Service System provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Supervisors may not continue to receive health insurance from the Health Service System after they leave the Board of Supervisors.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Board of Supervisors could allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System.

Controller's Statement on "G"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G will allow former Supervisors to buy health insurance coverage from the City’s Health Service system, when they leave office. THERE WILL BE NO COST TO THE CITY.

The Health Service System now provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Proposition G simply allows former Supervisors to buy continued health coverage in the City’s Health Plan, at their own expense.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition G
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "G"
Former supervisors are either those who have decided not to run; or those the electorate voted out of office.
Even as it claims they will pay their own health plan benefits, why continue to have them in the system.

Cut bait.
Vote NO.

Marguerite Warren
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.425 Persons Covered

Each plan may make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system by the dependents of members, retired city and county employees, temporary city and county employees, such other dependents of deceased and retired city and county employees as the board of supervisors may authorize by ordinance, teachers and other employees of the San Francisco Unified School District retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System and resigned employees of the city and county and resigned teachers and employees of the school district whose resignations occur after June 15, 1955, and within 30 days immediately prior to the date on which, but for their resignations, they would have become retired members of the said retirement system, on whose relinquishment of retirement allowances as permitted by the charter occurs after such date and resigned employees of the San Francisco Unified School District not otherwise included. A resigned employee or teacher is one whose employment has terminated other than by retirement, discharge or death or who has relinquished retirement allowances. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system to the aforementioned resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District is to enable them, subject to the health service board’s exercise of its power, to participate in the benefits of the system after transferring to the State Teachers’ Retirement System from the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for participation in the benefits of the system by the aforementioned resigned employees of the city and county and other resigned employees of San Francisco Unified School District is to permit the health service board to have power to treat them the same as it treats resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District.

As used in this section, and for the purpose of this section, the terms “city and county employees” and “employees of the city and county” shall include officers and employees of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco.

The board of supervisors may also provide by ordinance for the continuation in any plan by former supervisors who agree to and do pay the full cost of such benefit.
Fire Inspector and Engineer Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION H
Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers belong to the City's Retirement System. Under the charter, the Board of Supervisors may contract with the State's Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) to allow certain safety employees to be members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, if there is no additional cost to the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, if there would be no additional cost to the City.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want these employees to continue to be covered by the City's Retirement System.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This Charter Amendment would provide for safety retirement for eighteen civilian Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers employed by the San Francisco Fire Department, at no additional cost to the City.

Fire Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers are classified by the State of California as safety personnel and properly belong in a safety retirement program that is not offered by the City's Retirement System for non-uniformed employees. Instead, the City contracts with the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) for its public safety officers who are not police officers or firefighters.

Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers, along with their counterparts in the uniformed firefighter ranks, provide the professional expertise necessary for the City's fire prevention program. Proposition H provides a retirement plan for this small group of civilians equivalent to the retirement plan for their uniformed firefighter counterparts, at no additional cost to the City.

Voters approved similar measures in recent years that provided for safety requirement for probation officers, investigator groups and various other safety personnel.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition H
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.506-2 Miscellaneous Safety Employees

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the board of supervisors or the community college board shall have the power to contract with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System of the State of California to provide that the probation officers, airport police officers, district attorney and public defender investigators, coroner investigators, juvenile court counselors, and institutional police, fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers who are not members of the Section 8.588 plans, shall be members of the public employees' retirement system, and the board of supervisors, the community college board and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such contract.

The power to contract created herein shall be limited to a contract with no net increase in cost to the city and county or the community college district.

Any person who shall become a member of the public employees' retirement system pursuant to such contract shall have the right to be a member of the health service system and the health board shall make provision for the participation in the benefits of the health service system by such persons.

Out of town on June 5, 1990? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
THANKS TONS, SAN FRANCISCO
Residents are recycling in record numbers!

Nearly 70,000 homes in the southern and eastern parts of the City have curbside recycling. By 1991, every resident will have curbside collection service.

Until curbside reaches your neighborhood, you can recycle at our many community recycling centers.

For a free Recycling Starter Kit and information on where to recycle call:

San Francisco Recycling Program
CITY HALL
554-6193
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

PROPOSITION I

Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the State Retirement System are allowed to work for the San Francisco Unified School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. Retired San Francisco teachers in the City Retirement system are not allowed to do so.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow retired teachers who are members of the City’s Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. While they are consultants they would not make retirement contributions or earn additional retirement credits.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the City’s Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, costs could increase, the amount of which, being dependent upon the dollar amount and the number of personal service contracts executed, cannot be determined, but should not be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Jim Gonzalez and Richard Hongisto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Official Argument In Favor of Proposition I

Proposition I is necessary to correct an inequity that exists between teachers in the State Teachers' Retirement System and those in the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. Teachers in the state system can retire up to three years early and supplement their reduced retirement income by serving as consultants to the school district developing curriculum, orienting new teachers, substituting for absent teachers, tutoring students, etc. The Charter denies the right to the four hundred teachers in the city retirement system to continue serving students and schools in these ways. Proposition I would correct this inequity by extending the same right to teachers in the city retirement system. Proposition I will save taxpayers' money by encouraging teachers at the top of the salary scale to retire early. New hires at the low end of the salary scale will earn little more than half as much as those at the top.

Proposition I will also improve education in San Francisco schools by continuing to take advantage of the experience and expertise of retired teachers. It will also help to solve the shortage of qualified substitute teacher.

Vote YES on Proposition I for equity, economy, and educational excellence.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition I
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition I
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will bring equity and fairness to retired teachers, save the taxpayers money and improve the educational system in San Francisco.

Assemblyman Willie Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John Burton
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Jim Gonzalez
San Francisco Democratic Party
Fred Rodriguez, President of the Board of Education

United Educators of San Francisco, Joan-Marie Shelley
Judy Dellamonica
Joanne Miller, vice-president of the San Francisco Board of Education
Thomas Ammiano
Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council
Larry Martin, Transport Workers of America
Robert Barnes
James Wachob
Jose Medina
Harry G. Britt, President of the Board of Supervisors

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the charter on February 1, 1969, and persons who become miscellaneous officers and employees after February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by a three-quarters vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under Section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under Section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(a) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

"Retirement allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payments is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workers' compensation laws of the State of California, shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the retirement board, which would have been earned by the member had he worked, throughout the period under consideration, the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police department as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under Section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in Section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in Section 3.670 of the charter.

"Charters" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural, and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(b) Any member who completes at least 20 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 50 years, or at least 10 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 60 years, said service to be computed under Subsection (g) hereof, may retire from service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of 65 years. A member retired after reaching the age of 60 years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of two percent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of 65 years, if the allowance available to such member, pursuant to the provisions of Subsection (f) of this section, shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this Subsection (b), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this Subsection (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said Subsection (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of 60 years, after rendering 20 years or more of such service and having attained the age of 50 years, computed under Subsection (f), 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) for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/4</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/2</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-3/4</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-1/4</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-1/2</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-1/4</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-1/2</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-3/4</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-1/4</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-1/2</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-3/4</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-1/4</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-1/2</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-3/4</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-1/4</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-1/2</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-3/4</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-1/4</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-1/2</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-3/4</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-1/4</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-1/2</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-3/4</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-1/4</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-1/2</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-3/4</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-1/4</td>
<td>1.9250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-1/2</td>
<td>1.9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-3/4</td>
<td>1.9750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed 75 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or Subsection (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of 65 years may elect, without right of revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system, and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of Sec-
TEXT OF PROPOSITION I (Continued)

tion 8.514 of this charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall not less than $100 per month upon retirement after 30 years of service and after attaining the age of 60 years, and provided further that as to any member within 15 years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of 65, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $100 per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance, a member having credit for a service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculations of retirement allowances.

(c) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least 10 years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in Subsection (b) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in Subsection (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds 40 percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age 60, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed 40 percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earned by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one year immediately preceding his retirement. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied as full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commissioner 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 amount payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

(e) If a member shall die, before retirement, (1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection:

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of 12 months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(2) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired from service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If, at the date of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under Subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) shall be paid in lump sum as follows:

(A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election, but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 years, may make the election herein provided before benefit has been paid under this Subsection (e), for and on behalf of such children if, in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this Subsection (e), any allowance payable under this Subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

(f) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least 10 years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed $1,000, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service.
(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation paid to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to 7-1/2 percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of Subsection (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this Subsection (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county shall be applied, in the first instance, to the payment of the contributions described in subdivision (h), as prescribed by the board of supervisors, and thereafter, shall be applied to the payment of the contributions described in subdivision (k).

(5) Prior to the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said Subsection (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(j) Except as otherwise provided in Section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(l) Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsections (b), (e), (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 be disqualified from continued employment in said retirement system.
PROPOSITION J
Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?

YES 296  NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Human Rights Commission was created by an ordinance. Under that ordinance, the Human Rights Commission has 15 members.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment that would make the existing Human Rights Commission a charter commission; it would reduce the number of members from 15 to 11.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you want to reduce its size to 11 members.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you do not want to reduce its size to 11 members.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government in an amount not to exceed $4,200.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Thomas Hsieh.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Let us make human rights a fundamental part of the fabric of San Francisco.
San Francisco is the birthplace of the United Nations and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, our Human Rights Commission is not even a part of our constitution — the Charter. Proposition J will make the Human Rights Commission a charter commission. Proposition J will take the position of the Human Rights Commission out of politics and ensures its place in the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Please vote in favor of Proposition J to recognize the importance of human rights to San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition J
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition J

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department and a candidate for Municipal Court Judge I urge you to vote for Ballot Measure J.

The Human Rights Commission has been a positive voice for 25 years. Thousands of San Franciscans have directly benefited from the Commission’s efforts. Its mandate will be greatly strengthened by extending Charter status through this measure.

Please join me and vote yes on J!

James Harrigan
For Municipal Court

---

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “J”

We have a Human Rights Commission NOW, appointed by the Mayor. A new one in the charter would have the same appointing officer.

We don’t need a confirmation of said committee. It will not take it out of politics. No reason for this.

Just another layer of government — for what.

Vote no on “J”.

Marguerite Warren
NOTE: This entire section is new.

PART TWENTY-FOUR: HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
3.699-3 Commission; Composition
A human rights commission is hereby established. The human rights commission shall consist of eleven members, broadly representative of the general public to be appointed by the mayor. Three of the members who are first appointed shall be designated to serve for terms of one year, three for two years, three for three years and two for four years from the date of their appointments. Thereafter, members shall be appointed as aforesaid for a term of office of four years, except that all of the vacancies occurring during a term shall be filled for the unexpired term. Members of said commission shall be compensated for each commission or committee meeting actually attended by said members in an amount as may be established and amended, from time to time, by ordinance of the board of supervisors, but not less than $50 per meeting provided, however, that no member shall be paid for attending more than two commission or committee meetings in any one calendar month.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system, an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.

(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his pension or retirement allowance was determined.

(c) A retired person, who is a certified employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certified employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstalled as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.

8.584-10 Limitation on Employment During Retirement
(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.584 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county of a term of office or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.584, he shall re-enter membership under Section 8.584 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.584. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for service or disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 60 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earned, at the time he engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he held the position which he held at the time of his retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earned by the member if he held the position from which he was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
Seven Member Commissions

PROPOSITION K
Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?

YES 298
NO 299

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department, Fire Department, Social Services Department, Port of San Francisco, Public Utilities Commission, Board of Permit Appeals, Civil Service Commission, Airports Commission and Parking and Traffic Department are managed by a board or commission. Each of these boards and commissions has five members appointed by the Mayor.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K is a charter amendment that would increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the size of these boards and commissions to stay the same.

Controller's Statement on "K"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $18,800 annually beginning January, 1991."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh, Bill Maher, and Wendy Nelder.

Arguments for and against this measure and its full text immediately follow this page.
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K expands the opportunity for San Francisco’s varied communities to participate in City government. Proposition K increases, from five to seven, the membership of the Board of Permit Appeals and seven City commissions: Police, Fire, Social Services, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports, and Parking and Traffic. It also includes the Port Commission, subject to amendment of state law to authorize such an increase.

Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities. Only five members of these crucial commissions is insufficient to address the diversity of concerns in our City; seven members will provide greater representation and greater leadership from a variety of communities. The expansion of the size of these commissions enhances the possibility for all San Franciscans to be part of decision-making and policy-making processes at every level.

The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions. Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor, but instead of the many underrepresented voices in San Francisco.

Proposition K would make these commissions representative of the interests of more San Franciscans, while maintaining the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants. San Franciscans want accessible, responsive, and active commissioners. We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns, and Proposition K is a method for achieving these goals.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

You need a decoder ring to read the Supervisors’ argument in favor of creating 18 new commissioner slots. Here’s what the Board says, and here’s what they really mean.

The Board says: “Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities.”

The Board means: All you interest groups out there, it’s time to get yours.

The Board says: “The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions.”

The Board means: With 18 more political appointments, a mayor won’t offend as many supporters by passing them over for city jobs.

The Board says: “Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor.”

The Board means: Adding 18 new city commissioners isn’t really a boon to the incumbent mayor — unless he’s re-elected.

The Board says: “Proposition K would . . . maintain the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants.”

The Board means: Increasing commission memberships by 40% isn’t that big a deal.

The Board says: “We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns.”

The Board means: A fair hearing before city commissions isn’t enough; we want guaranteed results!

Let’s stop speaking in code and talk plainly. Proposition K is based on the notion that people should be treated as groups — not individuals — in the political process. That’s offensive, and so is Proposition K.

Please vote NO on K!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is a textbook example of what’s wrong with contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K demeans us because it lumps city residents into groups, rather than respecting their rights as individuals.

Proposition K divides us because it stresses what such interest groups (the polite euphemism is “communities”) disagree about, rather than what all San Franciscans share in common.

Proposition K debases us because it is premised on a “quota system” for city boards and commissions. There shouldn’t be “white seats” or “black seats”, “gay seats” or “straight seats” on city commissions. There should be but two qualifications for service as a city commissioner: San Francisco residency and individual ability!

Vote NO on Proposition K!

San Francisco is indeed a polyglot and richly diverse community. City residents come from all corners of the country and the globe. Their political opinions range from radical to reactionary and all points in between.

It’s impossible for each point of view, each ethnic group, each political persuasion, each neighborhood to be represented on city commissions. Increasing the membership on those bodies from five to seven persons is like buying a bigger umbrella in a hurricane. It won’t make a bit of difference.

It is possible, however, for city commissioners from all walks of life to represent views and interests other than their own. It happens all the time in countless actions by city boards and agencies. And if we want to encourage consensus and better understanding among San Francisco’s many “communities”, we must resist attempts — such as Proposition K — to make the labels we all wear easier to read.

Three years ago, Mayor Agnos campaigned on the slogan, “One City, One Future”. The supporters of Proposition K have failed to heed those words.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The opponents of Proposition K are clearly on the wrong page of the textbook of contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K values us because it gives city residents greater ability to be heard, individually and as a community.

Proposition K unites us because it reinforces what we all share in common: respect for democracy. If, as the opposition claims, the ability to have more access to representation is divisive, democratic ideals such as checks and balances must therefore also be divisive and undesirable.

Proposition K elevates us because it originates from that respect for democracy. This does not limit or allocate, but reasonably expands available seats on the commissions. Proposition K effectively dilutes the influence of special interests in favor of more broad-based views.

San Francisco is an extremely diverse city and that diversity should be reasonably represented. Democracy requires the opportunity for representation of all points of view. Good government demands that the number of appointed officials be limited so that debate can be functional. Proposition K addresses these two needs: increased citizen participation, and reasonable size to facilitate getting work done.

If you take the opposition’s argument — that it is not meaningful to have representatives from different neighborhoods, ethnicities, political persuasions — to its logical extreme, you could have one member commissions achieving a consensus at the price of democracy.

Proposition K is good government, since it integrates the multiplicity of voices into a united future for the residents of San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition K!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
Seven Member Commissions

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

We need to create an open, democratic, and participatory local government.
This measure will encourage more participation.
Vote YES on K.

Individuals and community groups strongly support K. Increasing the membership on these bodies expands the opportunity to participate for all San Franciscans.
Vote YES on K!

Mayor Art Agnos
Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John L. Burton
State Senator Milton Marks
Fr. James Goode
Carole Migden
Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes
Political Action Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Catherine Baccari
Bob Dockendorff
Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Robert McCarthy
Ruth Picon
President, Latino Democratic Club
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead, Pres.
Bernal Heights Community Foundation
Jake McGoldrick
Arnie Scher
Natalie Berg
Sodonla Wilson,
San Francisco Board of Education
Alma Jackson
Margaret Brady
Reverend Amos Brown
Yori Wada

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Vote No on Proposition K.

Proposition K unnecessarily tinkers with our commission system for managing city departments.

Many of the most important city functions — police and fire services, libraries and health care — are governed by five-member city commissions. Proposition K would increase the size of these commissions to seven members. The Planning Commission would be expanded to nine members.

For what reason? The supporters say that the commissions cannot reflect our diverse community unless we allow the mayor to appoint more commissioners. They miss the point of the commission system.

Commissioners are not advisors or members of a community-wide study panel. They are managers. They set city policy, recommend hundreds of millions of dollars in spending, and hire and fire key departmental personnel.

Preserve our system of citizen management. Don’t make city commissions debating societies.

Vote No on Proposition K.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Are not seven Deputy Mayors at the rate of $94,000 a year a sufficient number of political plums for the Mayor? Does he really need eighteen more commissioners to achieve good government in San Francisco?

Do not give the Mayor additional tools to promote his re-election efforts. The San Francisco Republican Party urges voters to Vote No on Proposition K.

San Francisco Republican Party
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Anna M. Guth

William E. Grayson
Honor H. Bulkley
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Brian Mavrogeorge
Ronald G. Kershaw
Sam T. Harper
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

No sound arguments have been presented which support the need for Proposition K. Enlarging Boards and Commissions would increase city costs without improving productivity. Indeed, extra members may impede efficiency and result in protracted proceedings.

Don’t give the Mayor additional opportunities for patronage. Vote NO on Proposition K.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw

Brian Mavrogeorge
Paul Kavouksian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence
Martin Keller

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Seven Member Commissions

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

PROPOSITION K WILL ADD TO BUREAUCRACY

Proposition K will hinder quick and fair response to citizen concerns. Larger commissions do not mean better commissions; on the contrary, they mean a less efficient, more cumbersome process.

PROPOSITION K WILL NOT MAKE COMMISSIONS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INTERESTS OF SAN FRANCISCO

Present commissions serve a diverse San Francisco by appointment of individuals who reflect and possess sensitivity, respect for different backgrounds and points of views.

Sharon Bretz
Susann L. Danielson
Jean Kalil
Victor Makras
Esther Marks
Beverly Prior

... Vote NO on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Proposition K is not about democracy. It is about patronage. It is about creating many new commission positions to hand out as political plums. To whom? For what? And why should the taxpayers be forced to pay for it?

No one, not even the author, Supervisor Ward, claims that it will improve the efficiency of the government, yet it will certainly add to the costs. The true costs will include trips, staff time, expenses, etc., with no discernable benefit to the public.

This measure will lead to longer meetings, more arguments, divisiveness and politics while providing less management oversight.

Proposition K is an insider's game. They gain and the voters pay. It is a costly bad idea and should be soundly rejected by the voters.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

 Supervisor Bill Maher

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "K"

If qualified commissioners were appointed who understood they represented ALL of San Francisco this charter amendment would not be necessary.

There are nine commissions listed for additional members — 18 more appointments. Just another avenue for political appointments.

Vote No on Proposition "K".

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

PART FOUR: POLICE DEPARTMENT
3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, police force, an office of citizen complaints and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of five seven members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission to seven members, shall continue to hold their respective positions, subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereunder, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the police department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the police commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-20 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The police commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

PART FIVE: FIRE DEPARTMENT
3.540 Fire Department

The fire department shall be under the management of a fire commission, consisting of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor; and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1948, 1949, and 1950, respectively, two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the years 1976, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The chief of department shall have power to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for fire-fighting purposes.

The commissioners shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the fire department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the fire commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-20 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter.

Positions of officers and employees of the fire department legally authorized shall continue, and the incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall continue as the officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments, and except as in this charter otherwise provided.

PART EIGHT: SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
3.570 Composition of Department; Commission

There is hereby established a social services department. This department shall consist of a social services commission of five seven members, a director of social services, and such employees and assistants as may be necessary to carry out the work and functions of said department.

The members of the social services commission shall be appointed thereto by the mayor and shall be selected for their respective positions on the basis of their interest in and understanding of the problems of public welfare. The members of said commission shall serve without compensation and no person shall be eligible to serve on said commission while holding a salaried public office, position or employment.

The term of office of the members of the said commission, subject to the provisions hereof relative to removal and the terms of the first

(Continued on next page)
The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3.590 Commission; Composition

A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers.

The term of each commissioner shall be four years, providing that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o'clock on the 8th day of January, 1932, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of two other commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936.

The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992, and on the expiration of these and successive terms, the mayor shall appoint their successors for four years. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS

3.650 Board Composition

The mayor shall appoint five seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $5,000. The mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms. This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART NINE: PORT COMMISSION

3.580 Commission; Composition

The San Francisco Port Commission shall consist of five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, their appointment being subject to confirmation by the board of supervisors. Each of said members shall serve for a term of four years. Vacancies on the commission shall be filled by the mayor for the unexpired portion of the term. Initial appointive members of the commission shall consist of the incumbent members of the San Francisco Port Authority, who shall serve as commissioners for a term corresponding to the unexpired portion of their tenure as members of the port authority. Subject to amendment of state law to authorize an increase in membership, the port commission shall consist of seven members. The two additional members shall be appointed by the mayor after the eighth day of January, 1992. The initial term of office not to exceed four years shall be fixed by the mayor to insure that the term of office for a majority of the commission shall not expire in the same year. In addition, the director of finance and secretary of agriculture and services, or their designated representatives, shall be ex-officio members of the commission. Persons appointed to the port commission shall be subject to recall, suspension and removal in the same manner as an elected official.

The board of permit appeals shall have and exercise the following powers:

(a) To hear and determine appeals where it is alleged there is error or abuse of discretion in any order, requirement, decision or determination made by the zoning administrator in the enforcement of the provisions of any ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors creating zoning districts or regulating the use of property in the city and county.

(b) To hear and determine appeals from the rulings, decisions and determinations of the zoning administrator granting or denying applications for variances from any rule, regulation, restriction or requirement of the zoning or setback ordinances, or any section thereof. Upon the hearing of such appeals, said board may affirm, change, or modify the ruling, decision or determination appealed from, or, in lieu thereof, make such other additional determination as it shall deem proper in the premises, subject to the same limitations as are placed upon the zoning administrator by this charter or by ordinance.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SEVENTEEN: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified personnel for appointment to the service of the city and county.

The civil service commission shall consist of five seven members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter section as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and provided further, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall be as follows; one shall expire on June 30, 1996 and one on June 30, 1998, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. No less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The persons so appointed, shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: "I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration."

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this

(Continued on page 128)
Commissioner Residency Requirement

PROPOSITION L

Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Candidates for elective office and members of charter boards and commissions must be San Francisco residents and electors. For other boards, commissions and advisory bodies, the law creating them may set residency requirements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L is a charter amendment that would require the members of all boards, commissions and advisory bodies to be San Francisco residents and electors.

This rule would not apply where a non-charter board, commission or advisory body requires a person with specific qualifications, and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found. Also, this rule would not apply to the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Fine Arts Museums, the Asian Arts Commission, the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission and the elected members of the San Francisco Retirement Board and Health Service Board.

Proposition L would delete the current requirement that candidates and members of charter boards and commissions be residents and electors for a certain length of time before assuming office, which courts have found unconstitutional.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “L”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh and Bill Maher.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

This charter amendment provides that all individuals serving on city boards and commissions and committees with few exceptions, must be citizens of voting age of San Francisco.

Members of boards and commissions and committees often have policy making and regulatory responsibilities. Clearly, San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco. With a population of 750,000 residents, surely we have enough qualified and talented San Franciscans who can get the job done.

This charter amendment offers the appointing officer with some flexibility. If a qualified candidate for a public post requiring specialized skills cannot be found in our city, then, following such a declaration, the appointing officer may search elsewhere.

Let's open up more opportunities for our residents to serve San Francisco. VOTE YES FOR THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERSHIP ON CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I was mistaken in one of my objections to Proposition L. Some years ago, a court decision invalidated the voter-adopted Charter requirement that a person be a San Francisco resident for five years before appointment to a city commission. I disagree strongly with that decision, for the reasons cited in my ballot argument appearing on the opposite page. The inoperative language remained in our Charter, however, and Proposition L disingenuously removes it — like pruning a dead branch from a tree.

But, there are still plenty of reasons to vote against Proposition L.

(1) Proposition L eliminates the requirement that a commissioner be an “elector” of San Francisco (a voter, meaning also a U.S. citizen) for at least one year. This Charter provision has not been altered by a court, but Proposition L would strike it from the books.

A person could move into town, register to vote, and be appointed that day to a city post.

(2) Proposition L exempts three city commissions — Health System, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board — from any residency requirement whatsoever.

(3) Proposition L would allow non-residents to serve on any board or commission created by the Board of Supervisors. In fact, Proposition L could even be interpreted to allow the appointment of non-citizens to such posts!

Don’t be misled or confused. If you want San Franciscans to make decisions about San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition L!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

If you want San Francisco residents to serve on all city commissions established by the charter, vote NO on Proposition L.
If you think San Franciscans should serve on boards and committees created by the Board of Supervisors, vote NO on Proposition L.
If you favor city residents serving on the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees, vote NO on Proposition L.

The Board of Supervisors says "San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco." I agree completely. Trouble is, Proposition L weakens the existing residency requirement in our City Charter.

Charter Section 8.100 states that no person "shall be appointed as a member of any board or commission unless he shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years." Proposition L eliminates the five-year residency requirement! Proposition L also exempts from any residency requirement whatsoever members of the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees.

The idea behind the five-year residency rule is that city commissioners should have first-hand knowledge and personal experience of San Francisco's people and neighborhoods, its problems and possibilities. City commissioners should not just rely on staff reports and statistical abstracts. Proposition L would destroy this sensible safeguard. Instead, a person could move into town and be appointed, that day, to a city post!

Finally, Proposition L purports to extend the Charter's residency rules to advisory boards and committees established by the Board of Supervisors. But the residency requirement can be waived for a person "with specific experience, skills, or qualifications." That's a loophole big enough to drive a truck through!

San Franciscans should make decisions about San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition L.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for most advisory panels of the City.
Under Proposition L, panel members MUST be residents of San Francisco.

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for membership on the Health System Board, Retirement Board and War Memorial Board.
Under Proposition L, there is no change. Membership on the Health System Board and Retirement Board is by DIRECT ELECTION of city employees. The Health Fund and Retirement Fund are operated by and for city workers. Because employees are not required to live in the city, there are serious constitutional problems with denying a worker the right to be a candidate for trustee of a fund controlled by employees.

The way things are now, the courts have thrown out San Francisco's five-year residency requirement. Reports the City Attorney:

"In the years since Charter Section 8.100 (residency rule) was originally adopted, the California courts have struck down all durational residency requirements applicable to candidates for elective or appointive office."

Most Supervisors like the durational requirement. But even Supervisors cannot overrule the Supreme Court.

The bottom line: Proposition L does not cover everything. Just most things. It's time San Franciscans were making the decisions about San Francisco. Proposition L is a major step in the right direction.

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S FUTURE. YES ON PROPOSITION L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

San Franciscans deserve to be represented by commissioners who live within San Francisco, not by employees filling in for their ex-officio bosses. Vote for San Francisco commissions made of San Francisco voters.

... Vote Yes on Proposition L!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Don’t clutter the Charter with unnecessary provisions. Vote No on Proposition L.

Proposition L would require almost all commissions and advisory board members to be city residents. That makes sense — so much sense that, for most commissions, it is already the law.

This is one more example of a needless Charter amendment. If the Board of Supervisors wants to require members of any advisory body to be city residents, they can pass an ordinance to accomplish it. Adding an unnecessary provision to a Charter that is already too long and complicated is not the answer.

Vote No on Proposition L.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.100 Qualifications
(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she is shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for at least one year immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retirement system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.680, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.

Notwithstanding this requirement, in the case of boards, commissions or advisory bodies established by legislative act, the residency requirement may be waived by the appointing officer, or entity upon a finding that the board, commission or body requires the appointment of a person with specific experience, skills or qualifications and after exercising due diligence, an eligible and willing appointee residing within the city and county could not be located.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.
REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease. Try cleaning the old-fashioned way without harmful chemicals. It's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be TOXIC FREE 554-4333

HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR YOUR HOME'S TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday 8 am. to 4 pm. 554-4333

San Francisco Household Hazardous Waste Program
Commission Gender Composition

PROPOSITION M
Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by the Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?

YES 302
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter requires some City boards and commissions, such as the Police and Fire Commissions, to have at least one woman member. However, the charter does not have a general policy on balancing the number of men and women on City boards and commissions.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a charter amendment that would create a City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex. This charter amendment does not apply to the Commission on the Status of Women.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “M”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “M”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Bill Maher and Wendy Nelder.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Commission Gender Composition

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The 1990s are here — but you would never know it by the few women serving on City boards and commissions. In fact, of ten major commissions — Police, Fire, Airports, Ports, Public Utilities, Parking Authority, Social Services, City Planning, Elections, Housing Authority — women hold just 18 percent of the seats. And only one woman serves as a president of these commissions.

Women do not fare much better on other key commissions. For instance, women hold just two seats on the seven-member Recreation and Park Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission. Three women serve on the eleven-member Small Business Advisory Commission.

Despite the enormous influence and regulatory controls most commissions have over the lives of all citizens, women's voices and leadership on city panels do not equal their numbers in society.

These gloomy statistics aside, women have begun to make gains during the past two years. Women are now being regularly considered and appointed to boards and commissions. But, clearly, much more needs to be done.

Proposition M will emblazon into the Charter a policy goal of gender equality on all boards and commissions. This amendment, authored by Supervisor Richard Hongisto, is a simple measure of justice.

Only the Commission on the Status of Women is excluded from the provisions of this charter amendment, since its sole purpose is to serve as an advocacy forum for women.

Increasingly, communities and groups are instituting gender parity provisions in their constitutions with much success. For instance, the Democratic Party has dramatically brought about near gender equality of delegates to its national and state conventions.

Let's start the 1990s off with a renewed commitment to fairness and equality.

VOTE YES ON THE GENDER PARITY AMENDMENT.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition M
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition M

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M moves San Francisco into the 1990s. It is stunning to review the composition of our city boards and commissions and see just how few women are serving. Women comprise 18 percent of the seats on ten major commissions. This is an untold tragedy. Women have been making gains in recent time. We can do even better.

Proposition M is about fairness and equality. Iowa enacted a law in 1987 to require greater gender balance on all boards, commissions, committees, and councils.

Vote Yes for Gender Justice. Yes on Proposition M.

SF Chapter, National Organization for Women
Legal Advocates for Women
San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Judiciary Project/California
TJ Anthony
Mary C. Dunlap
Ruth Pison, President, Latino Democratic Club
Helen Grieco, Director, SF NOW
Laura Campbell
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Agar Jacks, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Greg Day, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Jean K. Harris
Geraldine Johnson
Joyce Newsstat, Chair, Lesbian Caucus, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
James Harrigan

Creating political leadership opportunities for women will strengthen the public policy decision-making process.
Vote YES on M.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

As a predominately lesbian and gay Republican volunteer organization we believe it is a travesty that after fifteen years of three liberal Democrat mayors only 38% of the city’s Commissioners are women. This negligence has prompted the need to enact gender-parity. We support Proposition M.

In the future, the provisions of Proposition M should be amended to apply to the Commission on the Status of Women. Women and men must actively dialogue so that our city begins to address the concerns of all.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw
Paul Kavoukjian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulroney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Requirement that any commission be comprised of a certain number of persons of any gender is as inappropriate as requiring a certain number of persons who have red hair or blue eyes. Please vote to maintain the mayoral prerogative to appoint the best San Franciscans for the job.

... Vote NO on Proposition M!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

---

Vote No on Proposition M.
Like Proposition L, but only more so, Proposition M does not belong in the City Charter.
The power to make appointments to boards and commissions rests with the Mayor. Proposition M would write into the Charter a non-binding policy statement urging the Mayor to fill not more than 50% plus one of any commission with members of the same sex.
The City Attorney advised the Board of Supervisors that the Constitution prohibits the city from adopting a quota for male and female appointments. Instead, the Board of Supervisors proposes to clutter up the Charter with a non-binding, legally unenforceable policy statement.
If the Board of Supervisors wants to send a message to the Mayor it should be done by resolution, not costly and unnecessary Charter amendments.
Vote No on Proposition M.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

---

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "M"
There is nothing in the charter NOW that prevents the Mayor or Board of Supervisors to appoint more women to achieve gender parity now.

Why now does it have to be written in concrete.
Vote NO on "M".

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION M

NOTE: Entire section is new.
3.503 Composition of Boards and Commissions.
It is the policy of the city and county, which shall be considered a goal when filling vacancies
on boards or commissions appointed by the mayor, or otherwise provided by this charter, except for the Commission on the Status of Women, to achieve gender parity on these boards and commissions by limiting to a simple majority of board and commission membership the number of members who are of the same sex.

*************
Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 24.

*************
MISSING SOMETHING IN YOUR LIFE?

If your life seems to be missing that special warmth that comes from having a pet, come and see us at the new San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department. We have a wide variety of dogs, cats and other animals available for adoption.

A waggly tail, a sweet meow or a gentle squeak - it'll make you glad to come home at night.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

554-6364
PROPOSITION N

Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?

YES 305
NO 307

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter does not limit the number of consecutive terms a person may serve on the Board of Supervisors. A full term on the Board of Supervisors is four years.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a charter amendment. Under Proposition N, no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors. After two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, a person must wait four years before serving again. Any person appointed to the Board of Supervisors to complete more than half a four-year term would be considered to have served one full term. A member of the Board of Supervisors who resigned with less than half a four-year term remaining would be considered to have served a full term. This charter amendment would go into effect July 1, 1990. Each Supervisor holding office on that date would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when his or her current term ends.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the charter so that no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors and you want to prohibit persons who served two consecutive four-year terms from serving on the Board of Supervisors again until four years after their second consecutive term in office.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to limit Supervisors to serving two consecutive terms.

Controller's Statement on "N"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How "N" Got on the Ballot
On January 25, 1990, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition N to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,151* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 45,408 of the signatures submitted were valid, 5,257 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is a non-partisan, reasonable, fair and democratic measure to reform our government and improve the present city-wide system for electing supervisors. Neighborhood, civic leaders, current and former elected officials, community activists, business owners, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, unionists, and minorities all support Proposition N.

Limiting politicians' consecutive terms is not radical or extreme. In fact, it helps to prevent political corruption and power grabbing. More than 150 cities, towns and counties in the United States have laws limiting politicians terms. Governors in 30 states can only serve two terms. San Mateo county limits supervisors terms and for more than 30 years San Francisco's mayors have been limited to two consecutive terms.

Proposition N is a very modest and reasonable proposal.

Proposition N does not recall or force any current member of the board from office. Proposition N allows supervisors whose terms expire in 1991 to serve until January 1995 if they are reelected. Supervisors whose terms end in 1993 may serve until 1997 if reelected. Former supervisors may run for office again after 4 years.

