


THOMAS KEARNEY
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet

Sample Ballot Page 5



DISTRICT NO. 1

**Municipal Election
November 8, 1977**

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this publication were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a non-partisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. Members of the Committee are: Charlotte Berk, Jerry Burns, Bruce Kennedy, George Osterkamp and Myrna Tsukamoto.

Cover: Ross

THE RECORDER PRINTING AND PUBLISHING COMPANY



WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT

People vote to decide how their city will be run and who will run it. Your vote is just as important as anyone else's. This book will help you to understand what voting is all about.

INDEX

Voting Instructions	4
Sample Ballot	5-6
Map	13
Words You Need to Know	10
Your Rights as a Voter	11-12
Voter Selection Card	24
Absentee Ballot Application (Coupon)	95
Location of Your Polling Place	96

CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR DIST. 1

Ronald W. Anderson	15
Thomas H. Bomar	15
Bernard Finn Brady	16
Bill Eisen	16
Roger Grimes	17
Don Hill	17
Gordon J. Lau	18
Edward Lawson	18
John Maloney	19
Athanasius (Lou) Maunupau	19

CANDIDATES FOR CITY ATTORNEY

George Agnost	20
Gil Graham	20
Jim Reilly	21

CANDIDATES FOR TREASURER

Kay Pachtner	22
Thomas C. Scanlon	22

INDEX (Continued)

BALLOT PROPOSITIONS

A — Park Irrigation Bonds	23
B — Fire Department Bonds	26
C — Airport Revenue Bonds	28
D — Airport Revenue Bond Procedure	32
E — Duties of the Mayor	35
F — Term of Chief Administrative Officer	38
G — Budget Reductions	40
H — Dental Plan	42
I — Pension Increase	45
J — Disability Hearing Officers	47
K — Supervisors' Administrative Assistant	51
L — C.A.O.'s Executive Assistant	53
M — Fire Dept. Promotional Exams	55
N — Public Works Contract	58
O — Progressive Payments	60
P — Official Advertising	62
Q — Electricians Salary Demands	65
R — Plumbers Salary Demands	68
S — Sheetmetal Workers Salary Demands	70
(T) (Proposition T has been officially withdrawn)	
U — Declaration of Policy: International Hotel	72
V — Declaration of Policy: Fleishhacker Pool	76
W — Declaration of Policy: Billboard Removal	79


**At this election we will be using a new type of voting system.
Please study the directions for voting on page 4.**

THE FOLLOWING IS NOT A PORTION OF YOUR SAMPLE BALLOT

HOW TO VOTE YOUR BALLOT CARDS


STEP 1

Vote only one ballot card at a time. Slip ballot all the way into tray, UNDER clear plastic cover from left side of machine.




STEP 2

Move the chrome punch lever with its red pointer to the right of the candidate or measure of your choice and completely depress the lever, which will punch out the cross +. Repeat the process until you have voted for all candidates or measures of your choice.




STEP 3

Turn the card over and vote the other side in the same manner. Repeat this process with each remaining ballot card. You may write-in a candidate in the blank space provided, but you must punch out the cross + after your write-in. If you punch out the wrong cross +, or accidentally tear a ballot card, return all cards in the envelope for another set.



STEP 4

After you have completed voting, return the chrome punch lever to the top position. Place your ballot cards with the stubs at the top, in the ballot envelope and hand it to the Inspector.



SIDE 1

CARD A

SIDE 2

1-17



A

OFFICIAL BALLOT
GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Tuesday, November 8, 1977

This ballot stub shall be torn off by precinct board member and handed to the voter.

No 1977

Member, Board of Supervisors
 First District

Vote for One

ATHANASIOS (LOU) MAUNUPAU Postal Employee (Labor Official)	+
RONALD W. ANDERSON Attorney	+
THOMAS H. BOMAR Attorney	+
BERNARD FINN BRADY Financial Consultant	+
BILL EISEN Certified Public Accountant	+
ROGER GRIMES Stationary Engineer	+
DON HILL Systems Analyst	+
GORDON J. LAU Member, Board of Supervisors	+
EDWARD LAWSON Urban Planner	+
JOHN MALONEY General Contractor	+
	+

City Attorney

Vote for One

JIM REILLY Attorney-at-Law	+
GIL GRAHAM Public Interest Attorney	+
GEORGE AGNOST Chief Trial Attorney, City Attorney's Office	+
	+

Treasurer

Vote for One

KAY PACHTNER Consumer Economist	+
THOMAS C. SCANLON Incumbent	+
	+

**TURN CARD OVER
 TO CONTINUE VOTING**

38101

VOTE BOTH SIDES

A

I HAVE VOTED-HAVE YOU?

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A **IRRIGATION SYSTEM OF THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1977.** To incur a bonded indebtedness of \$9,270,000 for the purpose of improvement of the irrigation system of the Recreation and Park Department of the City and County of San Francisco.