The current system favors incumbent politicians and denies experienced newcomers a fair chance to serve. Since 1973, only 3 newcomers have been elected to the city-wide board. 5 supervisors have already served 10 years. By 1995 most board members will have been in office 14 years or more.

We know that a lake or pond will stagnate unless its waters are replenished from time to time. So too will an elected body grow stale without a regular infusion of fresh faces and new ideas.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Richard Bodisco
Chairman, San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform
Steve Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu
Harold Hoogasian
Joseph L. Powell
Raymond Chalker
Robert A. Reveles
Robert C. Sanchez
Joel Ventresca
Barry Lastra
Daniel Willson

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N backers have misrepresented the facts to get you to vote for N. Since just 1982 three non-incumbent supervisors have been independently elected to the Board. Proposition N is not true reform — it only tinkers with the citywide election process. It is not democratic — it takes power away from the people. It is not a solution — it's an additional problem.

Supervisors are elected to carry out the will of the people. When they fail to serve, they are unelected — by vote of the people. Appointed department heads, who are not supposed to have their own political agendas, are balanced only by the Mayor's and the Board’s overseeing eyes.

With the Mayor already limited to two terms, the Board must not consist only of rookies and lame ducks, or department heads can consolidate their power and bide their time, waiting until watchdog Supervisors are automatically thrown from office. Proposition N threatens accountability and increases the chances for bureaucratic corruption.

Uninformed actions are foolish actions — closely examine the facts, and you’ll agree that blindly forcing change is a bad plan. If Proposition N passes, nothing can stop department heads from installing power bases immune to voter inspection. Voters have the right to choose — this measure permanently limits that right.

PROTECT YOUR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Two years ago, San Francisco voted on Proposition O, a recall of the Board of Supervisors thinly disguised as a 'good government' initiative. San Franciscans saw through this scheme, and sent the measure down to defeat.

Last year, the same group attempted to offer a similar proposal to the voters, but failed to collect enough signatures to qualify it for the ballot.

Now they're at it again.

They say that Supervisors have lost touch with the people of San Francisco, and should automatically be thrown from office after they've served two terms — but by bringing up this rejected issue again and again, they're proving that THEY are the ones who are out of touch.

San Francisco doesn't need a two-term limit. When supervisors stop working for the people, they stop getting elected. If Board members are prematurely removed, more power falls into the hands of civil servants and department heads, who are unaccountable to the voters. These unelected officials who already hold great power must be balanced by supervisors free to do their jobs, or citizens lose their representation.

The diversity of our City is one of our greatest strengths. San Franciscans have always individually evaluated our city's varied issues, judging each on its specific merits. The Board of Supervisors is similarly diverse, and should also be evaluated selectively. Citizens should use the election process to tell their representatives when they're not doing their jobs — not by acting blindly and installing an arbitrary time limit. San Franciscans are smart enough to tell the difference between voting an incompetent out of office and firing a valuable employee without cause.

Proposition N denies San Franciscans the right to vote for legislators of their choice, and that's not fair.

Vote NO on Proposition N.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Let's talk about what WE want City Hall to do for US, not the politicians.

Politicians will tell you anything to advance their political careers.

They won't tell you the TRUTH about the Two Term Limit.

The politicians say we failed to collect enough signatures last year to qualify for the ballot.

But here's what their appointee, the city's Chief Administrative Officer says:

"Last year's Proposition removal was forced by an error, one which we admitted, apologized for and tried to repair..." (Letter to Two Term Limit — Chairman — Richard Bodisco, dated February 7, 1990.)

We need new leadership in City Hall.

We have some hard and serious problems to solve in San Francisco and we can't solve them with political rhetoric and name calling.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N removes experienced supervisors from the Board.

FACT:

Proposition N insures that San Francisco will always have 5 or 6 supervisors with seniority and experience on the Board.

Proposition N also gives experienced and concerned citizens an opportunity to serve without needing to become professional career politicians.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N will take away your right to vote for a legislator of your choice.

FACT:

Proposition N gives you more choices because it removes the current system which favors incumbent politicians.

The politicians have spoken too long for themselves.

It is time City Hall spoke for us.

Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Submitted by San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Richard Bodisco

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

This citizen’s initiative is a good government reform measure which will guarantee change, encourage competition, improve the chances of electing new political leadership, and curtail the influence of special interests.

Vote YES on N.

SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

Change is the driving force in our economy, our lives . . . and our government! Eight years on the Board of Supervisors is enough time to initiate changes espoused in any candidacy. Our City government is in desperate need of change. Vote for new life in San Francisco government.

. . . Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

The longer supervisors remain in office the more likely they become captives of special interests who bankroll their costly campaigns.

Entrenched incumbent politicians often end up working against the public interest, rather than for it.

Only two supervisors have been defeated at the polls since the end of 1980.

New faces, new ideas, new leaders, and new directions are needed at City Hall.

Vote YES on N.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

The Two-Term Limit is an idea whose time has come!

The United States Constitution limits the President to two terms in office. Similarly, the San Francisco Charter limits our Mayor to two terms.

Incumbent San Francisco Supervisors, however, continue to win re-elections year after year. This has made many of them less accountable to the voters.

Eight years is enough! Let’s bring new people, new ideas, and new energy to our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Citizens for a Better San Francisco

It works for executive offices, let’s put a limit on the terms of service for our supervisors. As Thomas Jefferson called it, “rotation in office”. Let’s have some healthy competition for these positions, let’s take advantage of the many experienced people around who are willing to serve. Let’s vote YES on Proposition N for reasonable reform.

John and Carol Maerzke

Argument printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will ensure that we have a Board of Supervisors of concerned citizens, not career politicians.

For almost forty years, San Francisco has limited its Mayor to eight years in office. Many cities around the Bay Area, such as San Jose, Richmond, Mountain View and Redwood City, limit terms in office for their city councils. Yet we have had supervisors serve up to 16 years in office. Why? Because by raising large sums of money and using the power of incumbency, supervisors face little chance of defeat when running for re-election.

Proposition N will not remove any member of the Board of Supervisors from office. It is a fair proposal that allows each current supervisor to run for one more four year term. But in the future, each supervisor will be limited to eight years in office.

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will give the city fresh leadership on the Board of Supervisors. It will open up the city’s political processes, reversing the trend in recent years towards full-time professional politicians. Most importantly, it will mean that our elected representatives put the city’s needs and interests ahead of their desire for re-election.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

I’m supporting Proposition N because of my concern about the status of women and children in San Francisco.

As a long time supporter and treasurer of a shelter for battered women in the City, I have had the opportunity to closely observe how our City government works. I think there are more important things than politics.

San Francisco needs leaders in government who will show more compassion and concern about peoples’ lives as opposed to their reelection campaigns.

I don’t feel that every member of the Board of Supervisors is bad, but the two term limit will improve the current system and help our Supervisors do a better job for us.

That is why I am voting YES on Proposition N.

Millie Favetti

Over the past 20 years women have made enormous gains in electoral politics. The situation is far, far from ideal but some positive changes have taken place. Therefore, we think it is important to encourage and support the entry of women into elective politics.

We’re supporting Proposition N because it ensures that more women will have the opportunity to assume leadership roles in City government. The two year experiment with district elections produced more women supervisors than at any other time in San Francisco’s history.

The gains women have made could be easily lost under the current city-wide system. Proposition N will prevent the clock from being turned back because it allows newcomers a fair chance to compete without always having to run against entrenched incumbents.

Proposition N is equitable and fair to everyone.

Join us and vote YES on Proposition N.

Helen Dawson
Miriam Smith

As a small business owner and long time resident of San Francisco, I’m supporting Proposition N because it makes good sense for our City.

Limiting Supervisors’ terms will create a Board of Supervisors more accountable to the needs of San Franciscans. Under the current city-wide system, many Supervisors see service on the Board as a career.

They worry more about keeping their seats than about doing the job they were elected to do. As a result, politics is all to often put ahead of the City welfare.

Let’s get politics out of City Hall.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Zdenka Bodisco
Mike Salarino
Harold Hoogasian
Small Business Owners
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Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

We’re supporting the Two Term Limit because San Francisco needs new political leadership. The Two Term Limit will open the “Door of Opportunity” for new candidates to serve on the Board of Supervisors.

The Two Term Limit will allow a new generation of civic leaders to represent our City. It is a fair and democratic way to reform the current system and to restore citizens’ confidence in City Hall.

San Francisco’s government should reflect the diversity of the people who live here. This is the meaning of a Democratic and free system. The Two Term Limit insures that new people with new ideas will have a fair chance to serve the City.

Don’t be fooled by arguments of professional, career politicians. The Two Term Limit is good for our community and it is good for San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Steve M. Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu

WHY DIDN’T WE GET TO VOTE ON THE TWO-TERM LIMIT LAST YEAR?

Because Louise Renne found a legal loophole to get the measure thrown off the ballot after the Registrar of Voters had certified that it qualified for submission to the electorate.

Never mind that when Renne violated a number of election laws several years ago she got everyone to overlook the “technicality.”

But what do you expect?

This is the same Louise Renne who sued the Olympic Club because it had no female members conveniently “overlooking” the fact that her husband Paul belongs to the all-white, all-male San Francisco Golf Club.

Say “No” to Renne’s legal machinations!

Vote “Yes” on “N.”

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

WHAT ARE THEY AFRAID OF?

Why are the Supervisors and their contributors fighting the two-term limit so hard?

Why did City officials use a legal loophole to get this same measure thrown off the ballot last fall?

Are they afraid they won’t be able to give away another city street worth $9 million to the Rockefellers for free like they did in 1987?

Are they afraid that the people might vote to turn them out?

Clean up City Hall! Yes on N!

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic Senate Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman
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Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The Two-Term Limit is a reform whose time has come! At the Federal, State, and Local levels, political reformers agree that the powers of incumbency virtually preclude incumbents from being defeated at the polls, and that term limitation is the only way to ensure turnover in legislative bodies. Even Attorney General John Van de Kamp has proposed a twelve-year limit for State legislators.

Since the return to City-wide elections in 1980, only two incumbent Supervisors have been defeated at the polls. They were replaced by Wendy Nelder and Angela Alioto — the daughters of a former Police Chief and Mayor, respectively. Because of this trend, Supervisors have become burned-out, complacent, less accountable to the voters, and more beholden to the special interests who contributed to their re-election campaigns.

New blood is badly needed in any legislative body to keep it healthy and alive. Many non-incumbents have an agenda, new energy, and fresh approaches to governing. If they are allowed to be elected and they are competent, they should be able to translate their agenda into legislation in eight years and then move on to higher office. If they aren’t able to enact their agenda, either they are incompetent or their agenda is out-of-step with the sentiments of the City. In either case, there is no need for Supervisors to serve on the Board more than eight years.

Proposition N will remedy stagnation on our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on N.

Harold M. Hoogasian
Christopher L. Bowman

Proposition N would limit San Francisco supervisors to two consecutive terms of office, just like the mayor. It’s a modest reform that deserves your vote.

Proposition N would not force any incumbent out of office. All current supervisors could run for one more term after their present term expires. And after four years, they could run again and hold office for two more terms.

The President of the United States has been limited to two consecutive terms of office since 1951. The Mayor of San Francisco has been limited to two consecutive terms since 1953. San Mateo County has a term limit for its board of supervisors. Proposition N is not a new or radical idea; it’s an overdue reform for a stagnant system.

The founders of our city charter envisioned supervisors as part-time citizen legislators, not full-time professional politicians. Proposition N respects and revives that tradition.

A bit of fresh air never hurt anybody — even two-term supervisors!

Please vote YES on Proposition N.

Senator Quentin Kopp

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

The current system of electing supervisors in San Francisco badly needs reform. But Proposition N is not the answer. The Board of Supervisors is not accountable to the people, largely because of the pernicious influence of large monetary contributions. A two-term limit would only exacerbate the problem. All supervisors would either be rookies or lame ducks, resulting in a tremendous shift of power to the bureaucracy, without lessening the powerful influence of money in campaigns.

What San Francisco needs is real campaign reform — limiting the ability of supervisors to vote on the pet projects of their major contributors, and district election of supervisors. Both would greatly reduce the enormous sums of money needed to run for office citywide.

Proposition N is a false promise of reform. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N!

Dennis Antenore
Robert Barnes
Ron Braithwaite
Supervisor Harry Britt
Gordon Chin
Brother Kelly Cullen
Catherine Dodd R.N.
Noah Griffin

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Geraldine M. Johnson
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leslie Katz
Tony Kilroy

Myra G. Kopf
Steven M. Krefling
William J. Brandy Moore
Jim Morales
Connie O’Connor
Ruth Picon
Mauri Schwartz
Yori Wada

Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead
Harold T. Yee
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms

The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943 and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and a public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, 11 members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected to a term of four years, from the commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms. Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the eighth day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said four members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1976, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said four members of the board of education shall be elected.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms. Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the eighth day of January, 1975. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.
Hypodermic Syringes

PROPOSITION O

Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?

YES: 309  
NO: 310

---

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law regulates the sale, distribution and use of hypodermic syringes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

---

Controller's Statement on "O"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

"Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted it would not affect the cost of government."

---

How "O" Got on the Ballot

On September 15, 1989 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,173 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,774 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.
Hypodermic Syringes

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

The connection between AIDS and unclean needles is unchallenged. Virtually every authority on the subject agrees that sharing needles increases the chances of contracting AIDS. San Francisco has an estimated 13,000 IV drug users, each of whom is at risk of contracting AIDS and spreading it to their sexual partners or their unborn children. Tens of thousands of people are being directly threatened with contracting AIDS because it is illegal to obtain clean, safe needles.

Some groups are trading clean needles with addicts for their dirty ones. This removes contaminated needles from circulation and can dramatically cut the infection rate among drug users and their partners. But these groups face up to six months in jail and a $1,000 fine. One member of this group, who lost her mother to AIDS, contracted through a dirty needle, said, “I lost a parent to this because this bureaucracy sits around and talks while lots of people are dying.” Dr. John Newmeyer of the Haight Ashbury Free Medical Clinics said, “People are dying because of our institution’s resistance to AIDS risk reduction methods.”

In an attempt to stop this disease from being spread to drug users and their partners AIDS prevention workers are risking legal persecution. Jerry DeJong, who works with substance abusers and is a member of the Mayor’s Narcotic’s Task Force, said “...with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives.” But in a sane, free society it shouldn’t be necessary to break the law to save lives.

The only way this deadly policy can be changed is for the state legislature to change the law. These State laws should be repealed.

Pamela Williard Pickens
Secretary San Francisco Libertarian Party

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition O
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition O
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Dr. John Watters of the Urban Health Study says that, "The middle class have access to clean needles." Poor people can't get clean needles, because they are illegal. Black and Latino IV drug users have a more difficult time finding clean needles and are thus more likely to be infected with AIDS. Because minorities are more likely to be infected with AIDS a higher proportion of their sexual partners or unborn children are being infected. AIDS is likely to become the leading cause of death in young Blacks and Latinos if things continue as they have. Legal clean needles will help save their lives.

Christina Groth

The San Francisco Department of Health estimates that there are 13,000 IV drug users in the city. If clean needles remain unavailable to them the AIDS infection rate can easily reach over 60%. If these 60% infect just two other people either through shared needles or sex, the total number of infected people can reach 23,400. San Francisco can’t afford the financial burden it is under today from AIDS cases. Prevention through clean and legal needles can save us millions of tax dollars without costing us a cent. Legal needles make financial sense.

Isaac Klein

The San Francisco Chronicle has reported on the use of needles for IV drug use in Scotland. The newspaper said that in Edinburgh police launched a crackdown on the availability of clean needles. Within 18 months of the crackdown 50% of all IV drug users were infected with AIDS. Soon their sexual partners and unborn babies were infected with the disease. But 30 miles away in Glasgow the police took no action against the availability of clean needles and only 4 to 7 percent of needle users were infected. Dr. Roy Robertson, Edinburgh’s leading authority on AIDS said, “Making needles available to addicts is not the only answer to the problem of AIDS among drug users but certainly, it has to be part of the solution.”

VOTE YES!

George Meyer

WHAT IS CANADA DOING RIGHT?

In Canada, fewer than 1% of AIDS cases are from needles!

In the United States, about 50% of new cases now involve needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners and babies, (up from about 20-30% in the beginning of the epidemic).

What is Canada doing right?

The AIDS epidemic has hit here many times worse than there. Why?

In Canada, drug-users can buy sterile needles in drugstores.

GRASSROOTS
Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

SURGEON GENERAL KOOP ON CLEAN NEEDLES

"One of the strongest advocates of making needles legal is Surgeon General Koop who addressed that issue last November (1987):

"I'm asked about clean needles everyplace I go. I've always said the same thing. If clean needles will do anything to contain a part

of the epidemic, we should not have any foolish inhibitions about so doing."

(S.F. Sentinel 1/22/88)

Wm. Schwartzman, M.D.

Clean needles cause no diseases.
Legal needles are clean needles.
Vote Yes.

William Schwartzman, MD

Does this initiative “condone drugs”?

If you vote Yes, that could be interpreted as condoning drugs.
But if you vote No, that could equally well be interpreted as
condoning the spread of AIDS (and hepatitis, and many other diseases).

The present state law is like the “death penalty” — not just for
drug abusers, but also their spouses, their babies, transfusion
recipients and others. Who can “condone that”?

GRASSROOTS

The AIDS epidemic was caused by a combination of germs,
working together to collapse the immune system.
N.Y.'s health department has concluded that the HIV epidemic
That epidemic existed only because New York has laws against

addicts buying clean needles.
If we keep these deadly laws, no one can predict what future
epidemics might result.

GRASSROOTS

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
ENCOURAGES STERILE NEEDLES

The National Academy of Sciences the country's most pre-
igious scientific organization in 1986, issued a major study titled
"Confronting AIDS". Many lives could have been saved if Califor-
nia had promptly implemented the conclusion drawn by America's
leading scientists:

"IT IS TIME TO BEGIN EXPERIMENTING WITH PUBLIC

POLICIES TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF STERILE NEE-
DLES AND SYRINGES BY REMOVING LEGAL AND
ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS TO THEIR POSSESSION
AND USE."

Wm. Schwartzman, MD
Wm. Steinsmith, MD

The issue is not “free needles”.
Some of us believe that mass giveaways of clean needles is best.
Others of us believe it would be enough if doctors and pharmacies
were allowed to sell needles, as with diabetes.
Legal needles are as cheap as ballpoint pens, so cheap that price

would be no barrier.
This initiative takes no position on “free needles” programs, only
for legalization — a prerequisite for either approach.

GRASSROOTS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Under present California law, even doctors aren’t allowed to provide needles except for approved purposes. So far “stopping AIDS” is not an approved purpose.

Under “legalization”, needles are a medical question, not a police question. A doctor’s prescription could still be required, as with diabetes. Whatever controls are adopted, needles will be better controlled under legalization than they are now.

William Steinsmith, M.D.

Dr. Don Francis, an epidemiologist with the Centers for Disease Control said, “We can’t overstate the threat of AIDS among addicts in the minority population in the inner city.” Dr. Francis says that there is no evidence that legal, clean needles increase the use of drugs. The only thing stopping clean needles is the law. It’s time for Sacramento to repeal the law and save lives.

Will Wohler

According to the New York Times a new, rare virus known as HTLV-II is spreading through the IV drug community because of needle sharing. Spread in the same manner as AIDS, this virus “could cause leukemia or other serious diseases and may exact a rising toll in future years.” Surveys have found that 20% of addicts in New Orleans were infected and in San Francisco a preliminary survey of blood donors showed this new disease has a higher rate of incidence than the AIDS virus. Because it can take as long as 20 years to develop no one can know for sure how many people have been infected. Clean, legal needles will stop the transmission of this disease. VOTE YES!

John Whisman

Clean needles save the lives of innocent victims of AIDS. Not everyone who gets AIDS because people share needles is an addict. Some are small babies. The Centers for Disease Control says 314 babies were born in 1988 with AIDS because their mothers used infected needles. Dr. James Buehler of the CDC said “We need to do what we can to prevent the sharing of dirty needles. Sharing dirty equipment is the worst problem.” In California it is illegal to obtain clean needles so addicts share. Because they share, babies are born with AIDS. Save lives. Legalize needles. VOTE YES!

Mark Pickens

Illegal needles, which force IV drug users to share unclean needles, is now the cause of over one-third of all AIDS cases in the United States according to the federal government’s Centers for Disease Control. In 1988, 10,747 people contracted AIDS because of sharing unclean needles. Some of these people never used needles themselves. 226 were men who had sex with women who used needles, 623 were women who had sex with men who used unclean needles and 314 were unborn babies. Over 1,000 people who don’t use drugs were infected because clean needles are illegal. VOTE YES FOR LEGAL, CLEAN NEEDLES!

Pamela Williard Pickens

Proposition O was endorsed by the Central Committee of the Democratic Party of San Francisco on March 21, 1990. VOTE YES!

John Whisman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Clean, legal needles will save lives. Jerry DeJong of the Mayor’s Narcotics Task Force said, “The bottom line is that this is not a moral or legal issue. Unfortunately with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives.” Something is very wrong when its illegal to save lives; and that wrong must be corrected. Tell Sacramento that we want to legalize saving lives. We need clean, legal needles now!

Ron Dorsey

Illegal needles are the primary means of spreading AIDS to minority communities. Most of the IV drug users and their partners who have been infected with AIDS are Black or Latino. Most of the babies born with AIDS because of needle sharing by their mothers are also Black and Latino. Blacks and Latinos are now more likely than ever before to become infected with AIDS because clean needles are illegal. Legal, clean needles will slow down the infection rate and decrease the number of deaths in minority communities. Illegal needles hurt Blacks and Latinos more than they hurt others. Support legal needles.

Jim Peron

Prof. Ethan Nadelman, in the Washington Post, reported that “The governments of England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, the Netherlands and several other countries have actively attempted to limit the spread of AIDS by removing restrictions on the sale of syringes . . . .” Dr. Nadelman notes that there is growing evidence that legal needles do not increase the use of drugs but they do save lives.

George O’Brien

A former prosecutor of high-level drug dealers, Ben Clark, said in The Daily Recorder, a law newspaper, that legal restrictions on clean needles “have had the disastrous effect of forcing drug users to share syringes. Over half the addicts in New York State are infected with AIDS, and the rate of infection among intravenous drug users in Illinois is growing dramatically.”

While some people may say addicts deserve to die, Clark notes, “. . . the issue is not simply whether society should sit back and watch addicts kill themselves off: AIDS transmitted by needles does not stay within the druggie population. Unborn children of AIDS-infected female users may become infected. The sex partners of persons with AIDS are exposed to the disease. Needle-sharing prostitutes interact with the drug-free heterosexual community on a daily basis.” Clark says that clean, legal needles have never been proven to increase drug use but they do save lives. VOTE YES!

Sam Grove

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
There is no scientific evidence that unlimited and uncontrolled availability of hypodermic syringes/needles will stop the spread of AIDS. Proposition “O” would open the floodgates to the purchase and distribution of hypodermic syringes, without prescription, in drug stores, supermarkets and in the streets without medical supervision under the guise of stopping the spread of AIDS. Addicts will continue to commit crimes to pay for the dope since possession and sale of drugs, such as crack cocaine and heroin, will still be illegal.

Latest statistics show that over 80 percent of inmates in our already overcrowded jails are there for illegal drug offenses.

Who will protect the public against the careless disposition of these used needles by addicts?

Black communities in San Francisco are under siege from the sale of illegal drugs and the crime this produces. Approval of Proposition “O” by the voters permitting use of unprescribed legal needles and illegal drugs could leave the City open to millions of dollars in lawsuits for unsupervised use of a medical procedure by intravenous drug addicts from death and other causes.

WE URGE A “NO” VOTE ON PROPOSITION “O”. It should not be City policy to support the removal of all restrictions in the distribution, sale and use of hypodermic syringes.

Rev. Amos Brown
Hon. Naomi Gray
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Senator Quentín Kopp
Dr. Raye Richardson
Lulann McGriff
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Melvin Miles

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION Q

We, the people of the City and County of San Francisco, California, call upon the California State Legislature to eliminate all sanctions, criminal, regulatory, or civil, on the manufacture, use, sale or other distribution of hypodermic syringes. We do this to reduce the spread of AIDS and other diseases.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION K (Continued from page 100)

charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of $100.

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such a time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission after the regular daily working hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

This amendment shall become operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY: AIRPORTS COMMISSION
3.690 Commission; Composition

An airports commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on September 1, 1996. On the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

All rights, claims, actions, orders, obligations, proceedings and contracts relating to the airport department under the public utilities commission existing prior to the effective date of these amendments shall not be affected by the adoption thereof, and shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the airports commission.

This amendment shall be operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY-TWO: PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION
3.698 Commission — Composition

A parking and traffic commission and the department of parking and traffic are hereby established. The parking and traffic commission shall consist of five seven members. If not in conflict with state law, members of the parking and traffic commission shall serve ex-officio as members of the parking authority.

The term of each member shall be for four years; provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section shall, by lot classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided further, that terms of the two commissioners created by the amendment of June, 1990 shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 5th day of December, 1992; and on the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month. Any person may serve concurrently as a member of the San Francisco parking authority and the parking and traffic commission.
Did you know that you can vote before Election Day? Vote absentee in person at City Hall (Room 158) starting May 7 or by mail — fill out the application on the back cover.
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IS GOING TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON ELECTION DAY A PROBLEM?

If you are unable to go to your polling place to vote on Election Day (Tuesday, June 5, 1990), you may vote by absentee ballot in one of two ways:

1. **Vote at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.** Starting on May 7 through June 5, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., you can vote in Room 158 at City Hall.

2. **Vote by mail.** Complete the application for an absentee ballot on the back cover. Tear or cut off the back cover, fold it in half with the address of the Registrar of Voters on the outside, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated, and mail the form.

Voters who have specified disabilities may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Please refer to page 24.

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside
(do not cut or tear off)

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
158 CITY HALL
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
Germaine & Wong

RETURN ADDRESS

signature

signature
ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION

Must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990

June 5, 1990 Consolidated Primary Election

FIRST NAME ____________________________ MIDDLE INITIAL __________ LAST NAME ____________________________

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX OR MAIL DROP ADDRESS)

NUMBER AND STREET ____________________________ CITY ____________________________ ZIP CODE __________

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (if different from above)

P.O. BOX OR STREET ____________________________ CITY ____________________________ STATE __________ ZIP CODE __________

I HAVE NOT AND WILL NOT APPLY FOR AN ABSENTEE BALLOT BY ANY OTHER MEANS.

X ____________________________

SIGNATURE (DO NOT PRINT) ____________________________ DATE __________

DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER ____________________________ EVENING PHONE NUMBER ____________________________

I understand that voters with specified disabilities may qualify as Permanent Absent Voters. See page 24.

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
VOTE!

Polls are open from 7 am to 8 pm.
See the label on the back cover for the location of your polling place.

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet & Sample Ballot

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $49 to $58 (plus bonuses)!
Meet Your Neighbors!
Serve Your Community!

There is a shortage of poll workers in most San Francisco neighborhoods. Voters who are interested in this important work are encouraged to apply as soon as possible at the Registrar’s Office at City Hall. If you apply while there is still a large selection of vacancies, it is probable that you will be assigned to a poll in your own neighborhood.

The Registrar is trying to build a permanent corps of polling officials, therefore housewives and retired people, as well as others who are interested in community service are particularly urged to apply.

The higher-paying and more responsible positions will be reserved for persons who apply in person. Others may mail in the application form provided below:

(The workday is from 6:30 a.m. to about 9:00 p.m., with breaks for lunch and dinner.)

APPLICATION TO SERVE AS ELECTION OFFICIAL

I want to work at the polls on Tuesday, Election Day. Please assign me to a polling place.

Name ____________________________________________

Address ___________________________________ Apt. #________

Telephone No. (required) _________________________________

Do you have an automobile? yes □ no □

Availability:
I want to work in the following area(s): _______________________

Second choice locations (if any) ______________________________

Signature ____________________________________________
# TABLE OF CONTENTS
Voter Information Pamphlet
Consolidated Primary Election June 5, 1990

## GENERAL INFORMATION
- Poll Worker Application .................................................. Inside Front Cover
- Purpose of the Voter Information Pamphlet .......................... 3
- Voting Instructions .......................................................... 4
- Sample Ballot .................................................................... 5-21
- Words You Need to Know ................................................... 22
- Voter Selection Coupon ...................................................... 23
- Voting Accessibility for the Disabled .................................... 24
- Permanent Absentee Voter Application ............................... 24
- Your Rights as a Voter ....................................................... 25
- Local Offices to be Voted on This Election ......................... 25
- Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures ....................... 36
- Absentee Ballot Application ............................................... Back Page
- Location of Your Polling Place .......................................... Back Page
- Index ................................................................................. 130

## CANDIDATES FOR ASSESSOR
- Paul E. Schwenger ............................................................. 26
- Richard D. Hongisto ........................................................... 26
- Wendy Nelder .................................................................. 27
- Ronald G. Kershaw ............................................................ 27

## CANDIDATE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
- Jeff Brown ......................................................................... 28

## CANDIDATES FOR SUPERIOR COURT

### JUDGE, OFFICE #3
- Alex Saldamando ............................................................... 29
- J. Dominique Oloymendy ..................................................... 29

### JUDGE, OFFICE #5
- Kay Tsun ................................................................. 30
- Carlos Bea ........................................................................ 30

## CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL COURT

### JUDGE, OFFICE #1
- James Harrigan ............................................................... 32
- Julie Tang ........................................................................ 32
- Ellen Chaitin .................................................................... 33
- William J. O'Connor ......................................................... 33

### JUDGE, OFFICE #3
- Lillian K. Sing ................................................................. 34
- Jerome A. DeFilippo ......................................................... 34

## PROPOSITIONS
- A Public Safety Improvement Bonds .................................... 37
- B School Facilities Safety Special Tax ................................. 45
- C Equipment Lease Financing ........................................... 51
- D Neighborhood Beautification Fund ................................. 55
- E ...................................................................................... Withdrawn
- F Minimum Firefighter Staffing .......................................... 61
- G Former Supervisor Health Benefits ............................... 75
- H Fire Inspector and Engineer Retirement Benefits ............ 79
- I Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts ............................ 83
- J Human Rights Commission ............................................ 89
- K Seven Member Commissions .......................................... 93
- L Commissioner Residency Requirement ................................ 101
- M Commission Gender Composition .................................. 107
- N Two-Term Limit for Supervisors ..................................... 113
- O Hypodermic Syringes .................................................... 121
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de voto y obtenga otra.

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

D 第一步
请双手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coincidan con los dos cabecitos rojas.

C 第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT UP]. PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de voto y perfora con él la tarjeta de voto en el lugar de sus candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
请把带针之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空白袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>GOVERNADOR (Governor)</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EILEEN ANDERSON</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singer / Cantante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES PINEDA JR.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator / Army Veteran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANKLIN R. GERATY</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Intelligence Agent / Agente Jubilado de Espionaje</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmer-Electrician-Rancher / Granjero-Electricista-Ranchero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LYDON BYRNE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneur / Empresario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIANNE FEINSTEIN</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES A. MAHON III</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman / Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney General, California / Procurador General, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARK CALNEY</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. FRANK WONG</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Systems Engineer / Ingeniero en Sistemas Jubilado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science Teacher / Profesor de Ciencias Políticas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>VICEGOBERNADOR (Lieutenant Governor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEO T. MC CARthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor of California / Vicegobernador de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Secretary of State | MERVIN EVANS  
Business Development Consultant  
Consultor de Desarrollo Empresarial  
商業發展顧問 | Democratic Party | 29     |
| Controller   | MARCH FONG EU  
California Secretary of State  
Secretario de Estado de California  
州務卿 | Democratic Party | 31     |
| Treasurer    | GRAY DAVIS  
Controller of the State of California  
Contralor del Estado de California  
州財務長 | Democratic Party | 36     |
| Treasurer    | KATHLEEN BROWN  
Corporate / Bond Counsel  
Asesora Legal Empresarial / Bonos  
財務顧問 | Democratic Party | 45     |
| Treasurer    | WESLEY SANDERS, JR.  
Municipal Treasurer  
Tesorero Municipal  
市財務長地方財務長 | Democratic Party | 47     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCURADOR GENERAL (検察長)</strong></td>
<td>IRA REINER</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Attorney of Los Angeles County&lt;br&gt;Fiscal del Distrito del Condado de Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attorney General</strong></td>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Attorney of the City and County of San Francisco&lt;br&gt;Fiscal del Distrito de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS (保険委員)</strong></td>
<td>COMISIONADO DE SEGUROS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance Commissioner</strong></td>
<td>CONWAY COLLIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization&lt;br&gt;Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Compensación</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONWAY COLLIS</strong></td>
<td>BILL PRESS</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer Advocacy Commentator&lt;br&gt;Comentarista en Defensa del Consumidor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOHN GARAMENDI</strong></td>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Senator&lt;br&gt;Senador Estatal de California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAY BOURHIS</strong></td>
<td>RAY BOURHIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance Consumers Attorney&lt;br&gt;Abogado de Seguros para los Consumidores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MICHAEL BLANCO</strong></td>
<td>MICHAEL BLANCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living Trust Attorney&lt;br&gt;Abogado Especialista en Fideicomisos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LARRY MURPHY</strong></td>
<td>LARRY MURPHY</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certified Insurance Consultant&lt;br&gt;Consultor Titulado de Seguros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WALTER A. ZELMAN</strong></td>
<td>WALTER A. ZELMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Consumers' Organization&lt;br&gt;Director, Organización de Consumidores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOCRATIC PARTY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>LOUIS JOHN PAPAN</td>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDWARD TABASH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BRAD SHERMAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOM BALDWIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JOSEPH G. COLMAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EMIL G. POLLACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO DEMOCRATA</td>
<td>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS</td>
<td>NANCY PELOSI</td>
<td>United States Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL</td>
<td>State Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES R. WACHOB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERALD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL</td>
<td>Member of the State Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JACKIE SPEIER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. FIGONE</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAITLIN F. CURTIN</td>
<td>Training / Communications Consultant</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB GEARY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH A. TROCHE</td>
<td>Traffic Control Officer</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL HARDEMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXA SMITH</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLOT APTIDUDARIAS</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS</td>
<td>5 DE JUNIO DE 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK ISLER</td>
<td>Retired Teacher, Businessman / Maestro Jubilado, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL S. KOPPEL</td>
<td>Retired Judge, Educator / Juez Jubilado, Educador</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ</td>
<td>College Education Dean / Decano de Educación Terciaria</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEX SALDAMANDO</td>
<td>Judge Municipal Court / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY</td>
<td>Municipal Court Judge / Juez de la Corte, Municipal</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLOS BEA</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAY TSENIN</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME T. BENSON</td>
<td>Superior Court Judge / Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA HITCHENS</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogada</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>William J. O'Connor</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Chaitin</td>
<td>Attorney / Law Teacher / Abogada / Maestra de Derecho</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julie Tang</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney / Fiscal Asistente del Distrito</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Harrigan</td>
<td>Sheriff's Department's Attorney / Abogado del Departamento del Sheriff</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #3</td>
<td>Jerome A. De Filippo</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lillian K. Sing</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Ronald G. Kershaw</td>
<td>Real Estate Portfolio Manager / Administrador de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
<td>Attorney; Member, Board of Supervisors / Abogado; Miembro, Consejo de Supervisores</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td>Supervisor / Supervisor</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Schwenger</td>
<td>Deputy Assessor / Asesor Asistente</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>J. Brown</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular del Cargo</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

107 HOUSING AND HOMELESS BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide funds for a housing program that includes: (1) emergency shelters and transitional housing for homeless families and individuals, (2) new rental housing for families and individuals including rental housing which meets the special needs of the elderly, disabled, and farmworkers, (3) rehabilitation and preservation of older homes and rental housing, and (4) home purchase assistance for first-time homebuyers.

YES 185

NO 187

108 PASSENGER RAIL AND CLEAN AIR BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion dollars ($1,000,000,000) to provide funds for acquisition of rights-of-way, capital expenditures, and acquisitions of rolling stock for intercity rail, commuter rail, and rail transit programs. Appropriates money from state General Fund to pay off bonds. Summary of Legislative Analyst’s estimate of net state and local government fiscal impact: If all authorized bonds are sold at 7.5 percent and paid over the typical 20 year period, the General Fund will incur about $1.8 billion to pay off bond principal ($1 billion) and interest ($790 million). The estimated annual cost of bond principal and interest is $90 million.

YES 189

NO 190

109 GOVERNOR’S REVIEW OF LEGISLATION. LEGISLATIVE DEADLINES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Extends Governor’s time to review proposed legislation. Changes legislation effective date. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 192

NO 193

110 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED PERSONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes taxbase transfer to replacement dwellings by severely disabled persons. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local fiscal effect since it merely authorizes Legislature to implement its provisions. If implemented, tax revenue loss of probably $1 million to $2 million per year.

YES 195

NO 197

111 THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION RELIEF AND SPENDING LIMITATION ACT OF 1990. This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five cent per gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years. This measure updates the state appropriations limit to allow for new funding for congestion relief, mass transit, health care, services for the elderly, and other priority state programs, while still providing for an overall limit on state and local spending. This measure would continue to provide that public education and community colleges receive at least 40% of the state general fund budget, and would provide that revenues in excess of the state appropriations limit are allocated equally between education and taxpayers.

YES 200

NO 203
BAlOTA INDEPENDIENTE
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

185 SI 🇲🇽
ACTA DE SONDOS PARA VIVIENDAS Y PARA PERSONAS SIN VIVIENDA DE 1990.
Esta acta dispone un empréstito de $150,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para un programa de viviendas que incluye: (1) rehabilitación de emergencia y abajo temporal para familias a
instituciones y las necesidades económicas; (2) nuevas viviendas de alquiler para familias y
individuos buscando viviendas de arriendo que tienen las necesidades económicas, (3) rehabilitación y preservación de casas y viviendas de alquiler ya deudas, y (4) asistencia para comprar casa para quienes compran casa por primera vez.

187 NO 🇲🇽

189 SI 🇲🇽
ACTA DE SONDOS PARA FERROCARRILES PARA PASAJEROS PARA USO LIMPIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone un empréstito de $150,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la adquisición de los derechos de vía, desahucios de capital, y para la adquisición de fondos para ferrocarriles en el Estado, de las cuales se debe invertir hasta el 2010.

190 NO 🇲🇽

192 SI 🇲🇽
REVISIÓN DE LEY CONSTITUCIONAL PARA LA GOBERNACIÓN. FECHAS DE VENCIMIENTO PARA LEGISLACIÓN. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Establece el

193 NO 🇲🇽

195 SI 🇲🇽
EXENCIÓN DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD PARA LAS PERSONAS SEVERAMENTE INCAPACITADAS. EMENDA CONSTITUCIONAL. Autoriza la transferencia del impuesto base a viviendas de reemplazo a personas severamente incapacitadas. Impacto fiscal: Ningú

197 NO 🇲🇽

200 SI 🇲🇽
ACTA PARA EL DESCONGESTIONAMIENTO DEL TRÁNSITO Y PARA LIMITACIÓN EN LOS DEBELOMIS DE 1990. Esta medida establece un impuesto adicional al 1% de los costos de construcción de autovías para reducir el congestión del tráfico, y para la adquisición de fondos para ferrocarriles en el Estado.

203 NO 🇲🇽
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Establishes additional state ethics laws. Creates Commission to set elected state officials’ compensation. Mandates public legislative meetings. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs depending on salary and benefits levels established by Commission. Relatively minor state costs for support of Commission, enforcement of measure.</td>
<td>YES 211 NO 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Redefines, expands &quot;peace officer&quot; definitions imposing penalty for murder. Fiscal impact: Unknown state costs as a result of the expansion of the coverage of special circumstance for first degree murder.</td>
<td>YES 218 NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Limits constitutional rights of accused to those afforded by federal Constitution; statutory changes. Fiscal impact: The net fiscal effect of this measure is unknown. The measure makes several significant changes to the criminal justice system. How the measure will be implemented and interpreted is unknown. There may be only a minor fiscal impact on state and local governments, or there may be a major fiscal impact.</td>
<td>YES 222 NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Authorizes $1,990,000,000 general obligation bond issue principally to provide passenger and commuter rail systems. Fiscal impact: Repayment over 20 years would require from the General Fund about $2 billion for principal and $1.6 billion for interest (annual average total of $180 million).</td>
<td>YES 226 NO 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Transfers $30 million to Habitat Conservation Fund, principally to acquire habitat. Restricts taking of mountain lions. Fiscal impact: Estimated annual transfers of $18 million from cigarette and tobacco products surtax; $12 million from General Fund, unless Legislature makes other transfers. Annual $1 million property management costs.</td>
<td>YES 230 NO 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990
PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

211 SI 贏成
FUNCTIONARIOS ESTATUALES. ÉTICA. Establece sanciones disciplinarias y multas por mal uso de dinero público. Impacto fiscalt: Se desconoce el costo al estado que le costaría implementar esta propuesta.

213 NO 反对

215 SI 贏成
PRÁCTICA DE LA QUIROPRÁCTICA. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redacta una ley en el Art 5 de la Juventud y crea un nuevo sistema de educación y locales debido al aumento en las multas.

217 NO 反对

218 SI 贏成
ASESINATO DE UN OFICIAL DEL ORDEN PÚBLICO. PENAS. ENMIENDA LEGISLATIVA DE INICIATIVA. Redacta una ley en el Art 5 de la Juventud, aumenta las multas por mal uso de dinero público. Impacto fiscalt: Se desconoce el costo al estado que le costaría implementar esta propuesta.

220 NO 反对

222 SI 贏成
DERECHO PENAL. ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Limita los derechos constitucionales de los acusados a un proceso penal, prohibiendo la libertad condicional. Impacto fiscalt: Se desconoce el costo al estado que le costaría implementar esta propuesta.

224 NO 反对

226 SI 贏成
TRANSPORTE EN FERROCARRIL. ACTO DE BONOS. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Autoriza el uso de bonos de obligación general por $1,900,000,000 para la construcción y mantenimiento del sistema de transporte por ferrocarril para pasajeros y viajeros de diario. Impacto fiscalt: Se desconoce el costo al estado que le costaría implementar esta propuesta.

228 NO 反对

230 SI 贏成
PROTECCIÓN DE LA VIDA SILVESTRE. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Transfiere $30 millones del Fondo para la Conservación de Árboles Naturales, principalmente para adquirir tierra. Impacto fiscalt: Se desconoce el costo al estado que le costaría implementar esta propuesta.

232 NO 反对

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION. LEDGER. INSTIGATES LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES. Redacta una ley en el Art 5 de la Juventud, aumenta las multas por mal uso de dinero público. Impacto fiscalt: Se desconoce el costo al estado que le costaría implementar esta propuesta.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 5, 1990
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

118 LEGISLATURE. REAPPORTIONMENT. ETHICS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT
AND STATUTE. Redistricting subject to 2/3 legislative vote, voter approval. Legislative Ethics Committee
created. Fiscal impact: Savings from limit on reapportionment expenditures could be all or partially offset by
costs of public vote and possible court redistricting. Costs of ethics provisions are probably minor.
YES 236  NO 238

119 REAPPORTIONMENT BY COMMISSION. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. STAT-
UTE. Establishes reapportionment by Commission, district population criteria. 1992 election for all legisla-
tive seats. Fiscal impact: Limit on funding would reduce reapportionment costs by several millions of dollars
each decade. If undertaken by Supreme Court, state costs would increase, offsetting savings.
YES 240  NO 242

120 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT OF 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of four hundred
fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds to relieve overcrowding in the state’s prisons and the
Youth Authority facilities through new construction.
YES 243  NO 245

121 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1990. This act provides for a bond issue of
four hundred fifty million dollars ($450,000,000) to provide funds for the construction or improvement of
facilities of California's public higher education institutions, which include the University of California’s
nine campuses, the California State University’s 20 campuses, the 71 districts of the California Community
Colleges, the Hastings College of the Law, the California Maritime Academy, and off-campus facilities of
the California State University approved by the Trustees of the California State University on or before July
1, 1990. The use of funds authorized under this act includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the construction
or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and the implementation of earthquake and other
health or safety improvements.
YES 248  NO 250

122 EARTHQUAKE SAFETY AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS REHABILITATION BOND ACT OF 1990. This
act provides for a bond issue of three hundred million dollars ($300,000,000) to provide funds for the
reconstruction, seismic retrofitting, repair, replacement, and relocation of state and local government
buildings which are unsafe primarily due to earthquake-related dangers.
YES 254  NO 256

123 1990 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of eight hundred million dollars
($800,000,000), to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.
YES 258  NO 259
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — ESTATAL

236 SI 负

LEGISLATURA, REDISTRIBUCIÓN, ÉTICA, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Rechaza la redistribución de distritos a las 2/3 partes de la elección legislativa y aprobación de las iniciativas. Se crea en Comité de Ética Legislativa, Impacto Fiscal: Las 3/4 partes de la redistribución de los distritos por redemarcación de las localidades por 10 años, incluyendo los distritos de California. Los costos por las disposiciones de dichos distritos no son probablemente menores.

238 NO 反对

REDISTRIBUCION FOR COMISIÓN, ENMIENDA Y ESTATUTO CONSTITUCIONAL DE INICIATIVA. Establece la redistribución de distritos mediante una comisión, los criterios de población en los distritos y las elecciones en 1992 para todos los cargos legislativos. Impacto Fiscal: La redistribución de los distritos de California reduciría los costos de la redistribución en varios millones de dólares cada década. De hacerse cargo la Corte Suprema, los costos estatales aumentarían, disminuyendo las ahorros.

240 SI 负

1990年新监狱建筑的公债法案，此法案将发行公债$450,000,000，用以提供资金来建筑新监狱，以及改善监狱和青少年拘留所的清况。

242 NO 反对

243 SI 负

ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para el alivio del congestionamiento en las prisiones estatales y en las instalaciones de la Autoridad de Menores por medio de nueva construcción.

245 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES DE EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por cuatrocientos cincuenta millones de dólares ($450,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de educación superior pública de California, las cuales incluyen los nuevos recintos de la Universidad de California, los 20 recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California, los 71 distritos de los Colegios Superiores de Comunidad de California, el Colegio Superior de Leyes “Hastings,” la Academia Marítima de California, y las instalaciones fuera de los recintos de la Universidad Estatal de California aprobadas por el Consejo Administrativo de la Universidad Estatal de California para el 1 de julio de 1990 inclusive. El uso de los fondos autorizados esta acta incluye, pero no se limita necesariamente, a la construcción o mejoramiento de los salones de clase, laboratorios y bibliotecas, y el establecimiento de medidas de seguridad contra terremotos y mejorías para la salubridad y seguridad.

248 SI 负

1990年6月的高等教育建筑公债法案。此法案将发行公债$450,000,000，用以提供资金来建筑加州州立大学、州立大学的20个分校，州立社区大学的71个分校，圣塔尼斯（HASTINGS）法学院，用以提供研究及州立大学的教育会于1990年7月1日或在此之前通过批准的其它高校建筑。此法案将批准资金的使用，将包括但不限于实验室、实验室、图书馆的建筑设计及施工，以及救灾防灾，其他建筑或安全的设备。

250 NO 反对

254 SI 负

ACTA DE BONOS PARA SEGURIDAD CONTRA SISMOS Y REHABILITACIÓN DE EDIFICIOS PÚBLICOS DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por trescientos millones de dólares ($300,000,000) para proporcionar fondos para la reconstrucción, adiciones a prueba de sismos, reparación, remodelación y edificios de edificios gubernamentales estatales y locales que sean inseguros principalmente en cuanto a sus peligros relacionados con terremotos.

256 NO 反对

1990年防震安全设备及公共楼宇重建公债法案。此法案将发行公债$300,000,000，用以提供资金来重建、改善防灾安全设备、校园、桥梁及道路等因受地震损害而变为危险的州及市政府楼宇。

258 SI 负

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1990. Esta acta dispone una emisión de bonos por ochocientos millones de dólares ($800,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para construcción o mejorías de escuelas públicas.

259 NO 反对

1990年学校建筑公债法案。此法案将发行公债$800,000,000，用以提供资金来兴建或改善学校的建筑。
### A
PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

**YES 263**

**NO 265**

### B
Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (i) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (ii) seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (iii) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (iv) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

**YES 269**

**NO 272**

### C
Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

**YES 277**

**NO 278**

### D
Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

**YES 280**

**NO 281**

### E
WITHDRAWN

### F
Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

**YES 284**

**NO 285**
BALOTA INDEPENDIENTE

CUIDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO, ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 5 DE JUNIO DE 1990

PROPOSICIONES A SER SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

269 SI 寫成

Tendrá el Distrito No. 8-1-4 de Instalaciones Comunitarias del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco la autorización de financiar: (1) la reparación, la restauración, y el remodelamiento de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco; (2) la mejora estética de los centros infantiles y demás instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco; (3) la rectificación de las violaciones de seguridad contra incendios en las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y (4) la conservación, limpieza y mantenimiento de las instalaciones del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco, y ciertos gastos varían relacionados a los anteriores por medio de la recaudación de un impuesto especial a ser recabado durante veinte (20) años con una tasa anual (a) para parcelas residenciales de familias únicas y parcelas no residenciales de $4,00 por parcela durante los primeros seis (6) años y $32.29 por parcela durante los años (14) años siguientes al costo año, y (b) para parcelas de uso mixto (parcelas con una o más unidades residenciales además de uno o más usos comerciales) y parcelas residenciales de varias familias, y parcelas residenciales de $4,00 por unidad de vivienda durante los años (6) primeros años y de $1.15 por unidad de vivienda durante los años (14) siguientes al costo año, con las definiciones de parcelas residenciales de familias únicas, para varias familias, de uso mixto y no residenciales, y los detalles relativos al método de distribución y las tasas máximas, las exenciones para parcelas residenciales, ciertos terrenos y edificios de propiedad pública, y otros asuntos, tal como se dispone con mayores detalles en la resolución No. 82-13-31 adoptada por el Consejo de Educación del Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco el 12 de febrero de 1990, y deberá establecerse un límite de apropiaciones de instalaciones Comunitarias.

272 NO 反對

¿Tendrá el Consejo de Supervisores, sin la aprobación de los electores y sujetos a límites de deuda especificados, la autorización de aprobar el financiamiento por el impuesto alquiler para una empresa sin fines de lucro, si el Contralor certifica que el costo neto en intereses a la Ciudad será menor que el mismo bajo otros tipos de financiamiento por alquiler?

277 SI 寫成

¿Crear la Ciudad un fondo de Embellecimiento del Vecindario y Limpieza de las Escuelas en las Parcelas para pagar por embellecer los vecindarios de la Ciudad y limpiar las escuelas de las parcelas, permitiendo que las empresas dispongan de un porcentaje de sus ingresos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje en cada año?

280 SI 寫成

¿Realizará una emisión a la Carta Constitucional para: (1) cambiar la semana normal de trabajo de 40,7 horas (después de lo cual un bombazo gana horas extra) y permitir establecer que la Comisión de Control de Trabajo establecerá por medio de una encuesta, establezca la duración y los horarios de comienzo de los turnos de los bomberos, en vez de requerir turnos de 24 horas que comienzan a las 6 a.m.?

281 NO 反對

335 SI 寫成

¿Por más y mejor buen gobierno, y para que, después de las elecciones presidenciales, los gobiernos locales puedan continuar su labor de restauración, la Comisión de Control de Trabajo establecerá un porcentaje de sus ingresos comerciales a dicho fondo, con un ajuste anual de este porcentaje en cada año?

ELIMINADA

284 SI 寫成

285 NO 反對
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?</td>
<td>YES 288</td>
<td>NO 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?</td>
<td>YES 290</td>
<td>NO 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?</td>
<td>YES 293</td>
<td>NO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?</td>
<td>YES 296</td>
<td>NO 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?</td>
<td>YES 298</td>
<td>NO 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?</td>
<td>YES 300</td>
<td>NO 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?</td>
<td>YES 302</td>
<td>NO 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?</td>
<td>YES 305</td>
<td>NO 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?</td>
<td>YES 309</td>
<td>NO 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposición</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Texto</td>
<td>SIGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>Tendrá el Concejo de Supervisores la autorización de permitir a los ex-Supervisores permanecer dentro del Sistema de Servicio de Salud de la Ciudad. En caso que paguen el costo completo?</td>
<td>市參加會是否應容許曾任市參議員繼續參加本市的健康服務制度 如果他們支付全部費用？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>Tendrá el Concejo de Supervisores la autorización de celebrar contratos con el Sistema de Jubilación de Empleados Públicos del Estado (PERS) para que los inspectores de seguridad contra incendios y los ingenieros de protección contra incendios de la Ciudad sean miembros del PERS en vez de serlos del Sistema de Jubilación de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando esto no implique un costo adicional para la Ciudad?</td>
<td>市參議員會是否應與加州公務員退休制度 (PERS) 契約以便使市防火安全檢查官及防火工程師成爲公務員退休制度的會員而不需本市退休制度只要市政府不須付附加的費用？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>Se permitirá que los miembros jubilados dentro del sistema de jubilación de la Ciudad celebren contratos de consultores con el Distrito Escolar Unificado de San Francisco o el Distrito de Colegios Comunitarios de San Francisco sin perder sus beneficios de jubilación?</td>
<td>現屬退休制度的退休教職員與三藩市聯合校區或三藩市社區大學簽約作諮詢顧問而不失掉他們的退休權益？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>¿Será la Comisión sobre los Derechos Humanos una comisión de la Carta Constitucional y se reducirá su tamaño de quince a once miembros?</td>
<td>市委員會是否應成爲市憲法委員會，並且會員人數維持15名至11名？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>¿Se aumentará el tamaño de las Comisiones de Policía, Bomberos, Servicios Sociales, Puerto, Servicios Públicos, Servicio Social, Aeropuertos y Estacionamiento y Tráfico, y de Consejo de Apelaciones de Parques de cinco a siete miembros?</td>
<td>市警務、消防、社會服務、海港、公用事業、社會福利、航空港和停車和交通以及行政訴訟委員會的委員會人數將從5名增至7名？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>¿Serán miembros de los consejeros y las comisiones de la Carta Constitucional sean miembros de la Ciudad y que sean servidores a la ciudad de otras comisiones, comisiones y cuerpos municipales de la Ciudad, siempre y cuando este requisito no se aplique a ciertos consejeros nombrados, o a los cuáles se requiera una persona con experiencia, especialidad o aptitudes especializadas y no puede encontrarse ningún residente de San Francisco que acepte con esas condiciones?</td>
<td>設約時委員會委任一部分的委員會作為本城委員會以及服務於城市的委員會、委員會和政府部門的委員會，必須具備此類特別能力和經驗，且無法找到任何居住於舊金山市的人員去接受此種條件？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>¿Se enmendará la Carta Constitucional para lograr que ningún consejo o comisión nombrados por el Alcalde o dispuesto por otra manera mediante la Carta Constitucional, con excepción de la Comisión de Estudio de las Mujeres, tenga más que una mayoría unitaria de miembros del mismo sexo?</td>
<td>除婦女委員會外，市憲法是否應規定設立一個具男性或具女性的委員會或委員會應否有過半的同性別委員？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>¿Se prohibirá que alguien preste servicio durante más de dos períodos consecutivos de cuatro años en el Consejo de Supervisores, y se prohibirá que dicha persona preste servicio como Supervisor nuevamente hasta que hayan transcurrido cuatro años, siempre y cuando los Supervisores que estén en sus puestos el 1 de julio de 1990 se consideren haber prestado servicio durante un período completo de cuatro años cuando termine su período actual?</td>
<td>市民法律禁止任何人在市議會連續任滿兩期的「一期」市議員及議員等四年過後才可再任市議會？而1990年7月1日起在任的市議員如當年未滿一期「四年」的議員？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 SI</td>
<td>赞成</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de San Francisco solicitar a la Legislatura del Estado que eliminen todas las penas criminales y civiles referentes a la fabricación, el uso, o la distribución de aguas hipodérmicas?</td>
<td>市民有意政策來要求加州立法取消之非法製造、使用，銷售或分發涉及刺激性毒品？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 51, N 52 & N 53
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — If you do not wish to go to your polling place to vote, you may vote by mail or by going to the Registrar’s Office in City Hall in person. This is called absentee voting.

BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, it may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City then pays back this money plus interest.


CHARTER BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (PROPOSITION J, K, L) — Boards and commissions created by the Charter, either directly or indirectly.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITION O) — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve a declaration of policy, the Board of Supervisors must carry out the policy, to the extent legally possible.

DEFERRED CAPITAL MAINTENANCE (PROPOSITION B) — Major building repair projects that have been postponed.

ELECTOR (PROPOSITION L) — A person who is eligible to register to vote.

FINANCE (PROPOSITION C) — Various ways to pay for something over time. This may include raising money or offering something in trade.

FISCAL YEAR (PROPOSITION A, D) — The twelve months from July 1 to June 30 make up a fiscal year. The City budgets revenues and expenses on a fiscal year basis.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS (PROPOSITION A) — The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INITIATIVE (PROPOSITION F, O) — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE (PROPOSITION D, J) — A law of the City and County, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters. For such a law to be passed by the Board of Supervisors, a majority, (or in some cases, three-fourths) of the Supervisors must vote to approve the law at two consecutive meetings.

OUTSTANDING PRINCIPAL (PROPOSITION A, C) — The actual amount of borrowed money, not yet paid back. Principal does not include interest charges.

PRIMARY ELECTION — An election to decide who will be a political party’s candidates for the general election the following November. For each office there may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE for each office you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent or has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A person who has turned in the required papers and signatures with the Registrar of Voters to run for an office as a write-in candidate. The name of this person will not be on the ballot. Voters who want to vote for this person can do so by writing the name of the person on the inside of the grey envelope given with the ballot.

SPECIAL PROPERTY TAX [MELLO-ROOS DISTRICT] (PROPOSITION B) — A flat tax on a parcel of land, which is not based on the property’s value. The special tax would be in addition to current property taxes. This tax requires a two-thirds majority vote.

STAFFING LEVEL (PROPOSITION F) — The number of employees on duty at any one time.

TAX EXEMPT DEBT (PROPOSITION C) — Money borrowed by the City which is paid back with interest. The lenders are not taxed on the money earned from these loans.

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares digests ("The Way It Is Now,""The Proposal,""A 'Yes' Vote Means,"" and ""A 'No' Vote Means") of measures placed on the ballot each election, and with the assistance of the Registrar of Voters, prepares the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of basic voters’ rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each elective office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE</th>
<th>SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 1S</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 1</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 3</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE – OFFICE 3</th>
<th>ASSESSOR</th>
<th>LOCAL PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNOR</td>
<td>(Check Ballot for the number of candidates to vote for)</td>
<td>118 236 238</td>
<td>119 240 242</td>
<td>120 243 245</td>
<td>121 248 250</td>
<td>122 254 256</td>
<td>123 258 259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT. GOVERNOR</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECRETARY OF STATE</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROLLER</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURER</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTORNEY GENERAL</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE COMMISSIONER</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, BOARD OF EQUALIZATION</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CUT OUT THIS COUPON AND TAKE IT WITH YOU TO THE POLLS. After reading this pamphlet, write down the names of the candidates of your choice, and circle the numbers corresponding to "YES" or "NO" on the propositions. Completing this coupon will help you vote faster and help reduce lines at the polls. PLEASE NOTE — This is a Primary Election. You can only vote for partisan offices if you are registered as a member of a party, and if there are candidates from your party running.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, and Molly Wood

Board of Supervisors appointees: Roger Cardenas, Martha Gilham, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, and Richmond Young

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that absentee ballots be mailed to them or they may vote in person at City Hall from May 7 through June 5 during normal working hours (see "Your Rights as a Voter" section of this pamphlet). In addition, voters with specified disabilities enumerated below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library’s Branch for the Blind at 3150 Sacramento Street produces and distributes tape recorded copies of the State and Local Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually-impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voter’s office by calling 554-4386.

ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them. The persons providing assistance may be someone who came with the voter, or poll workers can be asked to provide needed assistance.

CURBSIDE VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the sidewalk in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If your polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided that this will not impede the flow of traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large print instructions on how to vote and magnifying sheets to enlarge the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows for seated voting.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip tool and pen to be used in punching the ballot and signing in.

APPLICATION TO BE A PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER

The physically disabled may apply to be permanent absentee voters. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, you will automatically receive an absentee ballot every election until you move or re-register.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the form below and return it to the Registrar of Voters. Room 158, City Hall, San Francisco, 94102. Each time you move or re-register to vote, you must apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases you do not need to re-apply.

I hereby apply for “Permanent Absentee Voter” status in San Francisco by reason of:

____ Lost use of one or more limbs.  ____ Lost use of both hands.

____ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g. cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair).

____ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease.

____ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities.

____ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

____ PLEASE SEE EXPLANATORY LETTER ATTACHED.

Name

FIRST

MIDDLE

LAST

STREET

AFT.#

Residence Address

STREET

CITY

ZIP CODE

Mailing Address

(if different than residence address given above)

I declare under penalty of Perjury that the above is true and correct:

Date __________________ Signature __________________

(Return only this page; do not return the whole book)
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens over 18 years old who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 8, 1990.

Q — I moved before May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 7; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 8 and June 5, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — If you are registered as a member of a political party you may choose a candidate for:
Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Insurance Commissioner, Member-State Board of Equalization (District 2), Member-State Assembly, State Senator if you live in Senate District 8, United States Representative, and members of the County Central Committee.
Non-partisan offices are:
Superintendent of Public Instruction, Superior Court Judge, Municipal Court Judge, Assessor and Public Defender.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 5, 1990. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. that day.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let us know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the poll workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help you.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, you can write in the name of the person. If you don’t know how to do this, ask one of the poll workers to help you. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any test?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to my polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 5 by:
• going to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall from May 7 through June 5, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday; or
• mailing in a request for an absentee ballot. You may send in the application for an absentee ballot printed on the back cover of this book. The application must be received by the Registrar of Voters before May 29, 1990.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for an absentee ballot. This letter should include:
• your home address
• the address to which you want the ballot mailed
• your printed name and your signature.
Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 29, 1990.

LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

ASSESSOR
The term of office for the Assessor is four years. The Assessor is paid $98,670 a year.
The Assessor decides what property in the City is subject to tax, and the value of that property for tax purposes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER
The term of office for the Public Defender is four years. The Public Defender is paid $102,882 a year.
The Public Defender represents the following persons unable to pay for their own lawyer: 1) persons accused of crimes, 2) juveniles in legal actions, and 3) persons in mental health hearings.
Candidates for Assessor

PAUL E. SCHWENGER

My address is 16 Ord Court, Apt. #4
My occupation is Deputy Assessor
My age is 53
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Francisco, Mission High School graduate, and San Francisco State University graduate. I have been a Deputy Assessor for San Francisco for the past 22 years. I have been awarded the SRPA, Senior Real Property Designation, which is one of the highest awards for professional appraisers. My 22 years of experience will enable me to effectively represent homeowners' and renters' concerns before State Legislative Committees. I will analyze property values to make sure business pays its fair share and I will oversee the operations of the Assessor’s office in an experienced and professional manner.

Paul E. Schwenger

The sponsors for Paul E. Schwenger are:


RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 1848 Pine Street
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: With 28 years of public service, I am the only candidate with real management experience.

As Sheriff of San Francisco, I managed 399 employees; as Police Chief, 2,500; as New York Prison Commissioner, 13,000.

While this would be the largest managerial responsibility faced by the other candidates, it would be my smallest.

I want to be your assessor so I can make it a model agency. I know government and real estate. I am dedicated to public service and to lower taxes for you.

Mayor Agnos agrees I am the rational choice.
I would appreciate your vote.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Attorney/Supervisor
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have absolutely no ownership or income interests in real property which create any conflict of interest as Assessor.

As attorney for 25 years, Supervisor for three terms, and past President of the Board, I have a proven record of unique, practical accomplishments.

Just as I’ve fought for reduced local government spending, I’ll work for new statewide lower assessment formulas with the same energy that created the nationally copied No-Smoking Ordinance; the Police Fingerprint Computer which reduced our crime rate; laws allowing earthquake victims to quickly replace damaged buildings.

My goal is to achieve fair, reduced property assessments.

Wendy Nelder

The sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred S. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Retired Chief of Police.
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1200 Gough St. #20D, Attorney-Legislator.
Nancy Pelosi, 2640 Broadway, Member of Congress. John Burton, 712 Vermont, Assemblyman.
Jim Gonzalez, 642 Edinburgh, Member, Board of Supervisors.
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th Street, Community College Board.
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired City Treasurer.
Sam Duca, 16 Wawona St., Assessor.
John J. Lo Schiavo, 650 Parker Avenue, President—USF.
David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., University Professor, UCSF.
Sophie Hoffman, 2825 Lake St., Chairman, Salvation Army, Advisory Bd. Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett Ave. #4, Teachers’ Union President.
Collin P. Quock, 140 Casitas Avenue, Physician.
Richard Rodriguez, 37 Brentwood Ave., Vice President Teamsters.
Sam Jordan, 4006 3rd St., Caterer.
Alfred D. Trigueiro, 1956 Stockton St., Police Officers Association Official.
Lawrence W. Martin, 401 Garfield Street, International Representative, Transport Workers Union.
John Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Journalist.
Louis G. Spadina, 1177 California St. #315, President, Bay Area Sports Hall of Fame.
Mary Frances Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Businesswoman.
Stanley M. Smith, 15 Hearst Ave., Labor Union Official.
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Assistant to Speaker.
John J. Moylan, 2985 24th Ave., Labor Leader.

RONALD G. KERSHAW

My address is 3533 21st Street
My occupation is Real Estate Portfolio Manager
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are: B.S. Accounting, Brigham Young University 1975
MBA Real Estate, Golden Gate University 1986
Eleven years experience in all aspects of property management, appraisals, renovation and property sales
Currently responsible for supervising a real estate portfolio of $150,000,000
Past President SF Chapter, Institute of Internal Auditors
Currently, President, Log Cabin Club of San Francisco
San Francisco homeowner and resident since 1975.
San Francisco needs a fiscal conservative who is the only qualified candidate to become the City's new Assessor.

Ronald G. Kershaw

The sponsors for Ronald G. Kershaw are:

Christopher L. Bowman, 39 Fair Oaks #303, Political Consultant.
Nicolle Brien, 147 10th Ave., Secretary.
Honor H. Bulkley, 3 Downey St., Property Manager.
Albert C. Chang, 1328 Wawona St., Realtor.
Rose Chung, 2161 Mason St., Radiologic Technologist.
Theresa L. Claussen, 1940 Broadway, Retired Social Worker.
James Fang, 170 Gellert Drive, Journalist.
Wade Francois, 2436 15th Ave., Lawyer.
William E. Grayson, 95 Sea Cliff, Attorney.
Jun Retsu Hayotama, 150 Glenbrook, Political Consultant.
James L. Howard, 839 41st Ave., Child Welfare Supervisor.
Ronald G. Kershaw, 3533 21st Street, Real Estate Portfolio Manager.
Leonard J. Lacyo, 925 Persia Ave., Consultant.
Tung C. Lee, 1312 California, President, Chinese Times Newspaper.
Christina I. Mack, 2963 23rd Ave., Accountant.
Nancy A. Nichols, 1032 Broadway, Archeologist.
George H. Pfau, Jr., 2298 Vallego St., Stockbroker.
Emily G. Pike, 1800 Broadway, Retired.
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Owner, Andre’s TV.
Helen Skripkin, 347 14th Avenue, Retired.

Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidate for Public Defender

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850.40th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender represents people in trouble who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. The responsibility must be performed ethically, competently, and efficiently. During three terms in office, with the help of a superb staff of men and women, that duty has been fulfilled with compassion, dignity, and with the highest professional standards of the American legal system.

In the next term, I pledge to continue to carry out the special trust of this office: to guarantee that everyone in this City has the full benefit of our Constitution and is treated with fairness and with justice.

Jeff Brown

The sponsors for Jeff Brown are:


Statements are submitted by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #3

ALEX SALDAMANDO

My address is 700 Arkansas Street
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: In my 11 years presiding as a Municipal Court Judge, I have worked to protect the citizens of San Francisco. I have delivered justice swiftly and firmly, in a fair and impartial manner. As a Superior Court Judge, I would bring the same approach to felony criminal cases and complex civil disputes. I am currently President of the California Judges Foundation. My background includes experience as a prosecutor and a public interest lawyer. A graduate of the University of California (Berkeley) and Hastings College of Law, I live with my wife and two children on Potrero Hill.

My sponsors include: Judge Ira Brown, Jr.; Judge John Dearman; Judge Isabella Grant; Judge Ed Stern; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Lilian Sing; Former Judge Charles Renfrew; Mayor Art Agnos; Former Mayor Diane Feinstein; Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi; Assemblyman Willie Brown; Assemblyman John Burton; Superintendent of Public Instruction Bill Honig; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Harry Britt; Supervisor Jim Gonzalez; Supervisor Terence Hallinan; Supervisor Willie Kennedy; School Board Member Rosario Anaya; School Board Member Libby Dennebein; School Board Member Fred Rodriguez; Commissioner Paul Melbostad; Larry Mazzola, President, Local 38; Thelma Shelley, Director, Performing Arts Center; Benny Yee; Stan Smith, Building Trades Council; and Police Commissioner John Keker.

Alex Saldamando

J. DOMINIQUE OLCOMENDY

My address is 340 Magellan
My occupation is Municipal Court Judge
My qualifications for office are: I am a Municipal Court Judge since 1974, native Californian, resident San Francisco since 1937; attended local schools, N.D.V., St. Ignatius, USF and USF School of Law; married Patricia M. Berti, admitted State Bar 1960, devoted thirty years to public service; adjunct Professor of Law, USF; participant, member and/or lecturer for many organizations — Salesian Boys Club, 44 years — Municipal Court Speakers Bureau — California Judges Association — California Center for Judicial Education and Research — San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project; Supervising Judge, Preliminary Courts, Presiding Judge, Assistant Presiding Judge, Court Administrative Committee member eight years; honored by: San Francisco Board of Supervisors, Irish-Israeli-Italian Society, San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, Lawyers Club, USF School of Law and USF Law Society for outstanding community service.


J. Dominique Olcomandy

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Superior Court Judge
Office #5

KAY TSEININ

My address is 637 Steiner Street
My occupation is Attorney and Counselor at Law
My age is 43 years
My qualifications for office are: B.A., San Francisco State University (Dean’s List), graduate, University of San Francisco School of Law. Attorney for sixteen years specializing in civil litigation. Pro-Tem Municipal Court Judge in San Francisco for five years.

Born in China, moved to San Francisco as a child, graduate of George Washington High School.

Broad Community service includes founding of environmental law societies while in law school, Vice President for Legal Affairs for California National Organization for Women (NOW), Board Member for the Russian American Credit Union and San Francisco Trial Lawyers and Board Advisor for the Legal Advocates for Women. Vice-President, Alamo Square Neighborhood Association.