YES	+
NO	+

B **FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1977.** To incur a bonded indebtedness of \$6,000,000 for the purpose of improvements of the fire protection facilities of the San Francisco Fire Department, including the purchase of a new fireboat.

YES	+
NO	+

C **AIRPORT REVENUE BONDS.** Shall the Airports Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of \$90,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, improving and developing airport facilities at San Francisco International Airport, including an industrial waste treatment plant, additions to terminals, remodeling and modifications of terminals, baggage handling facilities, boarding areas, aircraft aprons, pedestrian access facilities, parking facilities, engineering and planning expense, and other works, properties or structures necessary or convenient for San Francisco International Airport?

YES	+
NO	+

D Shall issuance of airport revenue bonds be subject to Board of Supervisors approval and shall said Board be required to determine that projected revenues will be sufficient to retire said bonds?

YES	+
NO	+

38102

VOTE BOTH SIDES

A

**B**

OFFICIAL BALLOT
GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Tuesday, November 8, 1977

This ballot stub shall be torn off by precinct board member and handed to the voter.

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

E	Shall the Mayor of the City and County be expressly required to devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office?	YES	+
		NO	+
F	Shall the maximum term of office of the Chief Administrative Officer be fixed at ten years?	YES	+
		NO	+
G	Shall the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors be empowered to decrease amounts requested by City and County departments for employees' compensation without specifying the positions to be affected by such decrease?	YES	+
		NO	+
H	Shall the City and County, the Unified School District and the Community College District contribute to an employees' dental plan, the contribution per employee to be equal to the average contribution per employee made by the ten most populous California counties having such a plan?	YES	+
		NO	+
I	Shall pensions of male employees retired prior to July 1, 1977 be increased by re-computing said pensions on the basis of mortality tables which will be applicable on January 1, 1978?	YES	+
		NO	+
J	Shall applications for disability leave, disability retirement or death allowances be heard by independent hearing officers?	YES	+
		NO	+
K	Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be empowered to appoint his or her administrative assistant who shall serve at the pleasure of said member?	YES	+
		NO	+
L	Shall the Chief Administrative Officer be empowered to appoint his executive assistant who shall serve at the pleasure of the Chief Administrative Officer?	YES	+
		NO	+
M	Shall the promotional procedure in the Fire Department be changed so as to reduce seniority credits and providing additional credits for educational and professional courses?	YES	+
		NO	+


I HAVE VOTED-HAVE YOU?

N	Shall the Board of Supervisors be empowered to increase the monetary limits within which public works projects may be performed by City and County departments from \$5,000 to \$10,000?	YES	+
		NO	+
O	Shall a contracting officer be empowered, upon making certain determinations with respect to a City and County contract, to authorize an increase in the amount of progressive payments thereunder?	YES	+
		NO	+
P	Shall official City and County advertising be published in any newspaper which is printed on three or more days per week and has a weekly circulation of 50,000 or more?	YES	+
		NO	+
Q	Shall a schedule of compensation based upon the last demand of employees represented by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 6, be approved?	YES	+
		NO	+
R	Shall a schedule of compensation based upon the last demand of employees represented by the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry, Local No. 38, be approved?	YES	+
		NO	+
S	Shall a schedule of compensation based upon the last demand of employees represented by the Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Local No. 104, be approved?	YES	+
		NO	+
T OFFICIALLY WITHDRAWN			
U	DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall the City and County of San Francisco purchase the International Hotel, bring the building up to code and transfer same to the San Francisco Housing Authority to be used for low-rent housing?	YES	+
		NO	+
V	DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall the City and County of San Francisco restore, renovate and place into use Fleishacker Pool and its facilities?	YES	+
		NO	+
W	DECLARATION OF POLICY: Should the Board of Supervisors enact legislation which would phase out those billboards containing off-site advertising over a period allowing full amortization of costs to billboard companies?	YES	+
		NO	+

投票程序


STEP 1

每次限用一張選票。把整張選票放進投票機左方格內，選票應在透明膠面之下。




STEP 2

移動桿臂，使其紅點對正所要投選之候選人或提案之右角，然後用力壓下，打一小孔，重覆此程序，直至選足應選之候選人及提案時為止。




STEP 3

把選票反轉，依上述程序繼續投票。其他選票亦依此程序進行。如你所要選之人，其姓名不在選票上，你可以在選票上之空位寫下其姓名，但你必須在所寫之姓名右角打一小孔。如所打之小孔有差錯，或不慎撕破選票，應將全部選票交回監票員，另取一套選票。