Strong commitment to equal justice for all without prejudice or bias. The following San Franciscans support me because they feel that the Superior Court needs a judge with my background, legal expertise and perspective on the law:


Kay Tsein

CARLOS BEA

My address is 2727 Pierce Street
My occupation is Judge Superior Court #5
My qualifications for office are: I am a Superior Court Judge in San Francisco and author of articles in several professional journals, such as California Trial Lawyers and Defense Research Institute’s. Am recognized by the State Bar for pro bono work with members of the Hispanic Community. Have served two terms as a member of the Board of Visitors, Stanford Law School. Was a panelist and lecturer for the Continuing Education of the Bar. Was an adjunct professor, Hastings College of Law and Stanford Law School. I graduated from Stanford Law School and have been an attorney in San Francisco since 1959.

Sponsors include: Presiding Judge of the Superior Court Ollie Marie-Victoire, all the judges of the Superior Court, Angela Alioto, Ernest Chuck Ayala, Willie Brown, Jr., John Burton, Jim Gonzalez, Quentin Kopp, H. Jesse Arnelle, James Herman, Mary Noel Pepys, Robert McDonnell, G. Joseph Bertan, Edward McFetridge, Zeppelin Wong, Paul Renne, Leo Murphy, Jr., Gina Moscone, James Brosnahan, Barbara Caulfield, Robert Morales, Paul Haerle, Michael Hardeman, Howard Nemerovski, Edwin Heafey, Jr., Larry Mazzola, Vincent Friia, Putnam Livermore, William Coblenz.

Carlos Bea

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DONNA HITCHENS

My address is 468 30th Street
My occupation is attorney
My age is 42 years

My qualifications for office are: Over the past thirteen years, I have represented clients in San Francisco courts, taught law to San Francisco students and served on the Boards of Directors of private and public agencies designed to further the cause of justice in our city.

My experience as a mediator, counselor and advocate demonstrates my willingness to pursue alternative dispute resolutions. Judicial leadership and integrity are standards that the community should demand. My record attests to my ability to meet those standards.

- J.D. UC Berkeley 1977
- Staff Attorney, Equal Rights Advocates, a public interest firm specializing in sex discrimination cases. 1978 – 1984
- Co-founder, Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom
- Staff Counsel, ACLU. 1984 – 85
- Partner, Hitchens & Brenner. Small Business, non-profit corporations, civil rights and family law. Presently
- Former chair, San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women.
- Member, Board of Directors, Pacific Primary PreSchool.

SUPPORT: Assemblymember John Burton; Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisors Nancy Walker, Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, and Terence Hallinan; Judge Lillian Sing, Judge Mary Morgan, and Judge Herbert Donaldson; Commissioners Jim Jefferson, Adrian Bermudez, Jr., James Morales, Paul Melbostad, Richard Grosboll, and Leni Marin; Hon. Libby Deneheim; Hon. Leland Yee; Carol Migden; Will Leong; Catherine Dodd, R.N.; Jeff Mori, and Mauri Schwartz

Jerome T. Benson

My address is 187 Robinhood Drive
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the Superior Court
My age is 50

My qualifications for office are:
- 23 years public service in the courtroom protecting victims, litigants and the community.
- 7 years as Chief of the Criminal Division in the District Attorney’s Office including:
  - 65 felony jury trial prosecutions for murder, rape, child abuse, drugs, white-collar fraud.
  - Stanford Law School graduate 1964.
  - Chairman, State Bar of California Subcommittee on Jury Instructions (Criminal).
  - Member, Project Safer California.
  - Fair and equal application of the law without regard to race, sex, or economic status.
  - I am a native San Franciscoan and homeowner living with my wife and two daughters near Miraloma Park.
  - My judicial office is dedicated to fair rulings, hard work, human sensitivity, and legal equality.

CITYWIDE SUPPORT:
  State Senator Quentin Kopp; Justice Harry Low; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Public Defender Jeff Brown; Sheriff Michael Hennessey; Former Chief of Police Alfred Nelder.

SUPERVISORS:
  Angela Alioto, Tom Hsieh, Wendy Nelder;

JUDGES:
  John Ertola, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Ina Gyzmant, Paul Alvarado, Isabella Grant;

LABOR:
  Mike Hardeman, Stan Smith, Kevin Ryan;

ATTORNEYS AND COMMUNITY:
  William Coblenz; Harold Dobbs; Charles Breyer; Airport Commission President Morris Bernstein; Wayne Friday; Benny Yee; Louis Giraudo; Doris Thomas; Christopher Bowman; Haddie Redd; Elizabeth Aguilar-Tarchi; Ron Huberman;

Donna Hitchens

Jerome T. Benson

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge  
Office #1

JAMES HARRIGAN

My address is 494 Mangels St.
My occupation is Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department.
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I live in Glen Park with my wife, Serena Lee, and our three children.
I received my law degree with academic awards and Law Review distinction in 1975 from Golden Gate University, San Francisco.

I have completed more than 80 jury and court trials in Municipal and Superior Court, representing thousands of citizens and victims of crime in civil and criminal cases in private practice, as a public defender, and as Legal Counsel to the Sheriff.

My expertise includes: employment law, labor relations, criminal, landlord/tenant, and constitutional law. As Counsel to the Sheriff, I resolve the legal affairs of a major law enforcement agency. My work brings me before the civil and criminal justice system each day.

“James Harrigan is by far the best qualified candidate. No other candidate has his broad range of experience: public service and private practice; law enforcement and defense law; extensive courtroom experience and administrative expertise. I strongly urge your vote for James Harrigan.”

— Sheriff Michael Hennessey

I have not listed my sponsors. I firmly believe the voter’s decision should be based on one’s qualifications and experience — not on political connections.
I pledge equal application of the law. I ask for your support.
Thank you.

James Harrigan

JULIE TANG

My address is 788 18th Ave.
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My qualifications for office are: What I am in life, I owe to my family and to an excellent education: M.A., counseling, Stanford University; B.A., psychology, University of San Francisco; Juris Doctorate, Hastings College of Law. I began practicing law in 1982 and have been an assistant district attorney since 1983: with experience in criminal prosecution and family law enforcing child support. I have served 10 years on the College Board; my colleagues elected me president three terms because of my firm but fair judgment. My duties include equitably settling conflicts, grievances and contracts. In my years of public service, compassion, integrity and common sense have always guided my decisions; and as a judge that will continue to be the case.

My supporters:
Justice Harry Low
Judges: Isabella Grant, Lenard Louie, David Garcia, Larry Kay, Mary Morgan, Bill Mallen, Herbert Donaldson.
District Attorney: Arlo Smith
Public Defender: Jeff Brown
Senators: Milton Marks, Quentin Kopp
Attorneys: Charlie Clifford, Harriet Ross, William Coblenz, Cedric Chao, Roberta Achtenberg
BART Director: Mike Bernick
Commissioners: Rosario Anaya, Tim Wolfred, Chuck Ayala, Naomi Gray.
Supervisors: Thomas Hsieh, Angela Alioto
Walter Johnson; Alex Esclamado; Reverend Amos Brown;
Carole Migden;
UC Regent Yori Wada.

Julie Tang

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I'm honored that MAYOR ART AGNOS and 8 PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION — who know my courtroom experience and qualifications in civil and criminal law — endorse me.

As a lawyer in private practice 18 years, mother of 2 children, married 19 years, I care about the strength and integrity of San Francisco's courts.

A judgesship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred community trust — not a consolation prize for a restless politician. A lawyer lacking courtroom experience is unqualified to be judge.

In HUNDREDS of court appearances and trials, as chair of the Bar Association Criminal Justice Advisory Council, as a San Francisco Delinquency Prevention Commissioner, and as a Hastings Law School teacher, I have demonstrated a longstanding commitment to professional excellence.

Community and law enforcement leaders who acknowledge my legal service and endorse me:

SPEAKER Willie Brown
SUPERVISORS Nancy Walker, Bill Maher, Harry Britt, Terence Hallinan
JUDGES Dorothy vonBeroldingen, John Dearman, Edward Stern
COURT COMMISSIONER George Colbert
SENATOR Milton Marks
SCHOOL BOARD JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Libby Denebeim, Myra Kopf
POLICE COMMISSIONER John Keker
FIRE COMMISSIONER Sharon Bretz
SHERIFF LIEUTENANT Connie O'Connor
POLICE OFFICERS VICE PRESIDENT Paul Chignell
DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY Charles Wood
BUSINESSMAN Mel Swig
PUC COMMISSIONER Rodel Rodis

Ellen Chaitin

WILLIAM J. O'CONNOR

My address is 3615 Buchanan St. #206
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 50
My qualifications for office are: I am the most qualified candidate for this office. I have had judicial experience, serving as Municipal Court judge pro tem for over five years, and have been commended by the Presiding Judge for the quality of my service. I have been a journeyman lawyer for 15 years, with both criminal and civil experience, and have done over 30 jury trials.

With Amnesty International and Church representatives, I have been an International Trial Observer.

I have been a Board Member of the Elizabeth Frye Center and the Irish Forum, and a volunteer on the Bar Association's free legal services panel.


William J. O'Connor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge
Office #3

LILLIAN K. SING

My address is San Francisco Municipal Court,
400 Van Ness Ave.
My occupation is Incumbent Judge of the San Francisco
Municipal Court
My age is 47
My qualifications for office are: I am an incumbent judge, and
have been a judge since 1981. I am the first Asian-American
woman judge in the history of Northern California. In 1988, I
was awarded Trial Judge of the Year by San Francisco Trial
Lawyers Association, one of the highest awards a Bar Associa-
tion can bestow. Last year, I was unanimously elected as Munici-
pal Court’s Presiding Judge. As Presiding Judge, I implemented
the Pro Tem Judge Program, drastically reduced backlog in
civil/criminal cases, brought Trial Court Funding to San Fran-
cisco, spearheaded San Francisco’s first judicial forum “Access
to Justice” attended by 680 people. I served as a faculty member
with the California Center for Judicial Education/Research
which trains all new judges in California and am a faculty judge
with the National Institute for Trial Advocacy which trains trial
lawyers. In 1988 I lectured throughout China on the U.S.
Legal/Judicial System.

Join San Francisco judges led by Presiding Judges Choppelas,
and Marie-Victoire, Mayor Art Agnos, President Harry Britt,
and the entire 11 Board of Supervisors, Assembly Speaker Willie
Brown, Assemblyman John Burton, Senator Milton Marks, For-
mer Police Chiefs Nelder/Cahill, DA Arlo Smith, PD Jeff
Brown, Sheriff Michael Hennessey and retain me as judge.

JEROME A. DEFILIPPO

My address is 1534 38th Avenue
My occupation is Attorney at Law
My qualifications for office are: A third generation San Fran-
ciscan. I have practiced law in The City since 1973, served as
the Legal Officer of the San Francisco Police Department and a
Deputy City Attorney. I am committed to the impartial applica-
tion of our laws in all judicial proceedings. Having served twenty
years as a Police Officer attaining the position of Lieutenant, I
am well aware of the frustrations each of us feel by the impact
of crime in our City. If elected, I am committed to the imposi-
ton of the maximum sentence allowed by law for persons convicted
of violent crimes or narcotic sales.

Partial list of sponsors follows:

Ann Alberigi, Catherine Archbold, Alfred Arnaud, Martin
Bastiani, Chief Thomas Cahill, Ann Carrick, Peter Cimarelli,
Hon. Antone Cincotta, Clement Collins, Jean DeFilippo, Capit
Martin Feldman, Nancy Feldman, H. Welton Flynn, John
Fracchia, Carol Fujioka, John Gallagher, Judith Gallen, Kath-
leen Gee, Dr. William Gee, Susanna Lee, Margaret Leong,
Maureen Mahoney, Carmelita Mathais, Phyliss Moylan, James
Pagano, Renzo Panelli, Timothy T. Riordan, Rollin Schroot, Joan
Swendsen, Spirion Tentes, Paul Vigo, Rita Young

Jerome A. DeFilippo

Lillian K. Sing

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
City and County of San Francisco
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against these measures. All arguments, "official" and paid, are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None of them has been checked for accuracy by this office or any other city official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

"Official Arguments"

There is one "official" argument for and one against each measure, and they are published at no cost. "Official" arguments are selected by the Registrar of Voters in accordance with the priorities set forth in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code as summarized below:

For:
1. Person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee supporting the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Against:
1. For a referendum, person or entity causing measure to be placed on ballot.
2. Board of Supervisors or member(s) designated by the Board.
3. Mayor
4. Committee that has filed as a campaign committee against the measure.
5. Bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Individual voter

Rebuttals

Authors of official arguments may each prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. As with official and paid arguments, rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Each rebuttal follows immediately after its corresponding official argument.

Paid Arguments

All paid arguments are accepted for publication upon (1) deposit of an amount equal to $50 plus $1.50 per word, (2) submission of a petition containing valid signatures of registered voters in lieu of the printing fee at the rate of two signatures for each dollar of the fee, or (3) a combination of a printing fee and signatures which together equal the number of signatures and/or amount of money required to qualify the argument for publication.

For each measure, paid arguments follow after the official arguments and rebuttals. All paid arguments supporting a measure are printed together followed by all paid arguments against that same measure. Paid arguments within each group (e.g. all paid arguments in favor of Proposition Z) are not printed in any particular order. Rather they are arranged so that each page is fully utilized.

There is one ballot measure for which paid arguments were not accepted. The School Facilities Safety Special Tax measure is being proposed under state law; only one argument for, one argument against, and respective rebuttals for this measure are allowed.

Again, arguments and rebuttals are the opinions of the authors and they have not been checked by this office or any other city official or agency.
## PROPOSITION A

**PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990.** To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

### Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** Many City buildings were damaged by the October 17, 1989 earthquake and many may not survive another strong earthquake. Many City buildings contain asbestos and many are not accessible to disabled persons. Many City buildings do not meet current health, safety and building codes.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $332,400,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This total would be reduced by the amount of grants the City receives from the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the State of California for earthquake repair and hazard reduction. No more than $65,000,000 of bonds could be sold in any fiscal year.

This money would be used to pay for safety improvements to some City buildings, including repairing earthquake damage, making the buildings better able to survive earthquakes, removing or reducing the danger of asbestos in these buildings, making them more accessible to the disabled and bringing them up to current codes.

The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues. Proposition A would require an increase in the property tax.

**A "YES" VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the City to issue general obligation bonds for not more than $332,400,000 to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

**A "NO" VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue bonds to pay for certain safety improvements to some City buildings.

### Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty (20) year basis and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, in my opinion, it is estimated that the approximate costs would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond redemption</th>
<th>$332,400,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>$244,314,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$576,714,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bond authorization limits the issuance of bonds to no more than $65 million per year. Assuming a single sale on a 20 year basis at current interest rates with no reduction for possible FEMA or State of California grants, annual debt service on each $65 million increment would amount to $5,636,750, which amount is equivalent to one and forty-eight hundredths cents ($0.0148) in the current tax rate."

### How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 26, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Angela Alioto, Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Thomas Hsieh, Bill Maher, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, and Doris Ward.

**NO:** None of the Supervisors present voted no.

---

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We urge you to vote Yes on Proposition A the earthquake repair and protection measure.

Proposition A provides $332.4 million to repair earthquake damaged city buildings and to seismically reinforce many of them so that they would not sustain as much damage (or worse) during a future earthquake. This improves public safety while it also protects the investment we are making in repairs.

Your “Yes on A” vote will provide for:

Replacement of the broken and earthquake damaged water and sewer lines at the Zoo.

Proposition A represents a prudent investment which would protect many irreplaceable public buildings from major damage or collapse in a future earthquake.

In order to keep property taxes from rising more than 2-3¢ per $100 of assessed value, Proposition A will not allow more than $65 million in bonds to be sold in any one year. It further requires that any Federal or State earthquake relief money we receive to repair these buildings reduce the amount of bonds sold. This assures that local taxpayers will not be required to pay for repairs that can be made using Federal/State emergency relief assistance.

Vote Yes on Proposition A to protect city buildings and increase public safety in a next major earthquake.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition A
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition A
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

When future earthquakes strike, our libraries need to be safe. Proposition A will provide funds to help earthquake proof our library system.

Vote YES on A.

This bond issue will help to ensure the seismic safety of the Palace of Fine Arts, home of the Exploratorium which is visited by over 600,000 people a year. Prop A represents a prudent investment to improve public safety and protect irreplaceable public buildings. We urge all citizens to vote “Yes” on Proposition A.

Replacement of the earthquake-damaged, underground, 50-year-old water, gas and sewer lines at the San Francisco Zoo is critically needed for the safety and well-being of the animals. It will significantly improve public services to the 1.2 million children and adults who visit annually. The Zoological Society will endeavor to raise funds to renovate and build new above-ground facilities to supplement the $26 million included in the bond issue for the Zoo. Help make the Zoo a true sanctuary.

Michael Mellor, President
Friends of the San Francisco Public Library

Exploratorium
F. Van Kasper, Chairman
William K. Coblenz, Vice Chairman
C. Richard Kramlich, Vice Chairman
G. Steven Burrell, Treasurer

Charlotte Maillard Swig
Zoological Society Board

Frances May McAteer
Recreation & Park Commissioner

Amy Meyer
People for GGNRA

Andrew Nash
President, San Francisco Tomorrow

Trent W. Orr
Recreation & Park Commissioner

Elizabeth D. Rieger
Zoo Volunteer

Fred A. Rodriguez
School Board Member

Carroll Sook-Hoo
Zoo Benefactor

Stephen V. R. Spaulding
Zoological Society Treasurer

James J. Walsh Jr.
Citizens Advisory Committee on Wastewater Management

Connie O’Connor
President, Recreation & Park Commission

David E. Anderson
Zoo Director

Phil Arnold
Assistant General Manager
Recreation & Park

William Brewster Ely IV
Headmaster, Town School

Mary Burns
General Manager
Recreation & Park

Margaret K. Burks
Executive Director, Zoological Society

Jack W. Castor
Animal Keeper Shop Steward, Local 858

Todd Cecil
Children’s Zoo Keeper

Sherri Chiesa
President, Local 2

Robert Cockburn
Executive Director, Clean Water Program

Rosemary Davidson
Urban School

Dolores A. Donovan
Animal Control & Welfare Commission

Keith G. Eickman
Recreation & Park Commissioner

Roy Eisenhardt
Director, California Academy of Sciences

Becky Evans
Conservation Activist

Norman Gereshetz
Director, Ecosystem Survival Plan

Arthur J. Goedewaagen
Board Member, SPEAK

John E. Hafernik Jr.
Professor Biology, SFSU

Roger Hoppes
Director, Children’s Zoo

Michael Housh
Assistant to the Mayor

David J. Howe
Animal Keeper

Mark Hurley
Animal Control & Welfare Commission

Norma J. Kristovich
Zoo Docent Council

Connie Lurie
Vice Chairman, Zoological Society Board

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
**Public Safety Improvement Bonds**

**PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A**

We must rebuild and repair our infrastructure. The October 17 quake was a warning. More resources going to earthquake preparedness programs today will save lives in the future. Vote YES on A.

*Joel Ventresca*  
Past President,  
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods  
Candidate for Supervisor

We urge everyone to vote Yes on Proposition A. The people of San Francisco have a $3.5 billion investment in public buildings. This bond issue will be used to fund repairs to many of our facilities damaged in last October’s earthquake, including City Hall, General Hospital, neighborhood libraries, police stations and cultural buildings. It will also provide monies necessary to make life-safety improvements to other city buildings.

Your Yes Vote on Proposition A will protect lives and property in the event of another major earthquake at a very small cost to businesses and homeowners. Because bonds to finance repairs will be sold over 6 - 10 years, replacing older bond issues as they are paid-off, the result will be an almost unchanged tax rate. In fact, the City’s independent budget analyst found that the tax bill for an average homeowner will increase by less than $5.00 a month.

Proposition A is a small price to pay to preserve our investment in the city’s valuable public facilities. Vote Yes on Proposition A.

*Donald D. Doyle*  
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

We ask that you join us in Voting YES ON PROP. “A”. Your “Yes on A” vote will provide funds to protect the two remaining Police Stations which are not yet earthquake safe or provided for in previous bond issues.

In an emergency we can do our jobs only if our own police facilities are earthquake resistant and if we can get to those places in the City which most need our services. That is why it is important to us that as many City buildings as possible are made earthquake resistant. The less damage and street obstruction that results from a future earthquake, the better we can get to these parts of the City where we are most needed. The safer the public buildings in the City are made, the better we will be able to serve the rest of the City if we ever have to face a major earthquake emergency.

For security vote “Yes on A”.

*Michael Keys*  
President  
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association

The damage done by the October 17th earthquake to San Francisco’s most important public buildings is considerable. To correct that damage and prepare for the future vitality of our City demands the kind of response represented by Proposition A. This proposition carefully earmarks funds to upgrade buildings such as City Hall, the War Memorial Opera House, and the Department of Public Health offices which are treasures that can never be replaced or reproduced. They not only need to be repaired, but strengthened structurally and improved, to meet today’s building codes. The Federal Government will pick up some of the damage, but much more will be needed if these vital components of our City’s daily life are to be improved and made ready for the next major quake.

Proposition A requests a large sum, but this is a time when we as a City have to agree to such a request. We strongly urge your support of Proposition A.

*American Institute of Architects/San Francisco Chapter*
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

We ask you to join us in voting “Yes on A”.

The primary purpose of Prop “A” is to protect lives and public buildings from the effects of the next earthquake. As San Franciscans we all share the responsibility of having to do all we can to avoid the loss of life, the suffering and the huge costs which another, perhaps stronger or longer quake would bring. Thus we see Proposition “A” as a necessary, prudent investment in all our future.

We have a special reason to support “Prop A” and to ask you to vote YES ON “A” as well. That special reason is the fact that 20 of the buildings which will be repaired or strengthened against future earthquakes if Prop “A” passes will also be made fully accessible to the disabled. We want our City’s buildings to be repaired, to be made safe and to be made accessible to all San Franciscans.

Vote “Yes on A”.

Kathy Uhl, Executive Director,
Independent Living Resource Center
Michael L. Comini, Executive Director,
Lighthouse for the Blind and Visually Impaired

We urge a “Yes” vote on Proposition “A”.

Many city buildings were damaged in the October 17 earthquake. If these buildings are repaired and strengthened the Fire Department will be much safer when responding to future emergencies.

Please help the Fire Department do its job safely and effectively by voting “Yes” on Proposition “A”.

James D. Jefferson, President, Fire Commission
Frank A. Quinn, Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry E. Berman, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon L. Bretz, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted N. Soulsi, Commissioner, Fire Commission
Frederick F. Postel, Chief of Department

We urgently request that you vote “Yes on A”.
The War Memorial complex of buildings, dedicated to San Francisco’s veterans, are one of our city’s treasures, irreplaceable architecturally and economically. They are central to our history and we owe it to ourselves to make sure they are made as fully earthquake-resistant as possible.
The October 17 earthquake was a warning which we must heed. Proposition “A” is a prudent and necessary response. It will protect our treasured buildings and, even more importantly, it will protect the lives of those who use them and the memories of those whose lives they commemorate.

Harold F. Jackson, Chairman, American Legion War Memorial Commission
Claude M. Jarman, Jr., Vice-President, War Memorial Board of Trustees
Mark Ryser, Executive Director, Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage

Save lives.
Support earthquake safety.
Vote YES on Propositions A and B.
Also vote YES on Proposition N. Limit San Francisco Supervisors to two four-year terms.

Terence Faulkner
Republican State Assembly Candidate
San Francisco Republican Party Chairman (1987-89)

Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic State Senate Candidate
Past San Francisco Democratic Party Secretary
Max Woods
Republican Central Committee Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic County Central Committeewoman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Public Safety Improvement Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for your safety. Let us learn from the October 17th earthquake. 15 seconds of moderate shaking resulted in the need for $32 million in repairs to city buildings in the Civic Center alone. We need to be better prepared. We need to reduce known safety hazards. Please, vote YES on Proposition A.

Ken Dowlin, City Librarian
Steve Coulter, Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson, Library Commissioner
Lonni Chin, Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil, Library Commissioner
Dennis Normandy, Library Commissioner
Roselyne Swig, Library Commissioner

Help the City of San Francisco and the Zoo rebuild. The animals will benefit, too! Vote YES on A.

Susanne Barthell,
Zoo Advisory Committee member,
Zoo Volunteer
Sophie Papageorge,
Zoologist
Jorge L. Garcia, D.V.M.
Zoo Medicine Specialist
John J. Alcaraz,
Retired Zookeeper
Ronl Joan Howard,
Educator

David J. Howe
Animalkeeper
Terrence J. Moyles
Linda Carati
Animalkeeper
Anthony Sharp
Animalkeeper
Martin E. Dias
A.K.A. Big Bison, Animalkeeper
Jack W. Casor
Lion House, Animalkeeper
Sandra Keller
Director, Citizens for a Better Zoo

Proposition A will help restore structural safety to the San Francisco County Jails in San Bruno, which were built in 1934 and are badly in need of repair. This is the oldest operating jail in California and sits near the San Andreas fault.

For the safety of City employees and county jail inmates, please vote YES on Proposition A.

Michael Hennessey
San Francisco County Sheriff
Deputy Albert Waters, President
San Francisco Deputy Sheriff’s Association

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION A

This bond issue is iffy. It should have been presented to the voters as two separate bond issues.

One for $75 million — earthquake repairs to be partly refunded by F.E.M.A. for our present estimated damages. Another for $257.4 million to take care of our needed capital improvements so neglected by this and past administrations.

Vote NO and get one issue back on the November ballot.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A

(Special Election)

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1990, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, TO PAY FOR THE COST OF PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS TO BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION, ASBESTOS ABATEMENT, PROVIDING ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED, ALL RELATED TO PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDINGS OWNED BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING RELATED ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT FOR THE FOREGOING PURPOSE; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT NO MORE THAN $65,000,000 OF SAID BONDED INDEBTEDNESS SHALL BE INCURRED IN ANY SINGLE FISCAL YEAR AND PROVIDED, FURTHER, THAT THE AUTHORIZATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $332,400,000 WILL BE REDUCED BY THE AMOUNT OF THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEDERA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND THE CONTROLLER TO MONITOR THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND THE ACTUAL POST-AUDIT RECEIPT OF FEDERA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION AND TO TAKE ANY APPROPRIATE ACTION SO THAT THE BONDS ISSUED WILL NOT DUPLICATE FEDERA OR STATE OF CALIFORNIA GRANTS FOR EARTHQUAKE REPAIRS AND HAZARDS REDUCTION; FINDING THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF THE ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITION; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 5th day of June, 1990, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county a proposition to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amount and for the purposes stated:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, $332,400,000, to pay for the cost of public safety improvements to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled, all related to public safety to buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including related acquisition, construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient for the foregoing purpose; provided, however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual post-audit receipt of FEDERA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolution and in the amount specified:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990, Resolution No. 88-90, $332,400,000.

That said resolution was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified was too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount not to exceed the principal amount specified.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in said resolution are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvements.

Section 3. Authorizing and directing the Chief Administrative Officer and the Controller to monitor the issuance of the bonds and the actual post-audit receipt of FEDERA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction and to take any appropriate action so that the bonds issued will not duplicate FEDERA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction.

Section 4. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 5. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 5, 1990, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 31, 1990.

Section 6. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

PUBLIC SAFETY IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1990. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $332,400,000 for acquisition, construction or reconstruction of buildings owned by the City and County of San Francisco, including earthquake repairs and earthquake hazards reduction, asbestos abatement, providing access for the disabled; provided, (Continued on next page)
however, that no more than $65,000,000 of said bonded indebtedness shall be incurred in any single fiscal year and provided, further, that the authorization in the amount of $332,400,000 will be reduced by the amount of the actual receipt of FEMA or State of California grants for earthquake repairs and hazards reduction."

Each voter to vote for said proposition hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word “YES” on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word “NO” on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special election, each voter to vote for any said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word “YES” to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word “NO” to the right of said proposition.

Section 7. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as “serials,” and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 12 per centum per annum, payable semiannually, provided, that interest for the first year after the date of any of said bonds may be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such proposition, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 8. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 9. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 10. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.
PROPOSITION B

Shall Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District be authorized to finance (I) repair, restoration, and/or replacement of San Francisco Unified School District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (or its aftershocks), (II) seismic upgrading of children's centers and other San Francisco Unified School District facilities, (III) correction of fire safety violations of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and (IV) deferred capital maintenance of San Francisco Unified School District facilities, and certain Incidental expenses relating to the foregoing through the levy of a special tax to be collected for twenty (20) years with a maximum annual rate (a) for single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels of $46.00 per parcel for the first six (6) years and $32.20 per parcel for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year and (b) for mixed-use parcels (parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses) and multi-family residential parcels of $23.00 per dwelling unit for the first six (6) years and $16.10 per dwelling unit for the fourteen (14) years following the sixth year, with the definitions of single-family residential, multi-family residential, mixed-use and non-residential parcels, and particulars relating to the method of apportionment and maximum rates, exemptions for seniors, certain publicly-owned property and other uses, as more particularly set forth in Resolution No. 02-13-B1 adopted by the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District on February 13, 1990; and shall an appropriations limit in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year in connection therewith be established for the Community Facilities District?

YES 269
NO 272

Analysis by City Attorney

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The San Francisco Unified School District operates the City's public schools. Some School District buildings were damaged by the earthquake. Some District buildings do not meet present earthquake and fire standards.

The State Mello-Rosso law allows the Board of Education to submit to the voters a measure authorizing a special property tax to pay for repairs and other improvements to school buildings.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would authorize a special property tax to pay for costs of repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety. Some of the money would also be used for deferred capital maintenance. The repairs and maintenance would be funded on a pay-as-you-go basis. Since no money would be borrowed, there would be no interest costs to pay.

The tax would last for 20 years. The tax on single-family residential parcels and non-residential parcels could be no more than $46 for each of the first six years and no more than $32.20 for each of the last 14 years. The tax on other types of parcels could be no more than $23 for each dwelling unit for each of the first six years and $16.10 for each dwelling unit for each of the last 14 years. Dwelling units occupied by persons 65 years of age or older would be eligible for an exemption from this tax. The measure would also set an annual appropriations limit of $12 million.

A 'YES' VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to authorize this property tax to pay for repairing School District buildings damaged by the earthquake and bringing schools and child care centers up to present standards for earthquake and fire safety and you want to authorize this annual appropriations limit.

A 'NO' VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to authorize this tax.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed special tax levy be approved, in my opinion, it would increase revenues for the San Francisco Unified School District, net of estimated senior citizen exemptions, by approximately $8 million per year for the first 6 years and $5.6 million per year for the next 14 years, based on the current assessment roll of the City and County. The approximately $127.2 million generated over a 20 year period by this special tax levy would be restricted for use by the District for the repair, restoration, replacement, seismic upgrading and capital maintenance of School District facilities."

How "B" Got on the Ballot

On February 13, the Board of Education voted 5-1 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Board members voted as follows:


NO: Leland Yee.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
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OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

When the earthquake struck last fall, our school buildings suffered. Sustaining major damage and at special risk in the future are our buildings that were not earthquake proofed in the 1970's. In that category are our child care centers serving our youngest students. Also, in the fall of 1988 the City Fire Marshall inspected our schools and reported that the majority of our school buildings do not meet fire safety standards. Our 63,000 students and the community groups that meet at our schools in the evenings and on weekends must have buildings that can withstand earthquakes, and meet fire safety standards.

Proposition B will authorize a tax to provide for repairing earthquake damage at 131 sites including the reconstruction of John O'Connell High School, seismic improvement of nine Children's Centers, correction of fire code and safety violations at 97 sites and seismic improvement of John Swett, Jean Parker and Bessie Carmichael Elementary Schools and Parkside Curriculum Center. In addition, there will be funds for deferred capital maintenance.

Two years ago the citizens of this City voted to support major repairs for our school buildings. Now we must protect that investment by repairing the present earthquake damage and seeing that all our schools can withstand future earthquakes, be as safe as possible in case of fire and be well maintained into the next century.

Civic organizations who have joined in supporting Proposition B include: San Francisco League of Women Voters, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SF/PTA, Parents' Lobby, San Francisco Labor Council, United Educators of San Francisco, and Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth.

Submitted by Superintendent Ramon C. Cortines, San Francisco Unified School District, and Fred Rodriguez, President, Board of Education.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition B
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition B
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition B

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSITION B

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California
February 13, 1990
(For Board Meeting February 13, 1990)
REQUESTED ACTION:
WHEREAS, the Board of Education (the "Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District (the "District"), did, on January 9, 1990, adopt its Resolution of Intention (the "Resolution") to form Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District (the Community Facilities District"), and levy a special tax therein, pursuant to Chapter 2.5 of Part I of Division 2 of Title 5 (commencing with Section 53311) of the California Government Code, commonly known as the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982," as amended, (the "Act"); and
WHEREAS, a copy of the Resolution (which sets forth a description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, the name of the Community Facilities District and the types of facilities proposed to be financed by the District (the "Facilities")), providing that, except where funds are otherwise available, a special tax sufficient to pay for all facilities and the financing thereof (to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all non-exempt real property in the Community Facilities District) is proposed to be levied within the proposed Community Facilities District specifying the rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the proposed Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, and setting a hearing thereon, is on file with the Clerk of this Board and is incorporated herein by this reference; and
WHEREAS, notice of said hearing was duly published as required by law, as evidenced by the affidavit of publication on file with the Clerk of this Board; and
WHEREAS, on February 13, 1990 this Board held the noticed public hearing as required by law relative to the proposed formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and
WHEREAS, prior to the noticed public hearing a report (the "Report") containing a description of the facilities and an estimate of the cost of providing the facilities, including the estimated fair and reasonable cost thereof, was filed with this Board as a part of the record of said hearing; and
WHEREAS, at the public hearing all persons desiring to be heard on all matters pertaining to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution, including all interested persons or taxpayers for or against the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent of the Community Facilities District, or the furnishing of specific types of public facilities, were heard and considered, and a full and fair hearing was held thereon; and
WHEREAS, at the public hearing evidence was presented to this Board on the matters before it, and this Board at the conclusion of the hearing was fully advised as to all matters relating to the formation of the Community Facilities District, the levy of the special tax, and all other matters set forth in the Resolution; and
WHEREAS, written protests against the establishment of the District, the furnishing of specified type or types of facilities within the Community Facilities District as listed in the Report, or the levying of the special tax have not been filed with the Clerk of this Board by fifty percent (50%) or more of the registered voters, or five registered voters, whichever is more, residing within the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District, or the owners of one-half (1/2) or more of the area of land in the territory proposed to be included in the Community Facilities District and not exempt from this special tax;
NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District, in regular session assembled on February 13, 1990, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE, DETERMINE AND ORDER as follows:
Section 1. The foregoing recitals are true and correct.
Section 2. Written protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, or the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are insufficient in number and in amount under the Act, and this Board hereby further orders and determines that all protests to the establishment of the Community Facilities District, the extent thereof, or the furnishing of the public facilities proposed therefor, or the levy of the special tax proposed to be levied in the Community Facilities District, are hereby overruled.
Section 3. As proposed in the Resolution, a community facilities district is hereby established pursuant to the Act, designated "Community Facilities District No. 90-1 of the San Francisco Unified School District."
Section 4. The map and legal description of the proposed boundaries of the Community Facilities District, filed with the Clerk of this Board on January 24, 1990, are hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the boundaries of the Community Facilities District.
Section 5. The Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District, set forth in Exhibit "B" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, shall be the Facilities to be financed by the Community Facilities District.
Section 6. As provided in Exhibit "B", it is the intention of this Board, subject to the approval of the qualified electors of the Community Facilities District, to levy a special tax sufficient to acquire, construct and improve the Facilities including administrative expenses to be incurred by the District and the Community Facilities District in connection therewith; said tax to be secured by recordation of a continuing lien against all non-exempt real property in the Community Facilities District.
The rate, method of apportionment, and manner of collection of the special tax, in sufficient detail to allow each taxpayer or resident within the Community Facilities District to estimate the maximum amount that he or she will have to pay, is described in Exhibit "A" hereto and by this reference incorporated herein.
Section 7. The description of the proposed voting procedure, as set forth in the Resolution, is hereby incorporated herein by this reference, and shall be the voting procedure to be used in these proceedings.
Section 8. The special tax has not been precluded by majority protest pursuant to Section 53324 of the Act.
Section 9. The Facilities to be funded from the special tax are identified in Exhibit "B" hereto.
Section 10. In accordance with Section 53340.1 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, this Board shall designate the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District as the office, department or bureau which will be responsible for annually preparing the current roll of special tax levy obligations by assessor's parcel number on non-exempt property within the District and which will be responsible for estimating future special tax levies pursuant to Section 53340.1 of the Act. The name, address, and telephone number of the Fiscal Services Department of the San Francisco Unified School District, and the person responsible for administering the District, is as follows: Director of Fiscal Services Fiscal Services Department 135 Van Ness Avenue, Room 215 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 241-6480
Section 11. In accordance with Section 53323.5 of the Act, upon a determination by this Board, after the canvass of the returns of the

(Continued on next page)
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consolidated election provided for in Sections 15 and 16 hereof, that two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith, for the District, are cast in favor thereof, the Clerk of this Board shall record the notice of special tax lien provided for in Section 3114.5 of the Streets and Highways Code. Upon recordation of the notice of special tax lien pursuant to Section 3114.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, a continuing lien to secure each levy of the special tax shall attach to all nonexempt real property in the Community Facilities District, and this lien shall continue in force and effect until the special tax obligation is permanently satisfied and the lien cancelled in accordance with law or until collection of the tax by this Board ceases.

Section 12. A boundary map of the Community Facilities District has been recorded pursuant to Sections 3111 and 3113 of the Streets and Highways Code at Book 39, Page 182-183 in the Book of Maps of Assessment and Community Facilities Districts in the Office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 13. All other proceedings taken with respect to the establishment of the District were valid and in conformity with the requirements of the Act.

Section 14. In accordance with Section 53325.7 of the Act, the annual appropriations limit of the District, as defined by subdivision (b) of Section 8 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution, is hereby preliminarily established in the amount of $12,000,000 per fiscal year, and said annual appropriations limit shall be submitted to the voters of the District as hereafter provided. The proposition establishing said appropriations limit shall become effective if approved by the qualified electors voting thereon and shall be adjusted in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 53325.7 of the Act.

Section 15. The Board hereby calls an election and submits the question of levying the special tax, and the establishment of the annual appropriations limit for the District in connection therewith, to the qualified electors within the District, at an election to be held on Tuesday, June 5, 1990, all in accordance with and subject to the Act, the terms of which shall be applicable to such election.

Section 16. The Board hereby directs that the election at which the question of levying the special tax and the establishment of an appropriations limit in connection therewith is submitted to the qualified electors within the District shall be consolidated and shall be combined in one ballot proposition, all as provided by the Act; and the Board further directs that notice of the consolidated election on the combined proposition of authorizing the levy of the special tax and of establishing an appropriations limit be published as required by law.

Section 17. If two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast upon the question of levying the special tax are cast in favor of levying the tax, as determined by this Board after the canvass of the returns of such consolidated election, the Board may levy the special tax within the territory of the District in the amount and for the purposes as specified in this resolution. The special tax may be levied only at the rate and may be apportioned only in the manner specified in this resolution, subject to the Act, except that the special tax may be levied at a lower rate.

Section 18. The Clerk of this Board is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution, a certified map of the boundaries of the Community Facilities District, a sufficient description to allow the election official to determine the boundaries of the District, and the assessor's parcel numbers for the land within the District to the Registrar of Voters of the City and County of San Francisco within three business days after the adoption of this resolution.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 13th day of February, 1990.
President of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District
ATTEST:
Clerk of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District
Recommended by:
Ramon C. Cortines
Superintendent of Schools

EXHIBIT A
RATE AND METHOD OF APPORTIONMENT BASIS OF SPECIAL TAX LEVY

The annual special tax shall be levied on each separate parcel within Community Facilities District No. 90-1, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco County, California ("CFD 90-1") as shown on the San Francisco County Assessor's records, subject to the maximum rates specified below, as established by the Board of Education ("Board") of the San Francisco Unified School District ("District").

DETERMINATION OF PARCELS SUBJECT TO SPECIAL TAX

The records of the County Assessor of San Francisco County shall be used to determine the parcels subject to the special tax. The basis for determining the parcels will be the Secured Property Tax Roll. The land use code contained in the Secured Property Tax Roll, in combination with records maintained by the Assessor of the number of dwelling units on each residential parcel in CFD 90-1, will be the basis for assigning the appropriate tax rate to each parcel. If the District determines that the records maintained by the Assessor are incorrect with respect to one or more parcels, the District will assign the appropriate land use code and dwelling unit count based on its review of the property. All special taxes shall be based on parcels established in the County Assessor's records as of March 1 of each year and all land use categories shall be based on building permits and other relevant development approvals granted by the City and County of San Francisco or any successor jurisdiction as of June 1 of each year.

Using the records of the County Assessor, the District shall prepare a list of the parcels subject to the tax. The District shall establish the parcels subject to the tax using the procedure described below.

1. Exclude all parcels which are of March 1 of the prior fiscal year vacant; owned by federal, state, and local governments and public agencies and utilities and are used for public purpose; or which are publicly owned and non-profit hospitals, cemeteries, or buildings used exclusively for religious worship, provided that leasehold/possessor interests shall be taxed.

2. From the parcels remaining identify the following groups of parcels based upon assessor's data, and the District's review of building permits issued, and other changes in development status:
   a. Single Family Residential Parcels: Parcels containing one dwelling unit and no other uses
   b. Mixed Use Parcels: Parcels with one or more residential units in addition to one or more commercial uses
   c. Multi-Family Residential Parcels: Parcels with two or more residential units and no other uses
   d. Non-Residential Parcels: Parcels with no residential units, including transient residential units such as hotels.

   Parcels which have been granted a building permit for one or more residential units in addition to or in place of the uses presently existing on that parcel will be classified based on the use that will exist after the permit has been exercised.

   The District shall make every effort to correctly determine the parcels subject to the tax. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determination of the parcels subject to the tax and their classifications.

MAXIMUM ANNUAL SPECIAL TAX

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the first six years:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $46.47 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $23.00 per dwelling unit.

The maximum annual tax on parcels in CFD 90-1 shall be the rates below for the fourteen years following the sixth year:

1. Single Family Residential Parcels and Non-Residential Parcels shall pay $32.20 per parcel.
2. Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels shall pay $16.10 per dwelling unit.

For Mixed Use Parcels and Multi-Family Residential Parcels, the District shall calculate the annual tax for each parcel in CFD 90-1 by multiplying the applicable special tax rate times the number of dwelling units. The District shall notify the appropriate county official of the annual special tax for each parcel.

The special tax shall be collected in CFD 90-1 for twenty years.

The District shall make every effort to correctly assign the tax rate and calculate the annual tax liability for each parcel. It shall be the burden of the taxpayer to correct any errors in the determinations.
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ministration of the parcels subject to the tax and their special tax assignments.

SENIOR CITIZEN EXEMPTION

A property owner may apply for a Senior Citizen Exemption which would provide an exemption from the special tax for the applicable tax year on dwelling units occupied by senior citizens, if the following conditions are met:

1. The applicant must show evidence that the dwelling unit is owned or rented by a citizen who is at least 65 years of age.

2. The applicant must show evidence of ownership of the property subject to the Exemption.

3. The Senior Citizen Exemption must be applied for annually.

4. If the applicant is a landlord, then he or she must certify that the entire tax exemption will be reflected only in the rent for the exempted dwelling unit(s).

EXHIBIT B
COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO.

90-1 — Description of Facilities to be financed:

(i) Repair, restoration, and/or replacement of District facilities damaged by the earthquake of October 17, 1989 (and its aftershocks), to the extent that (A) such repair, restoration, or replacement is outside the scope of work approved by federal and state agencies for assistance from such agencies; (B) costs incurred in such repair, restoration, or replacement are ineligible for federal or state assistance; or (C) insufficient federal or state funds are appropriated, obligated, or approved to pay for repair, restoration, or replacement which would otherwise be eligible for federal or state assistance. Pending receipt by the District of disaster assistance from federal and/or state agencies, the Community Facilities District may advance funds to the District to pay costs eligible for federal or state disaster assistance; provided that upon receipt by the District of federal or state disaster assistance relating to such costs, the District shall promptly reimburse the Community Facilities District for any such advances.

(ii) Seismic upgrading of children’s centers and other District facilities.

(iii) Correction of fire safety violations of District facilities.

(iv) Deferred capital maintenance of District facilities. Incidental expenses, including the cost of planning and designing the Facilities and the cost of environmental evaluations thereof; all costs associated with the creation of the proposed Community Facilities District, the determination of the amount of and collection of taxes, the payment of taxes, and costs otherwise incurred in order to carry out the authorized purposes of the Community Facilities District; and any other expenses incidental to the construction, completion, and inspection of the Facilities and permitted under the Act.
BOUNDARIES OF SPECIAL TAX DISTRICT

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THIS ______ DAY OF _______.

RAMON C. CORTINES, CLERK
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE WITHIN MAP SHOWING PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, WAS APPROVED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AT A MEETING HELD ON THE 12TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1990, BY ITS RESOLUTION NO. 01-6981.

RAMON C. CORTINES, CLERK
OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT


BRUCE JAMESON
COUNTY RECORDER
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER, BEING THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SANTA ANA, IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN, ON THE EXTENSION OF NORTHERN LINE OF T3S OF MOUNT DIABLO BASE; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG THE PACIFIC COAST, TO ITS POINT OF INTERSECTION WITH THE WESTERLY EXTENSION OF THE LOW-WATER LINE ON THE NORTHERN SIDE OF THE ENTRANCE TO SAN FRANCISCO BAY, BEING THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MARIN AND NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE, EASTERLY, THROUGH POINT BONITA AND POINT RONDO, TO THE MOST SOUTHEASTERN POINT OF ANGELO ISLAND, ALL ON THE LINE OF MARIN; THENCE, SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG THE EASTERN LINE OF MARIN, TO THE NORTHWEST POINT OF GOLDEN ROCK (ALSO KNOWN AS RED ROCK), BEING A COMMON CORNER OF MARIN, CONTRA COSTA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE SOUTHWARD, Designs on the map stay for the first time, to a point established as the corner common to CONTRA COSTA, ALAMEDA, AND SAN FRANCISCO; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY, ON THE WESTERN LINE OF ALAMEDA COUNTY TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF T3S, 4W, M.D.B. & M., THENCE WESTERLY ON THE TOWNSHIP LINES AND AN EXTENSION THEREOF TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING. THE ISLANDS KNOWN AS THE RIVER (PARKER'S ISLAND) ARE A PART OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY.

PROPOSED BOUNDARIES OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 90-1 OF SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO STATE OF CALIFORNIA

KCA ENGINEERS, INC.
CONSULTING CIVIL ENGINEERS

JANUARY 1990

CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE: TITLE 3 DIVISION 1 CHAPTER 2 ARTICLE 2, 22130 — SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY LIMITS
Equipment Lease Financing

PROPOSITION C
Shall the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval and subject to specified debt limits, be authorized to approve the lease financing of equipment from a nonprofit corporation, if the Controller certifies that the net interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing?

YES 277
NO 278

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City obtains computers, telephone systems and other equipment by paying for it all at once or by leasing it until it is paid for, which is called "lease financing." The City may not enter into long-term leases for financing equipment unless (1) the voters approve it, or (2) the lease requires the Board of Supervisors to approve the payments each year. When the Board of Supervisors must approve the lease payments each year, interest rates are higher than when the lease payments are not subject to annual approval. Also, interest rates charged by for-profit companies are generally higher than interest rates charged by non-profit corporations.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C is a charter amendment. Under Proposition C, the Board of Supervisors, without voter approval, could authorize the lease financing of equipment without the lease payments being subject to annual approval. A non-profit corporation would be created to buy the equipment and would issue tax-exempt debt to pay for it. The City would lease the equipment from the non-profit until it was paid for. The total principal of the debt issued by the non-profit corporation could not be more than $20 million in the first year. This limit on the outstanding principal would increase five percent each year. The Board could approve this type of lease financing only if the Controller certified that the interest cost to the City would be lower than under other types of lease financing.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow the Board of Supervisors to approve this type of equipment lease financing without voter approval.

Controller's Statement on “C”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its possible future application, costs could be increased or decreased in presently indeterminate but probably not substantial amounts."

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would allow the City to lease finance needed equipment at the lowest possible interest rates. The City would establish a non-profit corporation, which would buy equipment approved by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors and lease it to City departments.

The charter currently requires the voters to approve lease financing if done through non-profit corporations. Financing through a non-profit is the less expensive method because interest rates are tax-exempt. The City has had to occasionally use the more expensive method because it is not always possible to delay purchasing critical equipment until an election is held.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Saves the City money by allowing current and future leases for equipment to be financed at lower interest rates (currently 6% to 7%) than must now be used with private corporations (ranging 9% to 16%).

By simply refinancing existing leases, the City could save over $500,000.

Additional money could be saved on any future leases.

Gives the City the option to pay cash for equipment or to finance it expeditiously at a low cost to the City.

Allows quicker replacement of inefficient and outdated equipment, which will reduce maintenance costs, decrease downtime, and increase productivity for equipment which has outlived its economic useful life.

Provides restrictions to insure prudent use of this financing mechanism.

Requires the Controller to certify that the lease is the least costly financing method.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor and the Chief Administrative Officer.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition C
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition C
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition C

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

7.309 Voter Approval of Lease Financing

(a) The board of supervisors shall not approve the lease financing of public improvements or equipment unless a proposition generally describing the public improvements or equipment and the lease financings arrangement is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition. The board of supervisors may by resolution submit such a proposition to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at a general or special election.

(b) For the purposes of this section, "lease financing" occurs when the city and county leases land, buildings, fixtures, or equipment from a Joint Powers Authority, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the San Francisco Housing Authority, the San Francisco Parking Authority, or a nonprofit corporation, and does so for the purpose of financing the construction or acquisition of public improvements or equipment.

(c) The requirements of this section do not apply:

(1) to any lease financing which was approved in fact or in principle by a resolution or ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; provided, that if the resolution or ordinance approved the lease financing only in principle, the resolution or ordinance must describe in general terms the public improvements or equipment to be financed; or

(2) to the approval of an amendment to a lease financing arrangement or to the refunding of lease financing bonds which results in lower total rental payments under the terms of the lease; or

(3) to lease financings involving a nonprofit corporation established for the purposes of this subsection for the acquisition of equipment, the obligations or evidence of indebtedness with respect to which shall not exceed in the aggregate at any point in time a principal amount of $20 million, such amount to be increased by five percent each fiscal year following approval of this subsection; provided, however, that prior to each sale of such obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the Controller certifies that in his or her opinion the net interest cost to the City will be lower than other financings involving a lease or leases.

Remember to VOTE on Election Day, Tuesday June 5, 1990.
Your polling place is open from 7:00 in the morning to 8:00 in the evening.
Recycling is not only easier than you might think, it's a simple way you can do your part for environmental conservation—and feel good about it, too.

All you need is an ordinary brown paper bag.

Each time you set up your kitchen garbage, place an extra brown bag or two out for recycling. Then every day just drop your newspaper into a recycling bag—a week's worth of papers fits perfectly (and your newspapers will stop piling up on the floor!).

When you're finished with an aluminum soda or beer can simply pop it in a separate bag. The same goes for bottles; just put them in a bag, labels and all. Then when you're on the way to the supermarket or heading out for the day, drop off the bags at a Recycling Center near you. Or, you can tie your newspaper with string and the garbage company will collect it free of charge.

That's it. When you think about it, isn't recycling almost as easy as not recycling?

And it really is the right thing to do.

For a free Recycling Guide and a list of Recycling Centers near you, call:

San Francisco Recycling Program

CITY HALL 554-6193
PROPOSITION D

Shall the City create a Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up fund to pay for beautifying City neighborhoods and cleaning up graffiti, allowing businesses to direct up to one percent of their business tax to the fund, this percentage to be adjusted annually so that $1 million is available in the fund each year?

YES 280
NO 281

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no special City fund to pay for neighborhood beautification projects or graffiti clean-up. Money can be spent for this purpose only when the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors approve it in the City’s budget.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D is an ordinance that would create a “Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund” (“the Fund”) to pay for cleaning up graffiti on public buildings and beautifying the neighborhood.

The Chief Administrative Officer would manage the Fund. Businesses could pay up to one percent of their payroll or business taxes into the Fund. Grants or money donated for graffiti clean-up would be deposited in the Fund. The goal of the ordinance is to produce for the Fund $1,000,000 each year, adjusted annually for inflation. The Controller would change the percentage of taxes businesses could pay into the Fund to produce $1,000,000 in the fund each fiscal year.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to create this fund.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

“Should the proposed Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, General Fund revenues could decrease by as much as $1.4 million in fiscal 1990 and as much as $1 million per year, adjusted for inflation, thereafter.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Harry Brit and Nancy Walker.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

Proposition D asks the voters to make the revitalization of our neighborhoods and the wiping out of graffiti a top city priority without raising taxes.

Proposition D will permit those employers currently eligible in San Francisco to earmark up to 1% of their payroll or gross receipts tax bill to establish The Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund.

The fund will be used to award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city. The Budget Analyst has estimated that approximately one million dollars would be available every year.

Proposition D creates a unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers to keep our city attractive. It will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting and graffiti clean-up.

Also, Proposition D will fund public information and education campaigns to combat litter, and instill in our youth the old-fashioned virtue of respect for public and private property. The fund created by Proposition D will be administered by the Chief Administrative Officer with public input from environmental organizations and neighborhood committees.

Proposition D was authored by Supervisor Jim Gonzales and has been submitted to the voters with the support of the Sierra Club, San Francisco Beautiful, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

According to their ballot argument, the Board of Supervisors wants to create a “unique partnership between local government and neighborhood volunteers” to reduce graffiti. What’s stopping them from doing that now?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

The supervisors also say they want to provide “seed money” for planting trees and improving street lighting. Well, why haven’t they placed items in the city budget to do so?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

In their rebuttal argument, the supervisors claim that “many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle.” Whose fault is that, if not their own?

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

Finally, the supervisors have the temerity to state: “With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark” funds for graffiti. What would be “fair” is if San Francisco businesses paid lower taxes. But no one should be “earmarking” tax dollars except elected representatives of the people!

WHY DO WE NEED PROPOSITION D?

There’s no question that graffiti is a serious problem demanding serious solutions. But what good is it to divert $1,000,000 a year from other city programs? That’s robbing Peter to pay Paul! It’s bad government.

Why do we need Proposition D? We don’t.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

I know something about graffiti.
I wrote the city ordinances prohibiting the sale of spray paint and large, felt-tip pens to minors. I also authored the state law to allow police officers greater latitude in arresting juveniles who deface public transit vehicles. This year, I'm pursuing a bill to revoke for one year the driver's license of any person convicted of graffiti vandalism.

Proposition D is not about graffiti or "neighborhood beautification". It's about diverting millions from the city's General Fund. It's about depriving existing city programs of critically needed revenue. Proposition D is a financial shell game.

Please vote NO on Proposition D.

Proposition D would allow any city business to designate up to 1% of its payroll tax check for deposit in a special fund. According to the supervisors' Budget Analyst, Proposition D could divert up to $1,440,260 from the General Fund in the program's first year.

Thereafter, annual diversions would approximate $1,000,000, plus inflation.

That's over $1,000,000 per year which cannot be spent on police services, fire protection, libraries, and public health.

As you can plainly see from my legislative record, I'm no soft touch when it comes to graffiti prevention and clean-up. But Proposition D is the wrong approach. "Special funds" and "segregated accounts" have no place in our city budget.

Graffiti programs deserve adequate city funding, and the Board of Supervisors and Mayor should move promptly to appropriate such funds in the next regular budgetary cycle.

The voters, meanwhile, should move promptly to reject Proposition D on June 5th!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

We need a city plan that invests in the quality of our neighborhoods... Now. It's obvious laws banning the sale of spray paint and felt pens have done nothing to stop the sprawl of graffiti or create a climate of cooperation between city officials and neighborhood groups to find real solutions.

Proposition D is about beautifying our neighborhoods consistently. Proposition D is about wiping out graffiti permanently. With all that downtown businesses pay in taxes, it is only fair that they can choose to earmark a mere one-hundredth to be poured back into the neighborhoods.

Out of a greater than two billion dollar annual budget, the city can afford a guaranteed million dollars to help keep our city beautiful, clean, and graffiti-free. Year in and year out, many neighborhood projects get jilted during the budget cycle. Proposition D will provide a solid foundation for the revitalization of our neighborhoods, which no one can tamper with and that requires no new taxes.

Over the last few years, individual Supervisors have spent many weekends planting trees and removing graffiti with neighborhood groups. Working with groups such as SF ALIVE, San Francisco Conservation Corps, 24th Street Revitalization Committee and the West Portal Merchants Association to make our neighborhoods shine has taught us one thing... neighborhood environmentalists and city departments working together as partners will be a winning combination for San Francisco.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

When City Hall and neighborhood organizations work together, problems can be solved. Vote YES on D.

Joel Ventresca
Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods Candidate for Supervisor

There is a reason that the San Francisco Beautiful, the Sierra Club and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, along with dozens of neighborhood groups support placing PROPOSITION D on the ballot.

San Franciscans are united in wanting to preserve and enhance our city’s attractiveness and keep San Francisco one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

Our Supervisors put PROPOSITION D on the ballot for your approval because they realize that a more attractive city starts with people like you and me and our neighbors who truly care about San Francisco.

YES ON PROPOSITION D creates a working partnership between our neighborhoods and city government;

YES ON PROPOSITION D means a more beautiful city and enhancement of your neighborhood and mine;

YES ON PROPOSITION D accomplishes this with NO NEW TAXES, allowing large employers to earmark up to 1% of their current payroll tax for beautification and graffiti cleanup;

YES ON PROPOSITION D pays for neighborhood-generated projects, giving residents a say in how these reserved funds are spent;

YES ON PROPOSITION D is the first step to guaranteeing more beautiful and attractive neighborhoods.

Join your neighbors, business owners and environmentalists by voting YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Al Pross, Chair
COMMITTEE FOR BEAUTIFUL NEIGHBORHOODS

The quality of life in our neighborhoods will truly become a top city priority with the passage of Proposition D.

• Proposition D will provide over a million dollars a year from the business community to stop neighborhood decay (through a voluntary checkoff on their payroll or gross receipts tax bill).

• Proposition D will award hundreds of small grants to responsible neighborhood and youth organizations involved in innovative projects to beautify long neglected areas within our city.

• Proposition D will provide the necessary seed money for caring neighbors to beautify our city with public amenities, trees, art, better lighting, and graffiti clean-up.

• Proposition D will fund an educational campaign to teach our youngsters a new respect for public and private property.

Let’s protect our city’s special livability. Let’s foster civic pride. Let’s invest in the long term health of San Francisco’s residential neighborhoods. Vote YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Supervisor Jim Gonzales

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Graffiti is a blight on the beauty of San Francisco. We strongly encourage the continued generosity of grants and donations to eradicate this problem. However, during the current deficit-ridden period, it is irresponsible for the City to direct at least $1,000,000 a year from the General Fund for this purpose.

The San Francisco Republican Party urges you to vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley
William E. Grayson

Anna M. Guth
Christopher L. Bowman
Tina H. Frank
Mildred "Millie" Danch
Rose Chang
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hatoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "D"
Why add more government to your taxes.
$1 million per year to be funded from Payroll taxes which has a sunset clause to expire in 1990.
Then who pays the tab? You do.
If the police would assert their powers and nab the violators, instead of the City offering to pay to clean up their "works of art" this ordinance would not be necessary.
Vote NO on Proposition D.

Marguerite Warren
[Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund]

AN ORDINANCE, ADDING SECTIONS 10.98 AND 10.98-1 TO THE SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TO ESTABLISH A NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND AND SPECIFYING THE PURPOSES THEREFOR AND AMENDING PART III, SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL CODE, BY ADDING ARTICLE 12B-1 THERETO, TO PROVIDE THAT ANY BUSINESS WHICH OWES A PAYROLL EXPENSE TAX OR BUSINESS TAX MAY ELECT TO DESIGNATE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE TAX FOR DEPOSIT IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND.

NOTE: All sections are new.

Section 1. The San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Sections 10.98 and 10.98-1 thereto, to read as follows:

SEC. 10.98. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: FINDINGS AND INTENT.

(a) Findings.

The proliferation of graffiti on public buildings and other public property has created a blight which offends both citizens of and visitors to San Francisco. The removal of such graffiti will enhance the beauty of the city in which we live and will encourage others to visit and to relocate here. Removal will thus both reflect and renew our civic pride and contribute to our economic viability. Providing a source of funds for the promotion of neighborhood beautification projects will support the efforts of local residents and businesses to improve the quality of life for San Francisco residents and the local economy, and assist in reducing the amount of graffiti in San Francisco.

(b) Statement of Intent.

The Board of Supervisors wishes to address the above concerns by establishing a neighborhood beautification and graffiti clean-up fund which will promote neighborhood beautification projects, including projects designed to improve the environmental quality of neighborhoods, and finance the clean-up of graffiti on public property.

SEC. 10.98-1. NEIGHBORHOOD BEAUTIFICATION AND GRAFFITI CLEAN-UP FUND: ESTABLISHMENT; ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS; DUTIES.

(a) Establishment of Fund. There is hereby established a special fund for the purpose of receiving all donations of money which may be collected by the City and County of San Francisco for the purposes enumerated in Section 10.98(b). Monies deposited in the fund shall only be expended for the purposes enumerated therein, provided that such expenditures shall include reimbursement to City and County departments for expenses incurred in the administration of the fund. The special fund shall be known and designated as the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund.

(b) Acceptance of Gifts. All donations of money which may be offered to the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund are hereby accepted for such purposes. Any grants, gifts and bequests from private sources for this purpose shall be deposited into said special fund.

(c) Duties of the Chief Administrative Officer. 1. The Chief Administrative Officer, or his or her designee, shall be responsible for the administration of the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund, and shall have all such authority as may be reasonably necessary to carry out those responsibilities.

2. The Chief Administrative Officer shall promulgate such rules and regulations as he or she may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Section and Section 10.98. Before issuing or amending any rules and regulations, the Chief Administrative Officer shall provide a thirty (30) day public comment period by publishing published notice in an official newspaper of general circulation in the City of the intent to issue or amend the rules and regulations. The rules and regulations shall be approved by resolution of the Board of Supervisors. Such rules and regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the qualifications of applicants and factors to be considered in the award of grants to fund programs to help remove graffiti and promote neighborhood beautification projects, including preference for the following projects: youth programs and innovation projects that are neighborhood generated, and projects designed to benefit areas of San Francisco that are economically disadvantaged.

3. The Chief Administrative Officer shall submit a semi-annual report to the Board of Supervisors setting forth an accounting of the amounts disbursed and the uses for which said funds were made.

(d) Budgetary and Fiscal Provisions of the Charter. The monies in this fund are subject to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of the Charter and may be expended only when authorized by appropriation ordinance of the Board of Supervisors.

(e) Interest. Interest earned from the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund shall become part of the principal thereof, and shall not be expended for any purpose other than that for which the fund is established.

(f) Accumulation of Monies in Fund. The balance remaining in the Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-up Fund at the close of any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been provided for a specific purpose within the meaning of Charter Section 6.306 and shall be carried forward and accumulated in said fund for the purposes recited herein.

Section 2. Part III of the San Francisco Municipal Code is hereby amended by adding Article 12B-1 thereto, to read as follows:

[Text of Proposed Ordinance: Neighborhood Beautification and Graffiti Clean-Up Fund Tax]
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PROPOSITION F
Shall a minimum number of fire stations and levels of staffing for the Fire Department be specified in the Charter, and shall the closing of any fire station or deactivation of any fire company or unit be subject to prior approval by the Fire Commission, Board of Supervisors and San Francisco voters?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Fire Commission has the authority to decide the number and staffing of fire companies and the number and location of fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors may change the number of firefighters. The Fire Commission may close or move fire stations or reduce the number of fire companies if it decides they are no longer needed. A fire company typically consists of a fire engine or other emergency vehicle and the firefighters needed to operate it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment that would specify a minimum number of fire stations and fire companies and minimum levels of staffing for those fire companies. Proposition F would increase the number of firefighters assigned to some types of fire companies. This means that the number of firefighters on duty at all times would increase from 297 to 322. Where necessary, Proposition F’s minimum level of staffing would be met by firefighters working overtime. Overtime pay for firefighters is one and one-half times their normal salary.

Proposition F would limit the power of the Fire Commission, Mayor and Board of Supervisors to set the number of fire stations and staffing levels.

Before closing any fire station or reducing the number of fire companies or units required by Proposition F, the measure would require (1) a recommendation by the Fire Chief; (2) approval by the Fire Commission, after public hearings; (3) approval by the Board of Supervisors; and (4) approval by the voters.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current salary rates and staffing levels of the Fire Department, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $4.9 million per year.”

How “F” Got on the Ballot
On March 2, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition F to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,485* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted on February 21 by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 56,364 of the signatures submitted were valid, 15,879 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

WHAT IS PROP F?

PROPOSITION F IS A CHARTER AMENDMENT THAT WILL ESTABLISH A MINIMUM LEVEL OF FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTHQUAKE PREPAREDNESS FOR SAN FRANCISCO. IT GIVES THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE FIRE CHIEF THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO MANAGE THE FIRE DEPARTMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CITIZENS.

SAN FRANCISCO NEEDS THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT BECAUSE IT WILL:

1. GUARANTEE THAT THE PRESENT 41 FIRE STATIONS STAY OPEN
2. GUARANTEE FULLY-STAFFED FIRE TRUCKS AT ALL TIMES
3. GUARANTEE PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE FIRE COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BEFORE ANY FIRE STATION CAN BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED
4. GUARANTEE THAT YOUR FIREBOAT WILL BE STAFFED WITH A FIREFIGHTING CREW OF TWO THE 7.1 QUAKE OF OCTOBER 17 WARNED US AGAIN — WE MUST BE PREPARED!

ITEM A — MAYOR AGNOS CUT THE FIRE DEPART-

MENT ON-DUTY STAFFING BY 19 PERSONS A DAY IN 1989.

PROP F RESTORES THOSE CUTS.


ITEM C — PROP F DOES NOT REQUIRE "GUARANTEE OVERTIME" AND, IN FACT, BY JULY 1992 NO OVERTIME WILL BE NEEDED FOR THE STAFFING REQUIREMENTS OF PROP F.

(Overtime is now caused by large numbers of vacant positions. New hiring will eliminate all vacancies and overtime by July 1992. Prop F will safeguard this full-staffing.)

PROP F IS A COMMON SENSE MEASURE TO GIVE ADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION TO ALL CITIZENS.

VOTE YES ON F!

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F;
COMMITTEE FOR FIRE PROTECTION AND EARTH-QUAKE PREPAREDNESS
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

It is clear that Proposition F is not a Fire Safety Issue.

It is clearly an issue to guarantee overtime.

1. This Mayor and Board of Supervisors have never closed a single fire station and have no intention to close firehouses.

2. Most major cities in America considers five firefighers per truck to be fully-staffed. More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire.

3. Proposition F will not restore cuts in firefighters. We are mandated by law to provide 90 new firefighters this year. Proposition F only guarantees overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day, $3.5 million per year.

Our firefighters do a tough job! But we compensate them well! We need new equipment — not more overtime. Following the earthquake, a fire truck had to be taken from the fire museum to fight fires. Let's not waste money which could be used for new firefighting equipment.

San Francisco voters rejected a similar proposal in 1987 and it should be rejected again in 1990.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Proposition F will waste millions of your tax dollars. Just look at the facts.

Fact: Proposition F does not hire new firefighters. The Federal Consent Decree already sets hiring standards — 90 new firefighters will be hired this year without Prop. F.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that Assistant Chiefs and Battalion Chiefs will continue to have chauffeurs.

Fact: Proposition F is not needed to save fire stations. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors have no intention of closing any fire stations.

Fact: Proposition F does guarantee that 18 current firefighters will get daily time-and-a-half overtime at a cost of $10,000 per day... or more than $3.5 million extra per year.

Fact: Proposition F is not a fire safety issue. Virtually every major American city deploys five or fewer firefighters on fire trucks. A sixth firefighter is featherbedding, not firefighting.

More than 30 firefighters already respond to a one-alarm fire. That’s enough people to raise ladders, ventilate rooftops and carry out lifesaving tasks.

FACT: Our firefighters do a tough job. But they are well compensated already and do not need additional guaranteed overtime... especially when there are so many other pressing needs in San Francisco.

FACT: Firefighters in San Francisco are currently paid $300 more per month than the average salaries of firefighters in the four largest California cities. But the other firefighters work 15 percent more hours than San Francisco.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters already receive 23 percent more vacation, sick and holiday leave than other city workers. A recent study by the Controller shows that increased overtime results in increased sick leave and disability.

Study the facts and you’ll agree. Proposition F is nothing more than $7 million per year in unnecessary guaranteed overtime.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F

FACT: PROP F does:

- Guarantee that the 90 new firefighters cannot later be eliminated by politicians.
- Require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people before cutbacks can be made to the minimum staffing.

FACT: The Mayor DID cut back Fire Department staffing in August 1989 from 315 to 296.

FACT: Assistant and Battalion Chiefs DO NOT have “chauffeurs.” They DO have an operations and communications assistant.

FACT: Prop F IS needed to guarantee public review and input before any fire station can be closed.

FACT: SIX fire stations have been closed by the Mayor’s office since 1972 without any public review.

FACT: Prop F DOES guarantee that the 19 on-duty firefighters cut by the Mayor in 1989 will be restored. When sufficient new firefighters are hired, NO OVERTIME will be required.

FACT: PROP F IS A FIRE SAFETY ISSUE!

FACT: San Francisco firefighters ARE REQUIRED to work overtime because previous policies of politicians allowed large numbers of vacant positions to occur.

FACT: San Francisco firefighters DO NOT get a paid health plan for dependents, nor do they get longevity pay or other benefits enjoyed by firefighters in the four largest California cities.

FACT: ALL city employees, including firefighters, receive EXACTLY THE SAME vacation, sick and holiday leave. This is a city Charter requirement.

SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS FOR YES ON PROPOSITION F
JAMES T. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN
JAMES M. AHERN, VICE-CHAIRMAN

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I STRONGLY SUPPORT PROP F!
Prop F will benefit all the people of San Francisco. Over 71,000 voters from every part of the City signed the petition to put Prop F on the ballot. They expressed enthusiastic support for a stronger Fire Department.

The City is becoming increasingly built-up, causing greater congestion. This means that fire hazards are increasing and adequate fire protection will be even more important to us than ever.

The October 17th earthquake was an urgent reminder of how fragile our city is and how important our Fire Department is to all of us.

When you, the people, call for help, whether it is for a medical emergency, a rescue, or fire, the firefighters come.

PROP F MAKES SENSE FOR ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!
It allows you to participate in fire safety decisions that affect your neighborhood.

Our neighborhoods are the “heart” of San Francisco. OUR FAMILIES, HOMES, CHURCHES, FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS NEED SATISFACTORY FIRE PROTECTION.

PROP F WILL MAKE SAN FRANCISCO A SAFER PLACE TO LIVE IN.

VOTE YES ON F!

Bill Maher, Member
Board of Supervisors

I STRONGLY SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!
They provide vital services to our citizens. Last year, our firefighters answered a record-breaking 58,000 alarms and saved thousands of lives. The greatest number of calls came from the Tenderloin, the Inner Mission, the Fillmore, Civic Center/Hayes Valley, Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley. I WANT TO BE SURE YOU GET THE HELP YOU NEED — WHEN YOU NEED IT!

Over the past 20 years, unlike other city departments, Fire Department staffing has been slashed by 40%! THREE FORMER CHIEFS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT AGREE THAT THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY ARE TOO FEW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS! THEY AGREE THAT NO MORE FIREFHOUSES SHOULD BE CLOSED.

We NEED Proposition F. It will:
• Put firefighters back on the ladder trucks
• Put firefighters back on our fireboats
• Bring daily staffing up to an adequate level
• Guarantee that any proposed closings of fire companies will be subject to a public review and vote by the Fire Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the people
• Guarantee the SFFD the funding it needs

THE COST OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT IS ONLY 2 CENTS A DAY FOR EACH OF US! That 2 cents could easily save a life — maybe yours, or that of a loved one. PROP. F WILL BENEFIT ALL SAN FRANCISCANS!

Supervisor Tom Hsieh

I STRONGLY SUPPORT IMPROVED FIRE PROTECTION IN SAN FRANCISCO!
I SHARE THE CONCERNS OF THE 71,000 VOTERS WHO PUT THIS PROPOSITION ON THE BALLOT. Fire Department daily staffing has been forced so low that our safety is threatened. WE MUST KEEP OUR FIREFHOUSES OPEN AND FIREF APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED.

In addition to fighting fires, our firefighters perform many services for our elderly, disabled and low income families that no one else does. FIREFIGHTERS RESPONDED TO OVER 58,000 EMERGENCIES LAST YEAR, INCLUDING 26,000 MEDICAL CALLS.

We depend on our firefighters to protect our families, homes, and businesses. Our narrow streets, steep hills and rows of wood frame buildings make firefighting very difficult. SAN FRANCISCO HAS SPECIAL FIREFIGHTING AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL NEEDS! We are different from other California cities with their wide streets, flat terrain and detached buildings!

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING FOR PROPOSITION F. THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL BENEFIT ALL OUR CITIZENS.

WENDY NELDER, Member
Board of Supervisors

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

STOP REDUCTIONS IN CITY FIRE PROTECTION! VOTE YES ON F!
Over 71,000 San Francisco voters from every neighborhood, ethnic group and economic level joined to put PROPOSITION F on this ballot. They are concerned because politicians have reduced daily staffing to a dangerous all-time low while emergency calls reached an all-time high of 58,000 last year. People want their neighborhood firehouses to stay open and their fire engines, aerial ladder trucks and fireboats fully staffed to meet their emergency needs. They want a Charter amendment to take politics out of fire safety decisions.

ONLY YOU CAN STOP FURTHER DANGEROUS CUTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!
Over the years, the San Francisco Fire Department has assisted hundreds of thousands of San Franciscans in time of great personal need. The people understand how important the SFFD is in their lives, and OVER 71,000 OF THEM SIGNED THE PETITION TO PLACE PROPOSITION F ON THE BALLOT. The citizens want to be heard!

SFFD EMERGENCY RESPONSES ARE INCREASING DRAMATICALLY EVERY YEAR! Fiscal year totals have gone from 28,000 in 1970 to over 58,000 in 1989, while politicians have slashed daily on-duty staffing from 482, when I was Fire Chief, to today's all-time low of 296. Department resources are being stretched thinner and thinner despite greater and greater needs. THIS DANGEROUS TREND MUST BE STOPPED!

The Department must be able to meet the complex and highly varied needs of today's San Francisco. These include fighting structural fires, providing medical assistance, performing cliff and water rescues, responding to BART and MUNI fires and accidents, controlling hazardous materials emergencies, assisting victims of industrial accidents, and responding to many other emergency needs.

Many seniors, low income families and handicapped people rely on the SFFD to help them. THE PERSONAL ATTENTION THAT THE SFFD PROVIDES CAN NEVER BE CONVERTED TO SELF-SERVICE OR AUTOMATED! Firefighters, now machines, put out fires, perform rescues and meet all the other emergency needs of our city. You need these firefighters! THE NEXT CALL HELP MAY BE YOURS!

The need for Fire Department services crosses all social, ethnic and economic strata. We can all get behind this quality of life issue. Proposition F will strengthen your Fire Department and take politics out of fire safety.

William F. Murray
Chief of Department, SFFD, Retired

VOTE YES ON PROP F!
It takes teamwork to put out a fire. Without it, lives and property can be lost. Without it, firefighters can pay a hard price, for their lives, when in danger, may depend on having a buddy to lend a hand or go for help. As much a part of their job as hose, ladders, and water is that firefighters work in pairs when possible. It can be critical where dense smoke obscures vision or — as so many San Francisco neighborhoods well know — when trying to maneuver on a steeply pitched roof.

Current staffing of aerial ladder trucks leaves one firefighter without a buddy, the team short one vital hand. Proposition F will restore the balance that a fire — and time-tested system needs.

It also will mean two firefighters ready to move out with the fireboat when it has a job to do. Because they weren't readily available, the fireboat was delayed in pumping bay water to put out the disastrous Marina fire after last October's earthquake.

That's why I'm voting "Yes" on Prop F and am urging all San Franciscans to do the same.

Edward J. Phipps
Chief of Department, SFFD (Retired)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

I OWE MY LIFE TO THE QUICK AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSE OF THE SAN FRANCISCO FIREFIGHTERS STATIONED AT MY LOCAL FIREHOUSE

Over 26,000 San Franciscans received emergency medical assistance last year by the SFFD. Many lives were saved because firefighters were on the scene in 3 minutes or less. The neighborhood firehouse is an essential part of San Francisco’s complex fire protection system.

The October 17th earthquake and the great Marina fire showed us how vital it is to have our Fire Department maintained at an adequate level. There were no firefighters on board the Fireboat Phoenix when it arrived in the Marina, and for over 1 1/2 hours firefighting and search and rescue operations were hindered by a lack of firefighters, as well as by a lack of water. UNDERSTAFFING CAN CAUSE FIRE DEATHS.

Proposal F will answer these critical needs by restoring funds for adequate staffing of fire companies, including the fireboat, and it will require public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission and Board of Supervisors before any further cutbacks in fire protection can be made.

PLEASE JOIN ME IN VOTING YES ON F!

John Barbagelata

---

PENNY-POWER! LOOK — HOW CAN YOU BUY SOMETHING PRICELESS FOR ONLY PENNIES A DAY?

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION F!

FOR ONLY 2 CENTS PER DAY, YOU WILL:

• KEEP YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIREHOUSE OPEN
• KEEP FIRE APPARATUS FULLY STAFFED
• KEEP YOUR FIREBOAT IN SERVICE AND STAFFED WITH FIREFIGHTERS
• GUARANTEE THAT NO FIREHOUSES OR FIRE COMPANIES WILL BE CLOSED OR RELOCATED WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT
• REMOVE POLITICS FROM FIRE SAFETY

THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CHARTER AMENDMENT WILL COST EACH OF SAN FRANCISCO’S 732,000 RESIDENTS JUST PENNIES A DAY:

YEAR 1 — COST $5.3 MILLION = 2 CENTS PER DAY!
YEAR 2 — COST $2.8 MILLION = 1 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 3 — COST $0.8 MILLION = 1/2 CENT PER DAY!
YEAR 4 — NO ADDITIONAL COST!

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSURANCE POLICY YOU WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON’T MISS THE CHANCE!

VOTE YES ON F!

W.F. O’Keefe, Sr.
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

---

WE STRONGLY SUPPORT PROPOSITION F!

No one worries more about costs than working people. For their hard-earned dollars, breadwinners demand value in return.

Value is what Proposition F is all about. It restores adequate staffing of engine and ladder truck companies, staffs the fireboat, and assures that you and I will have a voice in any proposed closing of a fire company or firehouse.

Proposition F is an insurance policy that is clearly a benefit to all San Franciscans. And, there is no question that the benefits greatly exceed the cost — to each of us, just 2 cents a day for the first year, 1 cent a day for the second year, and no cost thereafter.

Without adequate fire protection, San Francisco has too much to lose.

VOTE YES ON F!

Walter L. Johnson
San Francisco Labor Council
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

**PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F**

**SUPPORT OUR FIREFIGHTERS!**
They provide absolutely essential services for our citizens, and no one else can do their job! We have 500 high rise buildings, BART and MUNI tunnels, and large business, school and hospital complexes where firefighting requires many firefighters.

On October 17, we were lucky! It was just a warning.

**THE PRESENT 296 FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY IS TOO LOW TO MEET OUR DAILY AND OUR DISASTER NEEDS!**
Let's all get behind Proposition F! It will assure stability in Department funding, guarantee adequate staffing for our firehouses and apparatus, and permit long-range planning and improvements. Our firefighters need your vote!

James A. Hood
Chairman
San Franciscans for Fire Safety

---

**VOTE YES ON F!**
San Francisco is a fragile city. Over 90% of all structures are of wood frame construction. Your homes are built in solid blocks of wooden buildings. This situation presents the possibility of a disastrous fire or conflagration occurring, especially following an earthquake.

The Fire Department is the lifeline for all of us who live in this city. The earthquake on October 17th and the great fire in the Marina show how important the Fire Department is to San Francisco.

Politicians are using shrill rhetoric and other offensive tactics in an attempt to mislead the public as to what the real meaning of Prop F is. Do not be misled! Prop F provides three main points:

- Establishes the present 41 neighborhood fire stations as a minimum standard
- Puts a firefighters crew on the fireboat
- Requires public hearings and approval of the Fire Commission, The Board of Supervisors and the Citizens before a fire station can be closed or relocated.

These are common sense measures that provide a minimum level of public safety for our families and city.

Please join me, and the 70,000 other San Franciscans who signed the petitions to put Prop F on the ballot, and vote yes on "F!"

Frank T. Blackburn
Assistant Fire Chief

---

**VOTE YES ON F!**
Fire protection is vital for our families and businesses.
Prop F will stabilize protection and prevent further cuts in the Fire Department.
Protect our city. Vote Yes on F.

Robert E. Donohue
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)
Charles D. Cresci
Deputy Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Charles H. Lee
Director of Training, SFFD (Retired)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T TAKE YOUR FIREFIGHTERS FOR GRANTED!
San Francisco firefighters answered a record 58,000 calls for help last year. Of these, 26,000 were for medical emergencies. Heart attacks, auto accidents, building collapses, childbirths were just a few. BUT EVERY YEAR THERE ARE FEWER AND FEWER FIREFIGHTERS TO HELP YOU! In 1970 there were 482 firefighters on duty each day — in 1990 there are only 296! Six firehouses and 12 fire companies have been closed.

FIRESAFETYDECISIONS MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE HANDS OF POLITICIANS! Only a Charter amendment will assure that your Fire Department is adequately staffed to meet San Francisco's special needs — now and in the future. FOR JUST 2 CENTS A DAY, WE CAN KEEP OUR NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS OPEN AND OUR FIRE APPARATUS ADE-

QUATELY STAFFED.

THIS IS THE CHEAPEST — AND THE BEST — INSUR-
ANCE WE WILL EVER BE ABLE TO BUY. DON'T MISS
THE CHANCE! VOTE YES ON F!

Walter G. Jebe
John J. Figone
Caesar A. Churchwell
Alessandro Baccari
Virgil Caselli
Marsha Garland
Tom Creedon
Ed Farrah
Michael Salarno

NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE STATIONS
Pride, trust, reliance. They're all wrapped up in a San Francisco institution. The neighborhood fire station turns out to be more — it's a rock, an anchor, a point of reference in people's lives.

City residents have said so loud and clear in endorsing Proposition F. Besides setting a minimum number of firefighters to be on duty each day, the June ballot measure guarantees a public hearing in the area concerned and a vote of the people, if needed, before any fire station may be closed.

Seventy thousand people petitioned to put F on the ballot. Their reasons all had a common core. It's not THE fire station but OUR fire station, they said — a place to expect and get help in a fire or medical emergency, a place the local community can turn to and rely on if the earth shakes, buildings fall, and other resources break down.

Neighborhoods and fire stations. The one requires the other, San Franciscans say.

John W. Flaherty
Mark L. Kaplan
Robert L. Barisone
Elvera Jane Barisone
William A. Roberts Jr.
Maureen Porter
William Porter Jr.
Homer G. Miles
Dorothy L. Miles
Peter C. Gardner
Joan M. Gardner
John Daly
Lucia R. Flaherty

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

DON'T BE MISLED BY MAYOR AGNOS!
PROP F IS A LIFE AND DEATH ISSUE!
FIRE, INSURANCE AND EARTHQUAKE EXPERTS AGREE: SAN FRANCISCO FACED THE HIGHEST RISK OF CONFLAGRATION OF ANY CITY IN THE UNITED STATES!
FIRE RISK IS HIGHER THAN IN 1906!
SAN FRANCISCO'S FIRE PROTECTION NEEDS ARE DICTATED BY THE NATURE OF OUR CITY, with its:
- Blocks and blocks of adjoining wood frame buildings
- Steep hills
- Narrow streets
- Traffic congestion
- Network of overhead electrical, trolley and telephone lines
- Prevailing winds
- 500 high rise buildings
- High density residential areas
- Large population of seniors and low-income families
- High vulnerability to severe earthquake damage
- Isolation from outside help in time of disaster
SAN FRANCISCO IS IN TROUBLE BECAUSE THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH FIREFIGHTERS ON DUTY EACH DAY. Former SF Fire Chief Emmet Condon in his book "Denial of Disaster":
"THE SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT IS BELOW THE DAILY MANNING LEVEL THAT ANY EXPERIENCED CHIEF OFFICER KNOWS IS NECESSARY TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SERVICE TO THE CITY."

Condon continues:
"I WOULD AGREE THAT THE HAZARD OF FIRE TO THE CITY AFTER A SIMILAR DISASTER TODAY IS MUCH GREATER THAN IN 1906."

And,
"SYNTHETIC MATERIALS HAVE GREATLY INCREASED THE FIRE RISK IN MODERN BUILDINGS AND WILL MAGNIFY THE FIRE PROBLEM IN THE MULTIPLE FIRES THAT WILL BREAK OUT AFTER A SERIOUS EARTHQUAKE."

At least 400 of the city's 500 high rise buildings do not have modern life-safety systems! HIGH RISE FIRES CAUSE A HUGE DRAIN ON FIRE DEPARTMENT RESOURCES.

PROP F IS STRONGLY SUPPORTED BY INDIVIDUALS, CITIZEN, BUSINESS AND NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS, FIRE SAFETY EXPERTS, AND A BROAD SPECTRUM OF KNOWLEDGEABLE CIVIC LEADERS.

There is no significant opposition to Prop F.
PROTECT YOURSELF, YOUR FAMILY, YOUR FRIENDS — YOU HAVE A LOT TO LOSE! VOTE YES ON F!

GERRY LONG
Concerned Citizen

WHY VOTE YES ON F? WHY A CHARTER AMENDMENT?
City politicians have been consistently unresponsive to your fire safety concerns. It is the duty of the City to provide its citizens with adequate fire protection and earthquake preparedness. Instead, Fire Department staffing has been cut to a dangerous level.

THE POLITICIANS SAY, "TRUST US!"
We can see that this has not worked, and a Charter provision is necessary. YOUR EMERGENCY NEEDS ARE TOO VITAL TO BE LEFT VULNERABLE TO POLITICAL GAMES.

You hear the sirens every day — BUT HAVE YOU COUNTED THE FIREFIGHTERS? Fewer firefighters means greatly reduced firefighting capacity. FIRE DEPARTMENT STAFFING IS NOW AT AN ALL-TIME LOW AND CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO FALL FURTHER!

WE NEED A STRONG FIRE DEPARTMENT! VOTE YES ON F!

John Flaherty
Battalion Chief, SFFD (Retired)
Past President, S.F. Fire Chiefs Assn.
Minimum Firefighter Staffing

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

HIGH RISE BUILDINGS AND BART AND MUNI UNDERGROUND FACILITIES MAKE SPECIAL FIRE PROTECTION DEMANDS

Today, San Francisco has over 500 high rise buildings. Fires in these buildings require many firefighters because equipment must be carried by hand to the fire — often up many flights of stairs.

In 1988 in Los Angeles, a fire on three floors of a high rise building required 383 firefighters to bring it under control. In San Francisco, our entire on-duty force would be required, leaving the rest of the city completely unprotected. Mutual aid from neighboring communities would be totally inadequate to cover our needs.

BART and MUNI underground facilities present special fire and rescue problems. Large numbers of firefighters are required to fight these fires and perform rescue and evacuation operations.

In July 1989, Mayor Agnos forced reductions in truck company staffing — the key players in rescue and ventilation operations. Now these aerial ladder teams can no longer function properly.

Building ventilation is delayed, greatly increasing the risk of deadly backdrafts.

The Department’s daily staffing has fallen to 296 firefighters, the lowest in history, while fire, medical and other emergencies are higher than ever. Proposition F will bring SFFD staffing up to 320. This is critically needed to meet these ever-increasing demands.

In the past, some Fire Chiefs have thought that you could safely relocate or close a firehouse, but I now recognize that this is dangerous. The SFFD can now get to most emergencies within 3 minutes, but if we close a firehouse we lose that prompt response. With our rows of wood buildings, our large population of elderly citizens, we must get there quickly.

The SFFD is your lifeline. Protect it! I strongly urge all citizens to vote YES on F!

James P. Olson, President
San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association

Any firefighter responsible for any racist act or statement on duty, after due process, should be disciplined. Repeat occurrences must result in severe penalties.

Expensive overtime can be largely eliminated by adding more firefighters.

Differences between the union and the mayor should be resolved through good faith negotiations, not through the election process. Maintaining high morale is the only way to insure efficiency.

The neighborhood service cuts need to be restored.

Vote YES on F.

Joel Ventresca
Past President, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Becoming a victim in another major earthquake or runaway fire in one of San Francisco’s densely populated neighborhoods continues to be a hazard for all of us.

Nonetheless, because the Firefighters Union did not endorse him, Mayor Agnos has seen fit to reduce the staffing levels of the Fire Department in any twenty-four hour period from 315 to 296. The San Francisco Republican Party believes these cuts are penny-wise, pound-foolish, and politically motivated.

Vote Yes on Proposition F. DO NOT let the Mayor’s political vendetta jeopardize public safety.

San Francisco Republican Party
Honor H. Bulkley

William E. Grayson
Anna M. Guth
Tina H. Frank
Christopher L. Bowman
Mildred “Millie” Danch
Rose Chung
Sam T. Harper
Ronald G. Kershaw
Jun Hayoyama
Wade Francois
Martin Keller
Harriet Ross
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

I strongly urge you to vote NO on Proposition F. This proposition, if passed, will require twenty-five extra firefighters to be hired each day — five of these firefighters will have no specific functions — their daily assignment will be at the discretion of the Chief of Department. It will also require that daily truck staffing be increased from five to six persons and the fireboat staffing be increased by another two firefighters daily. These increases are unnecessary and are not required — fire suppression units are now staffed to provide effective and efficient fire service for San Francisco.

Proposition F will take management control and responsibility away from the Chief of Department by requiring organizational changes to be approved by the voters at a regular election. This would not allow the Chief, through the Fire Commission, to respond to the changing demands placed on the Fire Department. Fire protection decisions can’t wait until an election. To provide for and maintain the most cost effective and efficient fire department, I urge you to vote NO on Proposition F.

Frederick F. Postel
Chief of Department

Overtime pay is bleeding the Fire Department’s budget dry! Over 92 percent of the budget goes for personnel costs. In 1988-89 uniformed personnel were paid salaries totaling $53,567,000 plus mandatory fringe benefits of $33,543,000 and still another $11,893,000 for overtime!

Proposition F would increase that bleeding by creating new positions not necessary for the safety of San Franciscans despite the scare statements made by the firefighters’ union.

Proposition F would cost $4,900,000 in overtime thereby siphoning away money needed to make major improvements!

We already have excellent protection but we want to upgrade it by developing a comprehensive earthquake program, by improving our response to emergency medical calls (over 4 1/2 times the number of fires) and by purchasing more modern fire equipment. During the October quake 522 off-duty firefighters reported back immediately yet there were not enough engines and trucks for them; in fact, one old piece had to be taken out of the Fire Museum to help fight the Marina District fire.

Our firefighters work nine days out of 31 in shifts of approximately 24 hours on and 48 off.

Many are “double-dippers” holding down well paid outside jobs such as contractors, lawyers, plumbers and electricians. They still put in overtime because the Charter provides for such generous pay.

Overtime pay for a firefighter is $585 per shift, for a Captain $776 and for an Assistant Chief $1077! Last year the average firefighter’s cost to the City was $90,000, including salary, fringe benefits and overtime.

Do not pay out more money just for overtime.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION F!

James Jefferson
President, Fire Commission
Frank Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission
Henry Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Sharon Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission
Ted Souls
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

San Francisco has the finest fire protection in California. Now is not the time to jeopardize it with Proposition F. Proposition F is an ill-advised and wasteful measure.

First, it would wrest management of the Fire Department away from the Fire Commission and the Chief, where management properly and historically belongs.

Management of the Fire Department should remain accountable to the citizens of San Francisco, through its appointed Fire Commission. This principle is violated when rigid language is placed in the Charter. Second, Proposition F would unnecessarily increase the Fire Department’s budget by approximately $4.9 million a year.

The San Francisco Fire Department already has staffing levels on its fire engines and aerial ladder trucks that are equal to the best in California.

To overstaff the engines and trucks would be counterproductive as well as wasteful, especially in a time of limited resources and ever-increasing demands for City services.

Let life and death decisions of fire protection in San Francisco remain in the control of the Fire Commission and the Chief.

Let the buck stop where it has always stopped — with the Fire Commission and the Chief. And let San Francisco’s first-rate fire protection continue.

We can’t afford to play around with fire, or with Proposition F. A similar Proposition was defeated in November, 1987. Vote NO on this Proposition in 1990. Vote NO on Proposition F.

James D. Jefferson
President, Fire Commission

Frank A. Quinn
Vice-President, Fire Commission

Henry E. Berman
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Sharon L. Bretz
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Ted N. Souls
Commissioner, Fire Commission

Vote No on Proposition F.

Proposition F has little to do with fire protection and earthquake preparedness and a lot to do with unnecessary Fire Department staffing.

Vote No on Proposition F. Don’t tie the hands of the Chief and Fire Commission, preventing them from managing the department and our tax dollars. Proposition F will take $6 million a year from health services, libraries, homeless programs and other vital city services. Why? Because Proposition F will require the city to pay more overtime to firefighters who already receive higher salaries than those in Los Angeles, San Jose, Long Beach or San Diego.

Employment of unnecessary personnel is called “featherbedding.” Proposition F is just that — at a cost of $6 million.

San Francisco has the best fire protection services in the country. We already pay more per person for that service than any other city in California.

Stop a $6 million raid on the City Treasury. Vote No on Proposition F.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION F

Like all San Franciscans, we want a safe and healthy city. But Proposition F could jeopardize our safety and health.

By spending more than $7 million on unnecessary overtime, Proposition F will take money away from other vitally needed services like fire equipment, police protection, health care and children’s programs.

The annual fire department budget is already $150 million. Firefighters are already getting a pay raise of almost 10%. That’s more than most city workers — and most of us.

San Francisco already has more firefighters per thousand residents than any other major Western city.

Yet San Francisco has fewer fire and emergency alarms than other cities. In 1986, San Francisco had 78,000 emergency calls. Oakland had 95,000.

We appreciate the job that our firefighters do. But we cannot support this multi-million dollar attempt to win back overtime for just 18 firefighters per day.

Susan J. Bierman
Agar Jaiicks
Mauri Schwartz
S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Beverly Prior, Sunset Democratic Club
Margaret Brodkin, Director Coleman Advocates for Children
Carole Migden, chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

I respect and admire the work done by San Francisco’s firefighters.

It’s a dangerous job.

That’s why they’re paid more than firefighters in any other large city in California, even though our firefighters work 15 percent fewer hours.

But today our average cost per firefighter has hit $96,000 per year.

We have been reducing this amount — and improving fire service at the same time — by hiring more new firefighters and reducing costly overtime payments.

That overtime runs as much as $85 per day for a fourth-year firefighter, and up to $1077 per day at the higher ranks.

When they argue for Proposition F, the union avoids mentioning this fact. They raise a false alarm about closing down firehouses, when in reality we are adding new firefighters as quickly as we can train them.

Ninety new firefighters are being hired this year alone. We have full classes in the Fire Academy for the first time in years.

Prop F asks you, the voters, to put an unnecessary sixth firefighter back on every fire truck, in order to give current firefighters millions in guaranteed overtime.

There’s no need for it. Even a one-alarm fire in San Francisco draws 30 firefighters in response.

It’s easy, when you think about the heroic work firefighters do, to justify giving them whatever they ask for.

I made the same mistake myself three years ago, before I was mayor. As a State Assemblyman and a strong union supporter, I lent my name to a measure that was similar to Proposition F.

But no group, however much we appreciate their work, is entitled to millions of taxpayer dollars a year in guaranteed, unnecessary overtime — especially when they are trying to feather their own nests by keeping out women and minorities.

With all the pressing needs facing our city, we can’t afford to give away $7 million and get nothing in return. Please vote No on Proposition F.

Mayor Art Agnos
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TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: This entire section is new.

The Proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

NEW CHARTER SECTION: 3.548:
MINIMUM LEVELS OF FIRE
PROTECTION FOR THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Notwithstanding any other section of this
Charter, the minimum levels of fire protection for
the City and County of San Francisco shall be
specified as follows:

A. The MINIMUM level of Fire Protection for
the City and County of San Francisco, in fire
suppression, effective July 1, 1990, except as
specified in Section C shall be as follows:

1. Engine Companies 41
   Truck Companies 18
   Rescue Companies 2
   Fireboat Companies 1
   Battalion Districts 10
   Divisions 3
   Service Units 1
   Bureau of Equipment 2
   High Pressure System
   Tank (staffed)
   (Jones St. Tank) 1
   Assigned Firefighters
   (At Chief’s Discretion) 5

2. Fire station: The minimum number of sta-
tions shall be 41, at locations listed on the SFFD

B. MINIMUM daily staffing of Fire Compa-
nies and other Units:

1. Engine Companies: 1 Officer and 3
   Firefighters
2. Truck Companies: 1 Officer and 5
   Firefighters
3. Rescue Company: 1 Officer and 3
   Firefighters
4. Fireboat Company: 1 Officer, 1 Pilot,
   1 Marine Engineer and 2 Fire-
   fighters
5. Service Units: 1 Firefighter
6. Bureau of Equipment: 2 Firefighters

7. Battalion District: 1 Battalion Chief,
   1 Assistant Chief
   1 Chief's Aide
8. Division: 1 Assistant Chief,
   1 Chief's Aide
9. Jones Street Tank: 1 qualified person
to operate gates,
   valves and communica-
   tions equipment
   of the High
   Pressure System.

Required minimum staffing shall be main-
tained on a constant basis, 24 hours per day.
Sufficient personnel and positions shall be au-
thorized and funded to maintain MINIMUM re-
quired staffing levels established in this section.
When assigned personnel are not available, then
staffing shall be maintained by working of
overtime.

C. CLOSURE AND RELOCATION OF FIRE
   STATIONS, DEACTIVATION OF FIRE
   COMPANIES OR OF UNITS REQUIRED BY
   THIS SECTION:

1. Fire Stations, Fire Companies or other
   Units required by this section may be closed or
   deactivated only when each of the following
   procedures is completed:

   a. It is recommended by the Chief of Depart-
      ment and approved for consideration by the Fire
      Commission.
   b. The Fire Commission shall hold at least two
      public hearings on the matter so that affected
      citizens may appear to express their views.
   c. At least one of the public hearings shall be
      held in the neighborhood of the Station, Com-
      pany, or Unit to be closed or deactivated. Such
      meeting to be held at a time and place most
      suitable for maximum public attendance.
   d. Except as provided by this section, other
      facilities or units may be closed or deactivated by
      majority of the five members of the Fire Com-
      mission upon recommendation by the Chief of
      Department.
   e. Upon conclusion of public hearings and
      approval by a majority of the five members of the
      Fire Commission for the closure or deactivation
      of a Company or Unit, the Fire Commission shall
      forward its recommendation to the Board of Su-
      pervisors within 30 calendar days.
   f. Upon receipt of the Fire Commission rec-
      ommendation, the Board of Supervisors may
      hold public hearings on the matter and they may
      approve or disapprove of the recommendation of
      the Fire Commission for closure or deactivation
      of a Station, Company or Unit. Such approval or
      disapproval shall be by majority vote of the
      Board of Supervisors. If the Board of Supervisors
      approves of the Fire Commission recommen-
      dation, then they shall direct the Clerk of the Board
      to have the matter put on the ballot of the next
      regular election for final determination by the
      voters of the City and County.

D. DEFINITIONS — EQUIPMENT

1. ENGINE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying
   hose and a pump to pump water of at least 1,500
gallons per minute.
2. TRUCK COMPANY: A tractor-trailer ve-
   hicle carrying ladders and rescue equipment with
   a 100-foot aerial ladder or equivalent device to
   reach upper floors of buildings.
3. RESCUE COMPANY: A vehicle carrying
   rescue equipment capable of heavy rescue and
   diving equipment for underwater rescue.
4. FIREBOAT COMPANY: A boat equipped
   with pumps, hose, monitor nozzles and able to
   navigate San Francisco Bay for firefighting and
   rescue duty along the shorelines of the City and
   County.
5. SERVICE UNIT: A vehicle carrying spare
   supply of air and equipment for self-contained
   breathing apparatus and resuscitators.
6. HIGH PRESSURE SYSTEM PUMP STA-
   TION: A facility capable of pumping at least
   10,000 gallons per minute from San Francisco
   Bay or other water source into the mains of the
   high pressure water system.
7. BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT: A vehicle
   capable of carrying equipment for emergency
   repairs or towing of fire apparatus under emer-
   gency conditions.
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to allow former Supervisors to remain in the City's Health Service System, if they pay the full cost?

YES 288
NO 289

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Health Service System provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Supervisors may not continue to receive health insurance from the Health Service System after they leave the Board of Supervisors.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Board of Supervisors could allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System if they pay the full cost of their health insurance.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to allow former Supervisors to stay in the Health Service System.

Controller's Statement on "G"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G will allow former Supervisors to buy health insurance coverage from the City’s Health Service system, when they leave office. THERE WILL BE NO COST TO THE CITY.

The Health Service System now provides health insurance for current and retired City workers, including current members of the Board of Supervisors. Proposition G simply allows former Supervisors to BUY continued health coverage in the City’s Health Plan, at their own expense.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition G
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "G"
Former supervisors are either those who have decided not to run; or those the electorate voted out of office.
Even as it claims they will pay their own health plan benefits, why continue to have them in the system.

Cut bait.
Vote NO.

Marguerite Warren
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.425 Persons Covered

Each plan may make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system by the dependents of members, retired city and county employees, temporary city and county employees, such other dependents of deceased and retired city and county employees as the board of supervisors may authorize by ordinance, teachers and other employees of the San Francisco Unified School District retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees of the city and county and resigned teachers and employees of the school district whose resignations occur after June 15, 1955, and within 30 days immediately prior to the date on which, but for their resignations, they would have become retired members of the said retirement system, on whose relinquishment of retirement allowances as permitted by the charter occurs after such date and resigned employees of the San Francisco Unified School District not otherwise included. A resigned employee or teacher is one whose employment has terminated other than by retirement, discharge or death or who has relinquished retirement allowances. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for the participation in the benefits of the system to the aforementioned resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District is to enable them, subject to the health service board's exercise of its power, to participate in the benefits of the system after transferring to the State Teachers' Retirement System from the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System. The purpose of empowering the health service board to make provision for participation in the benefits of the system by the aforementioned resigned employees of the city and county and other resigned employees of San Francisco Unified School District is to permit the health service board to have power to treat them the same as it treats resigned teachers and employees of the San Francisco Unified School District.

As used in this section, and for the purpose of this section, the terms "city and county employees" and "employees of the city and county" shall include officers and employees of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco.

The board of supervisors may also provide by ordinance for the continuation in any plan by former supervisors who agree to and do pay the full cost of such benefit.

Moved since you last voted? Then you must re-register. Phone 554-4375.
Fire Inspector and Engineer Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION H
Shall the Board of Supervisors have authority to contract with the State Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) to make City fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers members of PERS instead of the City Retirement System, provided there is no additional cost to the City?

YES 290
NO 292

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers belong to the City's Retirement System. Under the charter, the Board of Supervisors may contract with the State's Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) to allow certain safety employees to be members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, if there is no additional cost to the City.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment that would add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System, if there would be no additional cost to the City.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to add Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers to the list of safety employees who are now allowed to become members of PERS instead of the City's Retirement System.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want these employees to continue to be covered by the City's Retirement System.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"
On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted no.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

This Charter Amendment would provide for safety retirement for eighteen civilian Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers employed by the San Francisco Fire Department, at no additional cost to the City.

Fire Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers are classified by the State of California as safety personnel and properly belong in a safety retirement program that is not offered by the City’s Retirement System for non-uniformed employees. Instead, the City contracts with the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) for its public safety officers who are not police officers or firefighters.

Fire Safety Inspectors and Fire Protection Engineers, along with their counterparts in the uniformed firefighter ranks, provide the professional expertise necessary for the City’s fire prevention program. Proposition H provides a retirement plan for this small group of civilians equivalent to the retirement plan for their uniformed firefighter counterparts, at no additional cost to the City.

Voters approved similar measures in recent years that provided for safety requirement for probation officers, investigator groups and various other safety personnel.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition H
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.506-2 Miscellaneous Safety Employees

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the board of supervisors or the community college board shall have the power to contract with the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System of the State of California to provide that the probation officers, airport police officers, district attorney and public defender investigators, coroner investigators, juvenile court counselors, and institutional police, fire safety inspectors and fire protection engineers who are not members of the Section 8.588 plans, shall be members of the public employees' retirement system, and the board of supervisors, the community college board and the retirement board shall have the power to perform all acts necessary to carry out the terms and purposes of such contract.

The power to contract created herein shall be limited to a contract with no net increase in cost to the city and county or the community college district.

Any person who shall become a member of the public employees' retirement system pursuant to such contract shall have the right to be a member of the health service system and the health board shall make provision for the participation in the benefits of the health service system by such persons.

---

Out of town on June 5, 1990? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.

---
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THANKS TONS, SAN FRANCISCO recycling in record numbers!

Residents are recycling in record numbers!

Nearly 70,000 homes in the southern and eastern parts of the City have curbside recycling. By 1991, every resident will have curbside collection service.

For a free Recycling Starter Kit and information on where to recycle call:

San Francisco Recycling Program
CITY HALL
554-6193

Until curbside reaches your neighborhood, you can recycle at our many community recycling centers.
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

PROPOSITION I

Shall retired teachers in the City retirement system be allowed to enter into consulting contracts with the San Francisco Unified School District or San Francisco Community College District without losing their retirement benefits?

YES 293
NO 295

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the State Retirement System are allowed to work for the San Francisco Unified School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. Retired San Francisco teachers in the City Retirement system are not allowed to do so.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I is a charter amendment that would allow retired teachers who are members of the City’s Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits. While they are consultants they would not make retirement contributions or earn additional retirement credits.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow retired San Francisco teachers who are members of the City’s Retirement System to have consulting contracts with the School District or Community College District without losing their retirement benefits.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make this change.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government. However, as a product of its future application, costs could increase, the amount of which, being dependent upon the dollar amount and the number of personal service contracts executed, cannot be determined, but should not be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Jim Gonzalez and Richard Hongisto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I is necessary to correct an inequity that exists between teachers in the State Teachers' Retirement System and those in the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System. Teachers in the state system can retire up to three years early and supplement their reduced retirement income by serving as consultants to the school district developing curriculum, orienting new teachers, substituting for absent teachers, tutoring students, etc. The Charter denies the right to the four hundred teachers in the city retirement system to continue serving students and schools in these ways. Proposition I would correct this inequity by extending the same right to teachers in the city retirement system.

Proposition I will save taxpayers’ money by encouraging teachers at the top of the salary scale to retire early. New hires at the low end of the salary scale will earn little more than half as much as those at the top.

Proposition I will also improve education in San Francisco schools by continuing to take advantage of the experience and expertise of retired teachers. It will also help to solve the shortage of qualified substitute teacher.

Vote YES on Proposition I for equity, economy, and educational excellence.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition I
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition I
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will bring equity and fairness to retired teachers, save the taxpayers money and improve the educational system in San Francisco.

Assemblyman Willie Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John Burton
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Tom Hsieh
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Jim Gonzalez
San Francisco Democratic Party
Fred Rodriguez, President of the Board of Education

United Educators of San Francisco, Joan-Marie Shelley
Judy Dellamonia
Joanne Miller, vice-president of the San Francisco Board of Education
Thomas Ammiano
Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council
Larry Martin, Transport Workers of America
Robert Barnes
James Wachob
Jose Medina
Harry G. Britt, President of the Board of Supervisors

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition I

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the charter on January 1, 1969, and persons who become miscellaneous officers and employees after February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter not a matter of the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under Section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under Section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(a) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

"Retirement allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for the life of the member unless a different term of payments is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workers' compensation laws of the State of California, shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation earned" shall mean the compensation as determined by the retirement board, which would have been earned by the member had he worked, throughout the period under consideration, the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police department as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under Section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in Section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean retirement board as created in Section 3.670 of the charter.

"Keeper" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural; and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(b) Any member who completes at least 20 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 50 years, or at least 10 years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of 60 years, shall be entitled to receipt of a retirement allowance at the rate of two percent of said average final compensation for each year of service credited, provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of 65 years, if the allowance available to such member, pursuant to the provisions of Subsection (g) 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 retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this Subsection (b), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in said Subsection (f). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of 60 years, after rendering 20 years or more of such service and having attained the age of 50 years, computed under Subsection (g), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under Subsection (g):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/4</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-1/2</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-3/4</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-1/4</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60

1.2000

1.2250

1.2500

1.2750

1.3000

1.3250

1.3500

1.3750

1.4000

1.4250

1.4500

1.4750

1.5000

1.5250

1.5500

1.5750

1.6000

1.6250

1.6500

1.6750

1.7000

1.7250

1.7500

1.7750

1.8000

1.8250

1.8500

1.8750

1.9000

1.9250

1.9500

1.9750

2.0000

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed 75 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or Subsection (c) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, and in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount, of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of 65 years may elect, without right of reversion, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system, and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of Sec-

(Continued on next page)
ion 8.514 of this charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $100 per month upon retirement after 30 years of service and after attaining the age of 60 years, and provided further that as to any member within 15 years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of 65, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $100 per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied as full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least 10 years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in Subsection (g) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in Subsection (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds 40 percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age 60, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed 40 percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earned by the member in the class of service rendered by him during the one year immediately preceding his retirement. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied as full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement. No member of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

(c) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least 10 years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in Subsection (g) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in Subsection (a) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds 40 percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age 60, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed 40 percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earned by the member in the class of service rendered by him during the one year immediately preceding his retirement. Part-time service and compensation shall be reduced to full-time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced, shall be applied as full-time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement. No member of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workers' compensation laws of the State of California.

(e) If a member shall die, before retirement, (1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection (e):

(A) Regardless of cause, a death benefit shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by the member during the six months immediately preceding death, plus the member's contributions and interest credited thereon.

(B) If a member sustains a traumatic bodily injury through external and violent means in the course and scope of employment and death results within 180 days of such injury, an additional insurance benefit of 12 months of compensation earnable shall be paid to the member's estate or designated beneficiary.

(2) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired from service on the date of his death, shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of 18 years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this Subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of 18 years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of 18 years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of 18 years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under Subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under Subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this Subdivision (2) shall be paid in lump sum as follows:

(A) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(B) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in Subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election, but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of 18 years, may make the election herein provided before benefit has been paid under this Subsection (e), for and on behalf of such children, if, in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this Subsection (e), any allowance payable under this Subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member's death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and in recognition 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 termination of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least 10 years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed $1,000, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service
(Continued)

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation paid to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to 7-1/2 percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of, said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(c) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of Subsection (g), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members, shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the account of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this Subsection (h), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), Subsection (h), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder, which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement, and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year, and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this Subdivision (k), 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.

(6) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in Subsection (b) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said Subsection (b), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(j) Except as otherwise provided in section 8.511 of this charter, no person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(k) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

I) Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsections (b), (c), (f), and (i) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and (Continued on page 92)
PROPOSITION J
Shall the Human Rights Commission be made a Charter commission and shall its size be reduced from fifteen to eleven members?

YES 296
NO 297

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Human Rights Commission was created by an ordinance. Under that ordinance, the Human Rights Commission has 15 members.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J is a charter amendment that would make the existing Human Rights Commission a charter commission; it would reduce the number of members from 15 to 11.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you want to reduce its size to 11 members.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Human Rights Commission to become a charter commission and you do not want to reduce its size to 11 members.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government in an amount not to exceed $4,200.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Thomas Hsieh.
Human Rights Commission

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Let us make human rights a fundamental part of the fabric of San Francisco.
San Francisco is the birthplace of the United Nations and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Yet, our Human Rights Commission is not even a part of our constitution — the Charter.
Proposition J will make the Human Rights Commission a charter commission. Proposition J will take the position of the Human Rights Commission out of politics and ensures its place in the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco.
Please vote in favor of Proposition J to recognize the importance of human rights to San Francisco.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition J
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition J

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

As Legal Counsel to the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department and a candidate for Municipal Court Judge I urge you to vote for Ballot Measure J.

The Human Rights Commission has been a positive voice for 25 years. Thousands of San Franciscans have directly benefited from the Commission’s efforts. Its mandate will be greatly strengthened by extending Charter status through this measure.

Please join me and vote yes on J!

James Harrigan
For Municipal Court

---

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “J”

We have a Human Rights Commission NOW, appointed by the Mayor. A new one in the charter would have the same appointing officer.

We don’t need a confirmation of said committee. It will not take it out of politics. No reason for this.

Just another layer of government — for what.

Vote no on “J”.

Marguerite Warren

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: This entire section is new.

PART TWENTY-FOUR: HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
3.699-5 Commission; Composition
A human rights commission is hereby established. The human rights commission shall consist of eleven members broadly representative of the general public to be appointed by the mayor. Three of the members who are first appointed shall be designated to serve for terms of one year, three for two years, three for three years and two for four years from the date of their appointments. Thereafter, members shall be appointed as aforesaid for a term of office of four years, except that all of the vacancies occurring during a term shall be filled for the unexpired term. Members of said commission shall be compensated for each commission or committee meeting actually attended by said members in an amount as may be established and amended, from time to time, by ordinance of the board of supervisors, but not less than $50 per meeting provided, however, that no member shall be paid for attending more than two commission or committee meetings in any one calendar month.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of Subsection (b) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system, an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.

(m) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1984 are hereby declared to be prospective and shall not give any person a claim against the city and county relating to a death prior to ratification of this amendment by the State Legislature.

8.511 Pensions of Retired Persons
(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no person retired for service or disability, and in receipt of a retirement allowance under the retirement system, shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement; provided that service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or the giving of testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco before any court or legislative or administrative body, shall not be affected by this section or by Section 8.509, Section 8.546 or Section 8.581 of the charter.
(b) Should any retired person, except persons retired for service prior to January 8, 1932, and persons retired because of disability incurred in the performance of duty, engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 62, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly pension or retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county, to an amount which, when added to the amount earned monthly by him in such occupation, shall not exceed the compensation on the basis of which his pension or retirement allowance was determined.
(c) A retired person, who is a certificated employee, may enter into a consultancy contract with the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District to the extent authorized by state law. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter to the contrary, a certificated employee who enters into such a consultancy contract shall not be reinstated as a member of the retirement system. No deduction shall be made from his or her compensation as contributions to the retirement system, and his or her retirement allowance shall not be terminated or suspended.
8.584-10 Limitation on Employment During Retirement
(a) Except as provided in Section 8.511 of this charter and Subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under Section 8.584 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.
(b)(1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of Subsection (a) of this section.
(2) The provisions of Subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office, provided said compensation does not exceed $100 per month.
(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under Section 8.584, he shall re-enter membership under Section 8.584 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of Subsection (a) of this section shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under Section 8.584. Such member’s individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.
(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this charter to the contrary, should any person retired for service or disability engage in a gainful occupation prior to attaining the age of 60 years, the retirement board shall reduce that part of his monthly retirement allowance which is provided by contributions of the city and county to an amount which, when added to the amount of the compensation earnable, at the time he engages in the gainful occupation, by such person if he held the position which he held at the time of his retirement, or, if that position has been abolished, the compensation earnable by the member if he held the position from which he was retired immediately prior to its abolishment.
Seven Member Commissions

PROPOSITION K
Shall the size of the Police, Fire, Social Services, Port, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports and Parking and Traffic Commissions, and the Board of Permit Appeals, be increased from five to seven members?

YES 298
NO 299

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department, Fire Department, Social Services Department, Port of San Francisco, Public Utilities Commission, Board of Permit Appeals, Civil Service Commission, Airports Commission and Parking and Traffic Department are managed by a board or commission. Each of these boards and commissions has five members appointed by the Mayor.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K is a charter amendment that would increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the size of these boards and commissions from five to seven members.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the size of these boards and commissions to stay the same.

Controller’s Statement on “K”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $18,800 annually beginning January, 1991.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh, Bill Maher, and Wendy Nelder.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Proposition K expands the opportunity for San Francisco's varied communities to participate in City government. Proposition K increases, from five to seven, the membership of the Board of Permit Appeals and seven City commissions: Police, Fire, Social Services, Public Utilities, Civil Service, Airports, and Parking and Traffic. It also includes the Port Commission, subject to amendment of state law to authorize such an increase.

Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities. Only five members of these crucial commissions is insufficient to address the diversity of concerns in our City; seven members will provide greater representation and greater leadership from a variety of communities. The expansion of the size of these commissions enhances the possibility for all San Franciscans to be part of decision-making and policy-making processes at every level.

The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions. Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor, but instead of the many under-represented voices in San Francisco.

Proposition K would make these commissions representative of the interests of more San Franciscans, while maintaining the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants. San Franciscans want accessible, responsive, and active commissioners. We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns, and Proposition K is a method for achieving these goals.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

You need a decoder ring to read the Supervisors' argument in favor of creating 18 new commissioner slots. Here's what the Board says, and here's what they really mean.

The Board says: "Proposition K is an excellent opportunity for all communities."

The Board means: All you interest groups out there, it's time to get yours.

The Board says: "The intent of Proposition K is also to reduce the political calculations involved in making appointments to commissions."

The Board means: With 18 more political appointments, a mayor won't offend as many supporters by passing them over for city jobs.

The Board says: "Taking effect after the mayoral inauguration in 1992, this is not an empowerment of a particular mayor."

The Board means: Adding 18 new city commissioners isn't really a boon to the incumbent mayor — unless he's re-elected.

The Board says: "Proposition K would . . . maintain the effectiveness of a moderate number of participants."

The Board means: Increasing commission memberships by 40% isn't that big a deal.

The Board says: "We want commissioners who will listen to our concerns, but most importantly we want people who share our concerns."

The Board means: A fair hearing before city commissions isn't enough; we want guaranteed results!

Let's stop speaking in code and talk plainly. Proposition K is based on the notion that people should be treated as groups — not individuals — in the political process. That's offensive, and so is Proposition K.

Please vote NO on K!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp's Good Government Committee
Seven Member Commissions

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is a textbook example of what’s wrong with contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K demeans us because it lumps city residents into groups, rather than respecting their rights as individuals.

Proposition K divides us because it stresses what such interest groups (the polite euphemism is “communities”) disagree about, rather than what all San Franciscans share in common.

Proposition K debases us because it is premised on a “quota system” for city boards and commissions. There shouldn’t be “white seats” or “black seats”, “gay seats” or “straight seats” on city commissions. There should be but two qualifications for service as a city commissioner: San Francisco residency and individual ability!

Vote NO on Proposition K!
San Francisco is indeed a polyglot and richly diverse community. City residents come from all corners of the country and the globe. Their political opinions range from radical to reactionary and all points in between.

It’s impossible for each point of view, each ethnic group, each political persuasion, each neighborhood to be represented on city commissions. Increasing the membership on those bodies from five to seven persons is like buying a bigger umbrella in a hurricane. It won’t make a bit of difference.

It is possible, however, for city commissioners from all walks of life to represent views and interests other than their own. It happens all the time in countless actions by city boards and agencies. And if we want to encourage consensus and better understanding among San Francisco’s many “communities”, we must resist attempts — such as Proposition K — to make the labels we all wear easier to read.

Three years ago, Mayor Agnos campaigned on the slogan, “One City, One Future”. The supporters of Proposition K have failed to heed those words.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

The opponents of Proposition K are clearly on the wrong page of the textbook of contemporary San Francisco politics.

Proposition K values us because it gives city residents greater ability to be heard, individually and as a community.

Proposition K unites us because it reinforces what we all share in common: respect for democracy. If, as the opposition claims, the ability to have more access to representation is divisive, democratic ideals such as checks and balances must therefore also be divisive and undesirable.

Proposition K elevates us because it originates from that respect for democracy. This does not limit or allocate, but reasonably expands available seats on the commissions. Proposition K effectively dilutes the influence of special interests in favor of more broad-based views.
San Francisco is an extremely diverse city and that diversity should be reasonably represented. Democracy requires the opportunity for representation of all points of view. Good government demands that the number of appointed officials be limited so that debate can be functional. Proposition K addresses these two needs: increased citizen participation, and reasonable size to facilitate getting work done.

If you take the opposition’s argument — that it is not meaningful to have representatives from different neighborhoods, ethnicities, political persuasions — to its logical extreme, you could have one member commissions achieving a consensus at the price of democracy.

Proposition K is good government, since it integrates the multiplicity of voices into a united future for the residents of San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition K!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Seven Member Commissions

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

We need to create an open, democratic, and participatory local government.
This measure will encourage more participation.
Vote YES on K.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Individuals and community groups strongly support K. Increasing the membership on these bodies expands the opportunity to participate for all San Franciscans.
Vote YES on K!

Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Robert McCarthy
Ruth Picon
President, Latino Democratic Club
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead, Pres.
Bernal Heights Community Foundation
Jake McGoldrick
Arnie Scher
Natalie Berg
Sodonia Wilson,
San Francisco Board of Education
Alma Jackson
Margaret Brady
Reverend Amos Brown
Yori Wada

Mayor Art Agnos
Speaker of the Assembly
Honorable Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assemblyman John L. Burton
State Senator Milton Marks
Fr. James Goode
Carole Migden
Chair, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Robert Barnes
Political Action Chair, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian and Gay Democratic Club
Catherine Baccari
Bob Dockendorff
Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Vote No on Proposition K.
Proposition K unnecessarily tinkers with our commission system for managing city departments.

Many of the most important city functions — police and fire services, libraries and health care — are governed by five-member city commissions. Proposition K would increase the size of these commissions to seven members. The Planning Commission would be expanded to nine members.

For what reason? The supporters say that the commissions cannot reflect our diverse community unless we allow the mayor to appoint more commissioners. They miss the point of the commission system.

Commissioners are not advisors or members of a community-wide study panel. They are managers. They set city policy, recommend hundreds of millions of dollars in spending, and hire and fire key departmental personnel.

Preserve our system of citizen management. Don’t make city commissions debating societies.

Vote No on Proposition K.

*Donald D. Doyle*
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

---

Are not seven Deputy Mayors at the rate of $94,000 a year a sufficient number of political plums for the Mayor? Does he really need eighteen more commissioners to achieve good government in San Francisco?

Do not give the Mayor additional tools to promote his re-election efforts. The San Francisco Republican Party urges voters to Vote No on Proposition K.

San Francisco Republican Party
*Christopher L. Bowman*
*Tina H. Frank*
*Anna M. Guth*

---

No sound arguments have been presented which support the need for Proposition K. Enlarging Boards and Commissions would increase city costs without improving productivity. Indeed, extra members may impede efficiency and result in protracted proceedings.

Don’t give the Mayor additional opportunities for patronage.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
*Ronald G. Kershaw*

---

*William E. Grayson*
*Honor H. Bulky*
*Mildred "Millie" Danch*
*Rose Chung*
*Brian Mavrogeorge*
*Ronald G. Kershaw*
*Sam T. Harper*
*Jun Hatoyama*
*Wade Francois*
*Martin Keller*
*Harriet Ross*

---

*Brian Mavrogeorge*
*Paul Kavouksarian*
*Edwin E. Turrell*
*Robert L. Speer*
*Christopher L. Bowman*
*Bruce Mulraney*
*David Braddock*
*Michael Lawrence*
*Martin Keller*
Seven Member Commissions

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

PROPOSITION K WILL ADD TO BUREAUCRACY

Proposition K will hinder quick and fair response to citizen concerns. Larger commissions do not mean better commissions; on the contrary, they mean a less efficient, more cumbersome process.

PROPOSITION K WILL NOT MAKE COMMISSIONS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE INTERESTS OF SAN FRANCISCO

Present commissions serve a diverse San Francisco by appointment of individuals who reflect and possess sensitivity, respect for different backgrounds and points of views.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K

Sharon Bretz
Susann L. Danielson
Jean Kalil
Victor Makras
Esther Marks
Beverly Prior

Larger commissions and larger support bureaucracy are not the answer to better representation. The answer is less political patronage and more appointments based on experience and knowledge. This proposal only makes government more cumbersome and less effective.

... Vote NO on Proposition K!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Proposition K is not about democracy. It is about patronage. It is about creating many new commission positions to hand out as political plums. To whom? For what? And why should the taxpayers be forced to pay for it?

No one, not even the author, Supervisor Ward, claims that it will improve the efficiency of the government, yet it will certainly add to the costs. The true costs will include trips, staff time, expenses, etc., with no discernable benefit to the public.

This measure will lead to longer meetings, more arguments, divisiveness and politics while providing less management oversight.

Proposition K is an insider’s game. They gain and the voters pay. It is a costly bad idea and should be soundly rejected by the voters.

Vote NO on Proposition K.

Supervisor Bill Maher

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”

If qualified commissioners were appointed who understood they represented ALL of San Francisco this charter amendment would not be necessary.

There are nine commissions listed for additional members — 18

more appointments. Just another avenue for political appointments.

Vote No on Proposition “K”.

Marguerie Warren
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out-type.

PART FOUR: POLICE DEPARTMENT
3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, police force, an office of citizen complaints and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of five (5) members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the years 1976 and 1978 respectively and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission to seven (7) members, shall continue to hold their respective positions, subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the police department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the police commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the 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 shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to or exceed the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-20 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The police commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

PART FIVE: FIRE DEPARTMENT
3.540 Fire Department

The fire department shall be under the management of a fire commission, consisting of six (6) members, who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $1,200. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1949, and 1950, respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the years 1976 and 1978 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1992. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective offices subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The fire commissioners shall be successors in office of the fire commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this charter shall go into effect, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. The chief of department shall have power to send fire boats, apparatus and men outside the City and County of San Francisco for fire-fighting purposes.

The commissioners shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the fire department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the fire commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The fire commission shall designate the civil service rank from which a non-civil service rank or position shall be appointed. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position as may be created hereunder shall hold civil service status in the department in the civil service rank from which they were appointed. In no rank below that of assistant chief shall the compensation attached to a non-civil service rank or position equal to or exceed the next higher civil service rank or position from which they were appointed and for this purpose the next higher civil service rank above H-2 fireman shall be H-20 lieutenant. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the fire commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in Section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of Section 8.405 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter.

Positions of officers and employees of the fire department legally authorized shall continue, and the incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall continue as the officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments, and except as in this charter otherwise provided.

PART EIGHT: SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
3.570 Composition of Department; Commission

There is hereby established a social services department. This department shall consist of a social services commission of five (5) members, a director of social services, and such employees and assistants as may be necessary to carry out the work and functions of said department.

The members of the social services commission shall be appointed hereto by the mayor and shall be selected for their respective positions on the basis of their interest in and understanding of the problems of public welfare. The members of said commission shall serve without compensation and no person shall be eligible to serve on said commission while holding a salaried public office, position or employment.

The term of office of the members of the said commission, subject to the provisions hereof relative to removal and the terms of the first members of this commission, shall be four years. (Continued on next page)
The compensation of each member of said port commission shall be $1,200 per year. Ex-officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation.

PART TEN: PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3.590 Commission; Composition

A public utilities commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers.

The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the five commissioners first appointed by the mayor after 12:00 o'clock on the 5th day of January, 1932, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934, and 1935, respectively, and that the terms of the two other commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936.

The term of the two commissioners appointed by the mayor pursuant to this amendment shall commence at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January, 1992. On the expiration of these and successive terms, the mayor shall appoint their successors for four years. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

PART SIXTEEN: BOARD OF PERMIT APPEALS

3.650 Board Composition

The mayor shall appoint five seven qualified electors, other than city and county officials or employees, for terms of four years, to constitute a board of permit appeals. The compensation for each member shall be $15 per meeting of the board actually attended by such members provided that the total amount paid all members of the board shall not exceed $5,000 $7,000 per year. One term shall expire at 12:00 noon on the 15th day of January in each of the years 1933, 1934 and 1935, and the remaining two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1936, and two terms at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January, 1996, and upon these and successive expirations the mayor shall appoint their successors for four-year terms.

This amendment shall become operative on the 15th day of January, 1992.

PART SEVENTEEN: CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

3.660 Commission; Composition; Meetings

There is hereby established a civil service commission which is charged with the duty of providing qualified persons for appointment to the service of the city and county.

The civil service commission shall consist of five seven members appointed by the mayor. The commissioners in office at the time of the adoption of this charter, and this charter as amended, shall continue in office until the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the 1st day of July immediately following the expiration of the terms for which they were appointed; provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the amendment shall expire on June 30, 1981, and, provided further, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 30, 1990 amendment shall be as follows; one shall expire on June 30, 1996 and one on June 30, 1995, and their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years beginning on the first day of July immediately following. No less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The persons so appointed shall, before taking office, make under oath and file in the office of the county clerk the following declaration: “I am opposed to appointments to the public service as a reaward for political activity and will execute the office of civil service commissioner in the spirit of this declaration.”

A commissioner may be removed only upon charges preferred, in the same manner as in this

(Continued on page 128)
Commissioner Residency Requirement

PROPOSITION L

Shall the requirement that members of Charter boards and commissions be City residents and electors be extended to the members of other City boards, commissions and advisory bodies, provided that this requirement would not apply to certain enumerated boards or where a person with special experience, skills or qualifications is required and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found?

YES 300
NO 301

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Candidates for elective office and members of charter boards and commissions must be San Francisco residents and electors. For other boards, commissions and advisory bodies, the law creating them may set residency requirements.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L is a charter amendment that would require the members of all boards, commissions and advisory bodies to be San Francisco residents and electors.

This rule would not apply where a non-charter board, commission or advisory body requires a person with specific qualifications, and no eligible San Francisco resident can be found. Also, this rule would not apply to the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Fine Arts Museums, the Asian Arts Commission, the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission and the elected members of the San Francisco Retirement Board and Health Service Board.

Proposition L would delete the current requirement that candidates and members of charter boards and commissions be residents and electors for a certain length of time before assuming office, which courts have found unconstitutional.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to make these changes to the residency requirements for members of boards, commissions and advisory bodies.

Controller's Statement on "L"

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "L"

On February 20, the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Thomas Hsieh and Bill Maher.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

This charter amendment provides that all individuals serving on city boards and commissions and committees with few exceptions, must be citizens of voting age of San Francisco.

Members of boards and commissions and committees often have policy making and regulatory responsibilities. Clearly, San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco. With a population of 750,000 residents, surely we have enough qualified and talented San Franciscans who can get the job done.

This charter amendment offers the appointing officer with some flexibility. If a qualified candidate for a public post requiring specialized skills cannot be found in our city, then, following such a declaration, the appointing officer may search elsewhere.

Let's open up more opportunities for our residents to serve San Francisco. VOTE YES FOR THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERSHIP ON CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

I was mistaken in one of my objections to Proposition L. Some years ago, a court decision invalidated the voter-adopted Charter requirement that a person be a San Francisco resident for five years before appointment to a city commission. I disagree strongly with that decision, for the reasons cited in my ballot argument appearing on the opposite page. The inoperative language remained in our Charter, however, and Proposition L disingenuously removes it — like pruning a dead branch from a tree.

But, there are still plenty of reasons to vote against Proposition L.

(1) Proposition L eliminates the requirement that a commissioner be an “elector” of San Francisco (a voter, meaning also a U.S. citizen) for at least one year. This Charter provision has not been altered by a court, but Proposition L would strike it from the books.

A person could move into town, register to vote, and be appointed that day to a city post.

(2) Proposition L exempts three city commissions — Health System, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board — from any residency requirement whatsoever.

(3) Proposition L would allow non-residents to serve on any board or commission created by the Board of Supervisors. In fact, Proposition L could even be interpreted to allow the appointment of non-citizens to such posts!

Don’t be misled or confused. If you want San Franciscans to make decisions about San Francisco, vote NO on Proposition L!

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

If you want San Francisco residents to serve on all city commissions established by the charter, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you think San Franciscans should serve on boards and committees created by the Board of Supervisors, vote NO on Proposition L.

If you favor city residents serving on the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees, vote NO on Proposition L.

The Board of Supervisors says “San Franciscans ought to be making decisions about San Francisco.” I agree completely. Trouble is, Proposition L weakens the existing residency requirement in our City Charter.

Charter Section 8.100 states that no person “shall be appointed as a member of any board or commission unless he shall have been a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years.” Proposition L eliminates the five-year residency requirement! Proposition L also exempts from any residency requirement whatsoever members of the Health System Board, Retirement Board, and War Memorial Board of Trustees.

The idea behind the five-year residency rule is that city commissioners should have first-hand knowledge and personal experience of San Francisco’s people and neighborhoods, its problems and possibilities. City commissioners should not just rely on staff reports and statistical abstracts. Proposition L would destroy this sensible safeguard. Instead, a person could move into town and be appointed, that day, to a city post!

Finally, Proposition L purports to extend the Charter’s residency rules to advisory boards and committees established by the Board of Supervisors. But the residency requirement can be waived for a person “with specific experience, skills, or qualifications”. That’s a loophole big enough to drive a truck through!

San Franciscans should make decisions about San Francisco. Vote NO on Proposition L.

Senator Quentin Kopp
Chairman, Kopp’s Good Government Committee

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for most advisory panels of the City.

Under Proposition L, panel members MUST be residents of San Francisco.

The way things are now, there are NO residency requirements for membership on the Health System Board, Retirement Board and War Memorial Board.

Under Proposition L, there is no change. Membership on the Health System Board and Retirement Board is by DIRECT ELECTION of city employees. The Health Fund and Retirement Fund are operated by and for city workers. Because employees are not required to live in the city, there are serious constitutional problems with denying a worker the right to be a candidate for trustee of a fund controlled by employees.

The way things are now, the courts have thrown out San Francisco’s five-year residency requirement. Reports the City Attorney:

“In the years since Charter Section 8.100 (residency rule) was originally adopted, the California courts have struck down all durational residency requirements applicable to candidates for elective or appointive office.”

Most Supervisors like the durational requirement. But even Supervisors cannot overrule the Supreme Court.

The bottom line: Proposition L does not cover everything. Just most things. It’s time San Franciscans were making the decisions about San Francisco. Proposition L is a major start in the right direction.

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE. YES ON PROPOSITION L.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
PAID ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

San Franciscans deserve to be represented by commissioners who live within San Francisco, not by employees filling in for their ex-officio bosses. Vote for San Francisco commissions made of San Francisco voters.

... Vote Yes on Proposition L!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

---

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Don’t clutter the Charter with unnecessary provisions. Vote No on Proposition L.

Proposition L would require almost all commissions and advisory board members to be city residents. That makes sense — so much sense that, for most commissions, it is already the law. This is one more example of a needless Charter amendment. If the Board of Supervisors wants to require members of any advisory body to be city residents, they can pass an ordinance to accomplish it.

Adding an unnecessary provision to a Charter that is already too long and complicated is not the answer. Vote No on Proposition L.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

8.100 Qualifications
(a) No person shall be a candidate for any elective office nor shall be appointed as a member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind established by this charter or legislative act of the United States of America, the State of California or this board of supervisors, unless he or she is a resident of the city and county for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for at least one year immediately prior to the time of his or her taking office, unless he or she is a retirement system member or health system member elected under charter section 3.670 or 3.680, or unless otherwise specifically provided in this charter, and every elected officer and member of any board, or commission or advisory body of any kind shall continue to be a resident of the city and county during incumbency of office, and upon ceasing to be such resident, shall be removed from office. Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, residency shall not be required for persons appointed to, or serving on, the following boards and commissions: the board of trustees of the San Francisco War Memorial, the board of trustees of the Golden Gate Museums of San Francisco, the Asian Art Commission, and the San Francisco Film and Video Arts Commission.

Notwithstanding this requirement, in the case of boards, commissions or advisory bodies established by legislative act, the residency requirement may be waived by the appointing officer, or entity upon a finding that the board, commission or body requires the appointment of a person with specific experience, skills or qualifications and after exercising due diligence, an eligible and willing appointee residing within the city and county could not be located.

(b) Except for those offices and positions and officers and employees specifically provided for in this section and other sections of the charter, the residential qualifications and requirements for all officers and employees and all offices and positions in the city and county service shall be as provided by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 7 through Tuesday, June 5, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
REAL LEMON CLEANING POWER

Use the juice of a real lemon to clean kitchen grease. Try cleaning the old fashioned way without harmful chemicals. It's less expensive, too.

Help Your Home be TOXIC FREE 554-4333

San Francisco Household Hazardous Waste Program

HERE'S A SAFE PLACE FOR YOUR HOME'S TOXIC WASTE

Thursday, Friday, Saturday
8 am to 4 pm. 554-4333

San Francisco Household Hazardous Waste Program
PROPOSITION M

Shall the Charter be amended to create a goal that no board or commission appointed by the Mayor or otherwise provided by the Charter, except the Commission on the Status of Women, shall have more than a simple majority of members of the same sex?

YES 302
NO 304

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter requires some City boards and commissions, such as the Police and Fire Commissions, to have at least one woman member. However, the charter does not have a general policy on balancing the number of men and women on City boards and commissions.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a charter amendment that would create a City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex. This charter amendment does not apply to the Commission on the Status of Women.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy that no more than a simple majority of the members of any board or commission shall be of the same sex.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “M”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “M”
On February 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: Supervisors Bill Maher and Wendy Nelder.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

The 1990s are here — but you would never know it by the few women serving on City boards and commissions. In fact, of ten major commissions — Police, Fire, Airports, Ports, Public Utilities, Parking Authority, Social Services, City Planning, Elections, Housing Authority — women hold just 18 percent of the seats. And only one woman serves as a president of these commissions.

Women do not fare much better on other key commissions. For instance, women hold just two seats on the seven-member Recreation and Park Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission. Three women serve on the eleven-member Small Business Advisory Commission.

Despite the enormous influence and regulatory controls most commissions have over the lives of all citizens, women’s voices and leadership on city panels do not equal their numbers in society.

These gloomy statistics aside, women have begun to make gains during the past two years. Women are now being regularly considered and appointed to boards and commissions. But, clearly, much more needs to be done.

Proposition M will emblazon into the Charter a policy goal of gender equality on all boards and commissions. This amendment, authored by Supervisor Richard Hongisto, is a simple measure of justice.

Only the Commission on the Status of Women is excluded from the provisions of this charter amendment, since its sole purpose is to serve as an advocacy forum for women.

Increasingly, communities and groups are instituting gender parity provisions in their constitutions with much success. For instance, the Democratic Party has dramatically brought about near gender equality of delegates to its national and state conventions.

Let’s start the 1990s off with a renewed commitment to fairness and equality.

VOTE YES ON THE GENDER PARITY AMENDMENT.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.
Commission Gender Composition

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Proposition M moves San Francisco into the 1990s.
It is stunning to review the composition of our city boards and commissions and see just how few women are serving. Women comprise 18 percent of the seats on ten major commissions. This is an untold tragedy. Women have been making gains in recent time. We can do even better.

Proposition M is about fairness and equality. Iowa enacted a law in 1987 to require greater gender balance on all boards, commissions, committees, and councils.
Vote Yes for Gender Justice. Yes on Proposition M.

SF Chapter, National Organization for Women
Legal Advocates for Women
San Francisco Democratic Central Committee

Creating political leadership opportunities for women will strengthen the public policy decision-making process.
Vote YES on M.

As a predominately lesbian and gay Republican volunteer organization we believe it is a travesty that after fifteen years of three liberal Democrat mayors only 38% of the city’s Commissioners are women. This negligence has prompted the need to enact gender parity. We support Proposition M.

In the future, the provisions of Proposition M should be amended to apply to the Commission on the Status of Women. Women and men must actively dialogue so that our city begins to address the concerns of all.

Judiciary Project/California
TJ Anthony
Mary C. Dunlap
Ruth Picon, President, Latino Democratic Club
Helen Grieco, Director, SF NOW
Laura Campbell
Carole Migden, Chair, SF Democratic Party
Agar Jaicks, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Greg Day, SF County Democratic Central Committee Member
Jean K. Harris
Geraldine Johnson
Joyce Newsstat, Chair, Lesbian Caucus, Harvey Milk Lesbian & Gay Democratic Club
James Harrigan

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

Log Cabin Club of SF Board of Directors and
Ronald G. Kershaw
Paul Kavouksorian
Edwin E. Turrell
Robert L. Speer
Christopher L. Bowman
Bruce Mulraney
David Braddock
Michael Lawrence

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Requirement that any commission be comprised of a certain number of persons of any gender is as inappropriate as requiring a certain number of persons who have red hair or blue eyes. Please vote to maintain the mayoral prerogative to appoint the best San Franciscans for the job.

\[ \text{... Vote NO on Proposition M!} \]

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

Vote No on Proposition M.
Like Proposition L, but only more so, Proposition M does not belong in the City Charter.
The power to make appointments to boards and commissions rests with the Mayor. Proposition M would write into the Charter a non-binding policy statement urging the Mayor to fill not more than 50% plus one of any commission with members of the same sex.
The City Attorney advised the Board of Supervisors that the Constitution prohibits the city from adopting a quota for male and female appointments. Instead, the Board of Supervisors proposes to clutter up the Charter with a non-binding, legally unenforceable policy statement.
If the Board of Supervisors wants to send a message to the Mayor it should be done by resolution, not costly and unnecessary Charter amendments.

\[ \text{Vote No on Proposition M.} \]

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “M”
There is nothing in the charter NOW that prevents the Mayor or Board of Supervisors to appoint more women to achieve gender parity now.

\[ \text{Why now does it have to be written in concrete.} \]
\[ \text{Vote NO on “M”} \]

Marguerite Warren
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION M

NOTE: Entire section is new.
3.503 Composition of Boards and Commissions.
It is the policy of the city and county, which shall be considered a goal when filling vacancies on boards or commissions appointed by the mayor, or otherwise provided by this charter, except for the Commission on the Status of Women, to achieve gender parity on these boards and commissions by limiting to a simple majority of board and commission membership the number of members who are of the same sex.

-----

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 24.

-----
MISSING SOMETHING IN YOUR LIFE?

If your life seems to be missing that special warmth that comes from having a pet, come and see us at the new San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department. We have a wide variety of dogs, cats and other animals available for adoption.

A waggly tail, a sweet meow or a gentle squeak - it'll make you glad to come home at night.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PROPOSITION N

Shall persons be prohibited from serving more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, and be prohibited from serving as a Supervisor again until four years have elapsed, provided that Supervisors holding office on July 1, 1990 would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when their current terms end?

YES 305
NO 307

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The charter does not limit the number of consecutive terms a person may serve on the Board of Supervisors. A full term on the Board of Supervisors is four years.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a charter amendment. Under Proposition N, no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors. After two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors, a person must wait four years before serving again. Any person appointed to the Board of Supervisors to complete more than half a four-year term would be considered to have served one full term. A member of the Board of Supervisors who resigned with less than half a four-year term remaining would be considered to have served a full term. This charter amendment would go into effect July 1, 1990. Each Supervisor holding office on that date would be considered to have served one full four-year term in office when his or her current term ends.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to change the charter so that no person could serve more than two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Supervisors and you want to prohibit persons who served two consecutive four-year terms from serving on the Board of Supervisors again until four years after their second consecutive term in office.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to limit Supervisors to serving two consecutive terms.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How “N” Got on the Ballot

On January 25, 1990, the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition N to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

40,151* valid signatures were required to place an initiative charter amendment on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 45,408 of the signatures submitted were valid, 5,257 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 10% of the registered voters at the time the notice of intent to circulate the petition was filed.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is a non-partisan, reasonable, fair and democratic measure to reform our government and improve the present city-wide system for electing supervisors. Neighborhood, civic leaders, current and former elected officials, community activists, business owners, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, unionists, and minorities all support Proposition N.

Limiting politicians’ consecutive terms is not radical or extreme. In fact, it helps to prevent political corruption and power grabbing. More than 150 cities, towns and counties in the United States have laws limiting politicians terms. Governors in 30 states can only serve two terms. San Mateo county limits supervisors terms and for more than 30 years San Francisco’s mayors have been limited to two consecutive terms.

Proposition N is a very modest and reasonable proposal.

Proposition N does not recall or force any current member of the board from office. Proposition N allows supervisors whose terms expire in 1991 to serve until January 1995 if they are reelected. Supervisors whose terms end in 1993 may serve until 1997 if reelected. Former supervisors may run for office again after 4 years.

The current system favors incumbent politicians and denies experienced newcomers a fair chance to serve. Since 1973, only 3 newcomers have been elected to the city-wide board. 5 supervisors have already served 10 years. By 1995 most board members will have been in office 14 years or more.

We know that a lake or pond will stagnate unless its waters are replenished from time to time. So too will an elected body grow stale without a regular infusion of fresh faces and new ideas.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Richard Bodisco
Chairman, San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Steve Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu
Harold Hoogasian
Joseph L. Powell
Raymond Chalker
Robert A. Reveles
Robert C. Sanchez
Joel Ventresca
Barry Lastra
Daniel Willsan

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Proposition N backers have misrepresented the facts to get you to vote for N. Since just 1982 three non-incumbent supervisors have been independently elected to the Board. Proposition N is not true reform — it only tinkers with the citywide election process. It is not democratic — it takes power away from the people. It is not a solution — it’s an additional problem.

Supervisors are elected to carry out the will of the people. When they fail to serve, they are unelected — by vote of the people. Appointed department heads, who are not supposed to have their own political agendas, are balanced only by the Mayor’s and the Board’s overseeing eyes.

With the Mayor already limited to two terms, the Board must not consist only of rookies and lame ducks, or department heads can consolidate their power and bide their time, waiting until watchdog Supervisors are automatically thrown from office. Proposition N threatens accountability and increases the chances for bureaucratic corruption.

Uninformed actions are foolish actions — closely examine the facts, and you’ll agree that blindly forcing change is a bad plan. If Proposition N passes, nothing can stop department heads from installing power bases immune to voter inspection. Voters have the right to choose — this measure permanently limits that right.

PROTECT YOUR DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N.

SUBMITTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Two years ago, San Francisco voted on Proposition O, a recall of the Board of Supervisors thinly disguised as a 'good government' initiative. San Franciscans saw through this scheme, and sent the measure down to defeat.

Last year, the same group attempted to offer a similar proposal to the voters, but failed to collect enough signatures to qualify it for the ballot.

Now they're at it again.

They say that Supervisors have lost touch with the people of San Francisco, and should automatically be thrown from office after they've served two terms — but by bringing up this rejected issue again and again, they're proving that THEY are the ones who are out of touch.

San Francisco doesn't need a two-term limit. When supervisors stop working for the people, they stop getting elected. If Board members are prematurely removed, more power falls into the hands of civil servants and department heads, who are unaccountable to the voters. These unelected officials who already hold great power must be balanced by supervisors free to do their jobs, or citizens lose their representation.

The diversity of our City is one of our greatest strengths. San Franciscans have always individually evaluated our city's varied issues, judging each on its specific merits. The Board of Supervisors is similarly diverse, and should also be evaluated selectively. Citizens should use the election process to tell their representatives when they're not doing their jobs — not by acting blindly and installing an arbitrary time limit. San Franciscans are smart enough to tell the difference between voting an incompetent out of office and firing a valuable employee without cause.

Proposition N denies San Franciscans the right to vote for legislators of their choice, and that's not fair.

Vote NO on Proposition N.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

REBUTTAL TO OFFICIAL ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Let's talk about what WE want City Hall to do for US, not the politicians.

Politicians will tell you anything to advance their political careers.

They won't tell you the TRUTH about the Two Term Limit.

The politicians say we failed to collect enough signatures last year to qualify for the ballot.

But here's what their appointee, the city's Chief Administrative Officer says:

"Last year's Proposition removal was forced by an error, one which we admitted, apologized for and tried to repair . . ."

(Letter to Two Term Limit — Chairman — Richard Bodisco, dated February 7, 1990.)

We need new leadership in City Hall.

We have some hard and serious problems to solve in San Francisco and we can't solve them with political rhetoric and name calling.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N removes experienced supervisors from the Board.

FACT:

Proposition N insures that San Francisco will always have 5 or 6 supervisors with seniority and experience on the Board.

Proposition N also gives experienced and concerned citizens an opportunity to serve without needing to become professional, career politicians.

The politicians tell you that Proposition N will take away your right to vote for a legislator of your choice.

FACT:

Proposition N gives you more choices because it removes the current system which favors incumbent politicians.

The politicians have spoken too long for themselves.

It is time City Hall spoke for us.

Vote YES on Proposition N!

Submitted by San Franciscans for Reasonable Reform

Richard Bodisco
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

This citizen’s initiative is a good government reform measure which will guarantee change, encourage competition, improve the chances of electing new political leadership, and curtail the influence of special interests.

Vote YES on N.

SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

Change is the driving force in our economy, our lives . . . and our government! Eight years on the Board of Supervisors is enough time to initiate changes espoused in any candidacy. Our City government is in desperate need of change. Vote for new life in San Francisco government.

. . . Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Harold M. Hoogasian
Small Business Owner

The longer supervisors remain in office the more likely they become captives of special interests who bankroll their costly campaigns.
Entrenched incumbent politicians often end up working against the public interest, rather than for it.
Only two supervisors have been defeated at the polls since the end of 1980.
New faces, new ideas, new leaders, and new directions are needed at City Hall.
Vote YES on N.

Joel Ventresca
Past President,
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Candidate for Supervisor

The Two-Term Limit is an idea whose time has come!
The United States Constitution limits the President to two terms in office. Similarly, the San Francisco Charter limits our Mayor to two terms.
Incumbent San Francisco Supervisors, however, continue to win re-elections year after year. This has made many of them less accountable to the voters.
Eight years is enough! Let's bring new people, new ideas, and new energy to our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on Proposition N!

Citizens for a Better San Francisco

It works for executive offices, let's put a limit on the terms of service for our supervisors. As Thomas Jefferson called it, "rotation in office". Let's have some healthy competition for these positions, let's take advantage of the many experienced people around who are willing to serve. Let's vote YES on Proposition N for reasonable reform.

John and Carol Maerske

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will ensure that we have a Board of Supervisors of concerned citizens, not career politicians.

For almost forty years, San Francisco has limited its Mayor to eight years in office. Many cities around the Bay Area, such as San Jose, Richmond, Mountain View and Redwood City, limit terms in office for their city councils. Yet we have had supervisors serve up to 16 years in office. Why? Because by raising large sums of money and using the power of incumbency, supervisors face little chance of defeat when running for re-election.

Proposition N will not remove any member of the Board of Supervisors from office. It is a fair proposal that allows each current supervisor to run for one more four-year term. But in the future, each supervisor will be limited to eight years in office.

Your Yes vote on Proposition N will give the city fresh leadership on the Board of Supervisors. It will open up the city’s political processes, reversing the trend in recent years toward full-time professional politicians. Most importantly, it will mean that our elected representatives put the city’s needs and interests ahead of their desire for re-election.

Vote Yes on Proposition N.

Donald D. Doyle
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

I’m supporting Proposition N because of my concern about the status of women and children in San Francisco.

As a long time supporter and treasurer of a shelter for battered women in the City, I have had the opportunity to closely observe how our City government works. I think there are more important things than politics.

San Francisco needs leaders in government who will show more compassion and concern about peoples’ lives as opposed to their reelection campaigns.

I don’t feel that every member of the Board of Supervisors is bad, but the two term limit will improve the current system and help our Supervisors do a better job for us.

That is why I am voting YES on Proposition N.

Millie Favetti

Over the past 20 years women have made enormous gains in electoral politics. The situation is far, far from ideal but some positive changes have taken place. Therefore, we think it is important to encourage and support the entry of women into elective politics.

We’re supporting Proposition N because it ensures that more women will have the opportunity to assume leadership roles in City government. The two year experiment with district elections produced more women supervisors than at any other time in San Francisco’s history.

The gains women have made could be easily lost under the current city-wide system. Proposition N will prevent the clock from being turned back because it allows newcomers a fair chance to compete without always having to run against entrenched incumbents.

Proposition N is equitable and fair to everyone.

Join us and vote YES on Proposition N.

Helen Dawson
Miriam Smith

As a small business owner and long time resident of San Francisco, I’m supporting Proposition N because it makes good sense for our City.

Limiting Supervisors’ terms will create a Board of Supervisors more accountable to the needs of San Franciscans. Under the current city-wide system, too many Supervisors see service on the Board as a career.

They worry more about keeping their seats than about doing the job they were elected to do. As a result, politics is all to often put ahead of the City welfare.

Let’s get politics out of City Hall.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Zdenka Bodisco
Mike Sataro
Harold Hoogasian
Small Business Owners

Argumente printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

We’re supporting the Two Term Limit because San Francisco needs new political leadership. The Two Term Limit will open the “Door of Opportunity” for new candidates to serve on the Board of Supervisors.

The Two Term Limit will allow a new generation of civic leaders to represent our City. It is a fair and democratic way to reform the current system and to restore citizens’ confidence in City Hall.

San Francisco’s government should reflect the diversity of the people who live here. This is the meaning of a Democratic and free system. The Two Term Limit insures that new people with new ideas will have a fair chance to serve the City.

Don’t be fooled by arguments of professional, career politicians. The Two Term Limit is good for our community and it is good for San Francisco.

Vote YES on Proposition N.

Steve M. Jeong
Elizabeth E. Liu

WHY DIDN’T WE GET TO VOTE ON THE TWO-TERM LIMIT LAST YEAR?
Because Louise Renne found a legal loophole to get the measure thrown off the ballot after the Registrar of Voters had certified that it qualified for submission to the electorate.

Never mind that when Renne violated a number of election laws several years ago she got everyone to overlook the “technicality.”

But what do you expect?
This is the same Louise Renne who sued the Olympic Club because it had no female members conveniently “overlooking” the fact that her husband Paul belongs to the all-white, all-male San Francisco Golf Club.

Say “No” to Renne’s legal machinations!
Vote “Yes” on “N.”

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

WHAT ARE THEY AFRAID OF?
Why are the Supervisors and their contributors fighting the two-term limit so hard?
Why did City officials use a legal loophole to get this same measure thrown off the ballot last fall?
Are they afraid they won’t be able to give away another city street worth $9 million to the Rockefellers for free like they did in 1987?
Are they afraid that the people might vote to turn them out?
Clean up City Hall! Yes on N!

Arlo Hale Smith
BART Director
Patrick C. Fitzgerald
Democratic Senate Candidate
Alexa Smith
Democratic Committeemember
Terence Faulkner
Former Republican Chairman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Two-Term Limit for Supervisors

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The Two-Term Limit is a reform whose time has come! At the Federal, State, and Local levels, political reformers agree that the powers of incumbency virtually preclude incumbents from being defeated at the polls, and that term limitation is the only way to ensure turnover in legislative bodies. Even Attorney General John Van de Kamp has proposed a twelve-year limit for State legislators.

Since the return to City-wide elections in 1980, only two incumbent Supervisors have been defeated at the polls. They were replaced by Wendy Nelder and Angela Alioto — the daughters of a former Police Chief and Mayor, respectively. Because of this trend, Supervisors have become burned-out, complacent, less accountable to the voters, and more beholden to the special interests who contributed to their re-election campaigns.

New blood is badly needed in any legislative body to keep it healthy and alive. Many non-incumbents have an agenda, new energy, and fresh approaches to governing. If they are allowed to be elected and they are competent, they should be able to translate their agenda into legislation in eight years and then move on to higher office. If they aren't able to enact their agenda, either they are incompetent or their agenda is out-of-step with the sentiments of the City. In either case, there is no need for Supervisors to serve on the Board more than eight years.

Proposition N will remedy stagnation on our Board of Supervisors. Vote Yes on N.

Harold M. Hoogastian
Christopher L. Bowman

Proposition N would limit San Francisco supervisors to two consecutive terms of office, just like the mayor. It's a modest reform that deserves your vote.

Proposition N would not force any incumbent out of office. All current supervisors could run for one more term after their present term expires. And after four years, they could run again and hold office for two more terms.

The President of the United States has been limited to two consecutive terms of office since 1951. The Mayor of San Francisco has been limited to two consecutive terms since 1953. San Mateo County has a term limit for its board of supervisors. Proposition N is not a new or radical idea; it's an overdue reform for a stagnant system.

The founders of our city charter envisioned supervisors as part-time citizen legislators, not full-time professional politicians. Proposition N respects and revives that tradition.

A bit of fresh air never hurt anybody — even two-term supervisors!
Please vote YES on Proposition N.

Senator Quentin Kopp

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

The current system of electing supervisors in San Francisco badly needs reform. But Proposition N is not the answer. The Board of Supervisors is not accountable to the people, largely because of the pernicious influence of large monetary contributions. A two-term limit would only exacerbate the problem. All supervisors would either be rookies or lame ducks, resulting in a tremendous shift of power to the bureaucracy, without lessening the powerful influence of money in campaigns.

What San Francisco needs is real campaign reform — limiting the ability of supervisors to vote on the pet projects of their major contributors, and district election of supervisors. Both would greatly reduce the enormous sums of money needed to run for office citywide.

Proposition N is a false promise of reform. VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION N!

Dennis Antenore
Robert Barnes
Ron Braithwaite
Supervisor Harry Britt
Gordon Chin
Brother Kelly Cullen
Catherine Dodd R.N.
Noah Griffin
Sue Hestor
Agar Jaicks
Geraldine M. Johnson
Walter L. Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Leslie Katz
Tony Kilroy
Myra G. Kopf
Steven M. Krefting
William J. Brandy Moore
Jim Morales
Connie O'Connor
Ruth Picon
Mauri Schwartz
Yori Wada

Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Calvin Welch
Gerald Whitehead
Harold T. Yee
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
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TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION N

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows.

9.100 Elective Officers and Terms
The mayor, an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, a public defender, the members of the board of education, and commencing with the general election in 1980, the members of the board of supervisors, shall be elected at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943 and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a mayor, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected a city attorney and a treasurer, and at the general election in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected an assessor and a public defender. At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, seven members of the board of education shall be elected at large. At the general election in 1980, 11 members of the board of supervisors shall be elected at large. All of the aforesaid officials, except as set forth herein, shall be elected to a term of four years, from the commencement of their respective terms as herein specified.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms. Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1982 there shall be elected five members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth of January, 1983, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1982, the successors to said five members of the board of supervisors shall be elected, and at the general election in 1984, there shall be elected six members of the board of supervisors to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1985, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1984, the successors to said six members of the board of supervisors shall be elected.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this section or any other section of the charter to the contrary, from and after the effective date of this section as amended, no person elected or appointed as a supervisor may serve as such for more than two successive four-year terms. Any person appointed to the office of supervisor to complete in excess of two years of a four year term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served one full term upon expiration of that term. No person having served two successive four year terms may serve as a supervisor, either by election or appointment, until at least four years after the expiration of the second successive term in office. Any supervisor who resigns with less than two full years remaining until the expiration of the term shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to have served a full four year term.

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the eighth day of August, 1972, shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at 12:00 o'clock noon on said eighth day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of each member elected to the board of supervisors shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

At the general election in 1974 there shall be elected three members of the board of education to succeed those members thereof whose respective terms of office expire on the eighth day of January, 1975, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in 1976 there shall be elected, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1974, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected, and at the general election in each fourth year after 1976, the successors to said three members of the board of education shall be elected. Except as set forth herein, all terms of office of elective officials shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the eighth day of January following the date of their election.

No person elected mayor or supervisor shall be eligible for a period of one year after his last day of said service as mayor, or supervisor, for appointment to any full-time position carrying compensation in the city and county service.

The effective date of this section as amended is July 1, 1990. All supervisors holding office on that date shall be deemed to have served one full four year term upon the expiration of their then current terms of office.
Hypodermic Syringes

PROPOSITION O
Shall it be the policy of the people of San Francisco to call upon the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal and civil penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic needles?

YES 309
NO 310

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: State law regulates the sale, distribution and use of hypodermic syringes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to call on the State Legislature to eliminate all criminal, civil and regulatory penalties on the manufacture, use, sale or distribution of hypodermic syringes.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “O”
City Controller Samuel D. Yockey has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition O:

“Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted it would not affect the cost of government.”

How “O” Got on the Ballot
On September 15, 1989 the Registrar of Voters certified that the initiative petition calling for Proposition O to be placed on the ballot had qualified for the ballot.

9,399* valid signatures were required to place an initiative ordinance on the ballot.

A random check of the signatures submitted by the proponents of the initiative petition showed that 11,173 of the signatures submitted were valid, 1,774 more than the required number of signatures.

*This number is equal to 5% of the people who voted for Mayor in 1987.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Hypodermic Syringes

OFFICIAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

The connection between AIDS and unclean needles is unchallenged. Virtually every authority on the subject agrees that sharing needles increases the chances of contracting AIDS. San Francisco has an estimated 13,000 IV drug users, each of whom is at risk of contracting AIDS and spreading it to their sexual partners or their unborn children. Tens of thousands of people are being directly threatened with contracting AIDS because it is illegal to obtain clean, safe needles.

Some groups are trading clean needles with addicts for their dirty ones. This removes contaminated needles from circulation and can dramatically cut the infection rate among drug users and their partners. But these groups face up to a six months in jail and a $1,000 fine. One member of this group, who lost her mother to AIDS, contracted through a dirty needle, said, “I lost a parent to this because this bureaucracy sits around and talks while lots of people are dying.” Dr. John Newmeyer of the Haight Ashbury Free Medical Clinics said, “People are dying because of our institution’s resistance to AIDS risk reduction methods.”

In an attempt to stop this disease from being spread to drug users and their partners AIDS prevention workers are risking legal persecution. Jerry DeJong, who works with substance abusers and is a member of the Mayor’s Narcotic’s Task Force, said “...with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what’s sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives.” But in a sane, free society it shouldn’t be necessary to break the law to save lives. The only way this deadly policy can be changed is for the state legislature to change the law. These State laws should be repealed.

Pamela Williard Pickens  
Secretary San Francisco Libertarian Party

No Official Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition O  
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition O
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Dr. John Watters of the Urban Health Study says that, “The middle class have access to clean needles.” Poor people can’t get clean needles, because they are illegal. Black and Latino IV drug users have a more difficult time finding clean needles and are thus more likely to be infected with AIDS. Because minorities are more likely to be infected with AIDS a higher proportion of their sexual partners or unborn children are being infected. AIDS is likely to become the leading cause of death in young Blacks and Latinos if things continue as they have. Legal clean needles will help save their lives.

Christina Groth

The San Francisco Department of Health estimates that there are 13,000 IV drug users in the city. If clean needles remain unavailable to them the AIDS infection rate can easily reach over 60%. If these 60% infect just two other people either through shared needles or sex, the total number of infected people can reach 23,400. San Francisco can’t afford the financial burden it is under today from AIDS cases. Prevention through clean and legal needles can save us millions of tax dollars without costing us a cent. Legal needles make financial sense.

Isaac Klein

The San Francisco Chronicle has reported on the use of needles for IV drug use in Scotland. The newspaper said that in Edinburgh police launched a crackdown on the availability of clean needles. Within 18 months of the crackdown 50% of all IV drug users were infected with AIDS. Soon their sexual partners and unborn babies were infected with the disease. But 30 miles away in Glasgow the police took no action against the availability of clean needles and only 4 to 7 percent of needle users were infected. Dr. Roy Robertson, Edinburgh’s leading authority on AIDS said, “Making needles available to addicts is not the only answer to the problem of AIDS among drug users but certainly, it has to be part of the solution.”

VOTE YES!

George Meyer

WHAT IS CANADA DOING RIGHT?

In Canada, fewer than 1% of AIDS cases are from needles!
In the United States, about 50% of new cases now involve needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners and babies, (up from about 20-30% in the beginning of the epidemic).

What is Canada doing right?

The AIDS epidemic has hit here many times worse than there.
Why?
In Canada, drug-users can buy sterile needles in drugstores.

GRASSROOTS
Hypodermic Syringes

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

SURGEON GENERAL KOOP ON CLEAN NEEDLES
"One of the strongest advocates of making needles legal is Surgeon General Koop who addressed that issue last November (1987):
"I'm asked about clean needles everywhere I go. I've always said the same thing. If clean needles will do anything to contain a part..."

(Wm. Schwartzman, M.D.)

Clean needles cause no diseases.
Legal needles are clean needles.
Vote Yes.

William Schwartzman, MD

Does this initiative “condone drugs”? If you vote Yes, that could be interpreted as condoning drugs. But if you vote No, that could equally well be interpreted as condoning the spread of AIDS (and hepatitis, and many other diseases).

The AIDS epidemic was caused by a combination of germs, working together to collapse the immune system. N.Y.’s health department has concluded that the HIV epidemic already existed among New York addicts in the 1970’s. That epidemic existed only because New York has laws against addicts buying clean needles.

If we keep these deadly laws, no one can predict what future epidemics might result.

GRASSROOTS

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES ENCOURAGES STERILE NEEDLES
The National Academy of Sciences the country’s most prestigious scientific organization in 1986, issued a major study titled “Confronting AIDS”. Many lives could have been saved if California had promptly implemented the conclusion drawn by America’s leading scientists: “IT IS TIME TO BEGIN EXPERIMENTING WITH PUBLIC

POLICIES TO ENCOURAGE THE USE OF STERILE NEEDLES AND SYRINGES BY REMOVING LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS TO THEIR POSSESSION AND USE.”

(Wm. Schwartzman, MD
Wm. Steinsmith, MD

The issue is not “free needles”. Some of us believe that mass giveaways of clean needles is best. Others of us believe it would be enough if doctors and pharmacies were allowed to sell needles, as with diabetes. Legal needles are as cheap as ballpoint pens, so cheap that price would be no barrier.

This initiative takes no position on “free needles” programs, only for legalization — a prerequisite for either approach.

GRASSROOTS

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Under present California law, even doctors aren’t allowed to provide needles except for approved purposes. So far “stopping AIDS” is not an approved purpose.

Under “legalization”, needles are a medical question, not a police question. A doctor’s prescription could still be required, as with diabetes. Whatever controls are adopted, needles will be better controlled under legalization than they are now.

William Steinsmith, M.D.

Dr. Don Francis, an epidemiologist with the Centers for Disease Control said, “We can’t overstate the threat of AIDS among addicts in the minority population in the inner city.” Dr. Francis says that there is no evidence that legal, clean needles increase the use of drugs. The only thing stopping clean needles is the law. It’s time for Sacramento to repeal the law and save lives.

Will Wohler

According to the New York Times a new, rare virus known as HTLV-II is spreading through the IV drug community because of needle sharing. Spread in the same manner as AIDS, this virus “could cause leukemia or other serious diseases and may exact a rising toll in future years.” Surveys have found that 20% of addicts in New Orleans were infected and in San Francisco a preliminary survey of blood donors showed this new disease has a higher rate of incidence than the AIDS virus. Because it can take as long as 20 years to develop no one can know for sure how many people have been infected. Clean, legal needles will stop the transmission of this disease. VOTE YES!

John Whisman

Clean needles save the lives of innocent victims of AIDS. Not everyone who gets AIDS because people share needles is an addict. Some are small babies. The Centers for Disease Control says 314 babies were born in 1988 with AIDS because their mothers used infected needles. Dr. James Buehler of the CDC said “We need to do what we can to prevent the sharing of dirty needles. Sharing dirty equipment is the worst problem.” In California it is illegal to obtain clean needles so addicts share. Because they share, babies are born with AIDS. Save lives. Legalize needles. VOTE YES!

Mark Pickens

Illegal needles, which force IV drug users to share unclean needles, is now the cause of over one-third of all AIDS cases in the United States according to the federal government’s Centers for Disease Control. In 1988, 10,747 people contracted AIDS because of sharing unclean needles. Some of these people never used needles themselves. 226 were men who had sex with women who used needles, 623 were women who had sex with men who used unclean needles and 314 were unborn babies. Over 1,000 people who don’t use drugs were infected because clean needles are illegal. VOTE YES FOR LEGAL, CLEAN NEEDLES!

Pamela Williard Pickens

Proposition O was endorsed by the Central Committee of the Democratic Party of San Francisco on March 21, 1990. VOTE YES!

John Whisman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION O

Clean, legal needles will save lives. Jerry De Jong of the Mayor's Narcotics Task Force said, "The bottom line is that this is not a moral or legal issue. Unfortunately with the laws on the books, it leaves some of us with no choice but to do what's sometimes viewed as illegal to save lives." Something is very wrong when its illegal to save lives; and that wrong must be corrected. Tell Sacramento that we want to legalize saving lives. We need clean, legal needles now!

Ron Dorsey

Illegal needles are the primary means of spreading AIDS to minority communities. Most of the IV drug users and their partners who have been infected with AIDS are Black or Latino. Most of the babies born with AIDS because of needle sharing by their mothers are also Black and Latino. Blacks and Latinos are now more likely than ever before to become infected with AIDS because clean needles are illegal. Legal, clean needles will slow down the infection rate and decrease the number of deaths in minority communities. Illegal needles hurt Blacks and Latinos more than they hurt others. Support legal needles.

Jim Peron

Prof. Ethan Nadelman, in the Washington Post, reported that "The governments of England, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, the Netherlands and several other countries have actively attempted to limit the spread of AIDS by removing restrictions on the sale of syringes ...." Dr. Nadelman notes that there is growing evidence that legal needles do not increase the use of drugs but they do save lives.

George O'Brien

A former prosecutor of high-level drug dealers, Ben Clark, said in The Daily Recorder, a law newspaper, that legal restrictions on clean needles "have had the disastrous effect of forcing drug users to share syringes. Over half the addicts, in New York State are infected with AIDS, and the rate of infection among intravenous drug users in Illinois is growing dramatically."

While some people may say addicts deserve to die, Clark notes, "... the issue is not simply whether society should sit back and watch addicts kill themselves off: AIDS transmitted by needles does not stay within the druggie population. Unborn children of AIDS-infected female users may become infected. The sex partners of persons with AIDS are exposed to the disease. Needle-sharing prostitutes interact with the drug-free heterosexual community on a daily basis." Clark says that clean, legal needles have never been proven to increase drug use but they do save lives. VOTE YES!

Sam Grove

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION O

There is no scientific evidence that unlimited and uncontrolled availability of hypodermic syringes/needles will stop the spread of AIDS. Proposition "O" would open the floodgates to the purchase and distribution of hypodermic syringes, without prescription, in drug stores, supermarkets and in the streets without medical supervision under the guise of stopping the spread of AIDS. Addicts will continue to commit crimes to pay for the dope since possession and sale of drugs, such as crack cocaine and heroin, will still be illegal.

Latest statistics show that over 80 percent of inmates in our already overcrowded jails are there for illegal drug offenses.

Who will protect the public against the careless disposition of these used needles by addicts?

Black communities in San Francisco are under siege from the sale of illegal drugs and the crime this produces. Approval of Proposition "O" by the voters permitting use of unprescribed legal needles and illegal drugs could leave the City open to millions of dollars in lawsuits for unsupervised use of a medical procedure by intravenous drug addicts from death and other causes.

WE URGE A "NO" VOTE ON PROPOSITION "O". It should not be City policy to support the removal of all restrictions in the distribution, sale and use of hypodermic syringes.

Rev. Amos Brown
Hon. Naomi Gray
Rev. Martin Grizzell
Supervisor Willie Kennedy
Senator Quentin Kopp
Dr. Raye Richardson
Lulann McGriff
Dr. Julianne Malveaux
Melvin Miles
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TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION O

We, the people of the City and County of San Francisco, California, call upon the California State Legislature to eliminate all sanctions, criminal, regulatory, or civil, on the manufacture, use, sale or other distribution of hypodermic syringes. We do this to reduce the spread of AIDS and other diseases.

TEXT OF PROPOSITION K (Continued from page 100)

charter provided for elective officers. Each of the commissioners shall receive a monthly salary of $100.

Special meetings of the commission for the purpose of considering and adopting examination questions shall not be open to the public. The regular meetings of the civil service commission shall be open to the public and held at such a time as will give the general public and employees of the city and county adequate time within which to appear before the commission after the regular daily working hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Such person or persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard by the commission before final action is taken in any case involving such person or persons.

This amendment shall become operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY: AIRPORTS COMMISSION
3.690 Commission; Composition

An airports commission is hereby created, which shall consist of five seven members, who shall be appointed by the mayor and who shall be subject to recall and to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. The term of each commissioner shall be four years, provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section, shall, by lot, classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided, however, that the terms of appointment of the two additional members, whose offices are created by the June 1990 amendment shall expire at 12 o'clock noon on September 1, 1996. On the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month.

All rights, claims, actions, orders, obligations, proceedings and contracts relating to the department under the public utilities commission existing prior to the effective date of these amendments shall not be affected by the adoption thereof, and shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the airports commission.

This amendment shall be operative on the 1st day of September, 1992.

PART TWENTY-TWO: PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION
3.698 Commission — Composition

A parking and traffic commission and the department of parking and traffic are hereby established. The parking and traffic commission shall consist of five seven members. If not in conflict with state law, members of the parking and traffic commission shall serve ex-officio as members of the parking authority.

The term of each member shall be for four years; provided that the first five commissioners to be appointed by the mayor to take office upon the effective date of this charter section shall, by lot classify their terms so that the term of one commissioner shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on each of the first, second and third anniversaries of such date, respectively; and, the terms of the remaining two commissioners shall expire at 12:00 o'clock noon on the fourth anniversary of said effective date; and, provided further, that terms of the two commissioners created by the amendment of June, 1990 shall commence at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 5th day of December, 1992; and on the expiration of these and successive terms of office, the mayor shall appoint commissioners for four-year terms. The compensation of each commissioner shall be $100 per month. Any person may serve concurrently as a member of the San Francisco parking authority and the parking and traffic commission.
Did you know that you can vote before Election Day? Vote absentee in person at City Hall (Room 158) starting May 7 or by mail — fill out the application on the back cover.
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<td>Superior Court Judge, Office #15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Tang</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Tsenin</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission Gender Composition</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Residency Requirement</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Lease Financing</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Inspector and Engineer Retirement Benefits</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Supervisors Health Benefits</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Commission</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypodermic Syringes</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Firefighter Staffing</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Beautification Fund</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition A</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition B</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition C</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition D</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition E</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition F</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition G</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition H</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition I</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition J</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition K</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition L</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition M</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition N</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition O</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Improvement Bonds</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Teachers Consulting Contracts</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Facilities Safety Special Tax</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Member Commissions</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Term Limit for Supervisors</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IS GOING TO YOUR POLLING PLACE ON ELECTION DAY A PROBLEM?

If you are unable to go to your polling place to vote on Election Day (Tuesday, June 5, 1990), you may vote by absentee ballot in one of two ways:

1. **Vote at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.** Starting on May 7 through June 5, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., you can vote in Room 158 at City Hall.

2. **Vote by mail.** Complete the application for an absentee ballot on the back cover. Tear or cut off the back cover, fold it in half with the address of the Registrar of Voters on the outside, put a 25¢ stamp where indicated, and mail the form.

Voters who have specified disabilities may apply to be a **permanent absentee voter.** Please refer to page 24.
BALLOT TYPE
D6 17
90

DEVELOPMENTAL
19th Assembly District
8th Senate District
5th Congressional District

PRECINCTS
APPLICABLE:
9400's

fold here so that Registrar of Voters address is outside
(do not cut or tear off)

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION
Must be received by the Registrar of Voters
no later than May 29, 1990
June 5, 1990 Consolidated Primary Election

FIRST NAME ___________________________ MIDDLE INITIAL ___________________ LAST NAME ___________________________

RESIDENCE ADDRESS (DO NOT USE P.O. BOX OR MAIL DROP ADDRESS)

NUMBER AND STREET ___________________________ CITY ___________________________ ZIP CODE ___________

MAILING ADDRESS FOR BALLOT (if different from above)

P.O. BOX OR STREET ___________________________ CITY ___________________________ STATE ___________ ZIP CODE ___________

I HAVE NOT AND WILL NOT APPLY FOR AN ABSENTEE BALLOT BY ANY OTHER MEANS.

X ___________________________ DATE ___________ DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER ___________

EVENING PHONE NUMBER ___________

⇒⇒ I understand that voters with specified disabilities may qualify as Permanent Absent Voters. See page 24.

THIS FORM WAS PROVIDED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGISTRAR OF VOTERS