STEP 4

投票完畢之後，把投票機上桿臂移至頂上位置，把選票放進信封內放給監票員。



1-17



官方選票
三藩市縣地方普選

一九七七年十一月八日星期二

這紙選票存根將由選區成員
撕下交給選民

Nº 1977

市參議員 第一選區	副選一名
ATHANASIOS (LOU) MAUNUPAU 郵政工人(工會職員)	+
RONALD W. ANDERSON 律師	+
THOMAS H. BOMAR 律師	+
BERNARD FINN BRADY 財政顧問	+
BILL EISEN 核准公共會計師	+
ROGER GRIMES 當值工程師	+
DON HILL 系統分析員	+
GORDON J. LAU 市參議員	+
EDWARD LAWSON 城市設計員	+
JOHN MALONEY 普通水電師	+
市和局	副選一名
JIM REILLY 律師	+
GIL GRAHAM 公共利益律師	+
GEORGE AGNOST 市議員助理, 市律師事務所	+
市和局	副選一名
KAY PACHNER 前投資者經濟學者	+
THOMAS C. SEANLON 現任	+

反轉此卡
繼續投選

C38101

請在兩面投票

A

我已投票 —— 你呢

提交選民公決之提案		市縣提案	
<p>一九七七年康樂與公園部改善灌溉系統公債。提供九百二十七萬元公債，用作改善三藩市、縣康樂與公園部的灌溉系統。</p>		贊成	+
		反對	+
<p>一九七七年改善消防系統公債。提供六百萬元公債，用作改善三藩市消防局的消防設備，包括購置新的消防船。</p>		贊成	+
		反對	+
<p>機場稅收公債。三藩市、縣機場委員會，按照一九四一年稅收公債法，應否發行稅收公債，本金總額九千萬元，用作購置、興建、改善和發展三藩市國際機場的設備，包括修建一個工業廢料調理廠，機場擴建、改建和裝修，行李裝卸設備，候機室，停機坪，行人通路設備，停車設備，工程和設計費，以及其他項目和三藩市國際機場所需的物業和建築物？</p>		贊成	+
		反對	+
<p>發行稅收公債，應否須經市參議會批准，並規定市參議會決定該項計劃所得收入足夠償還公債本息？</p>		贊成	+
		反對	+

C38102

請在兩面投票

A



官方選票

三藩市縣地方普選

一九七七年十一月八日星期二

這選票存根將由選區成員
撕下交給選民

Nº 1977

提交選民公決之提案

市縣提案

E	應否明確要求市長把他的全部時間和精力，竭盡職責？	贊成	+
		反對	+
F	市首席行政官的最長任期應否限為十年？	贊成	+
		反對	+
G	應否授權市長和市參議會，削減市、縣各部門申領的工人補助金，而無須特別說明其理由因削減所招致的影響？	贊成	+
		反對	+
H	市、縣，統一校區，社區學院區應否分付工人牙科保健計劃的保健費，每個工人的保健費相等於加州人口最稠密的十個縣份推行這個計劃的平均數？	贊成	+
		反對	+
I	在一九七七年七月一日前退休的男性公務員，他們的退休金應否按照一九七八年一月一日生效的壽命率表計算相應增加？	贊成	+
		反對	+
J	申領傷殘休假，傷殘退休或身亡撫恤金者，應否由獨立的聽斷官聽斷？	贊成	+
		反對	+
K	應否授權市參議會的每個市參議員，委任他或她的行政助理，協助他或她工作？	贊成	+
		反對	+
L	應否授權市首席行政官，委任他的行政助理，協助他工作？	贊成	+
		反對	+
M	消防局的升職程序，應否改變，以便減低學歷學分，增加教育性和職業性課程的學分？	贊成	+
		反對	+

C38201

請在兩面投票

B

我已投票——你呢？

N	應否授權市參議會把用款限額從五千元(\$5,000)增至一萬元(\$10,000)，以便工務計劃可由市、縣各部門處理？	贊成	+
		反對	+
O	應否授權市訂約官，以決定市、縣合約時，有權增加累進付款數額？	贊成	+
		反對	+
P	市、縣的官方廣告，應否在任何每週出版三天或三天以上的、每週銷數達五萬份或五萬份以上的報紙刊登？	贊成	+
		反對	+
Q	國際電工工會第六分會代表工人最後一次提出的工人補助金率表，應否予以批准？	贊成	+
		反對	+
R	水電聯合工會第三十八分會代表工人最後一次提出的工人補助金率表，應否予以批准？	贊成	+
		反對	+
S	國際金屬板工人工會第一〇四分會代表工人最後一次提出的工人補助金率表，應否予以批准？	贊成	+
		反對	+
T 正式撤消			
U	政策聲明： 三藩市、縣應否購置國際旅店，把它修葺符合民居標準，然後移交民居局作為廉租住屋？	贊成	+
		反對	+
V	政策聲明： 三藩市、縣應否恢復、重修弗萊沙克格泳池(Fleishacker Pool)及其設備，使它能再度公用？	贊成	+
		反對	+
W	政策聲明： 市參議會應否制定法律，使那些與若干地區無關的廣告牌，待廣告公司在一定期間內得回其所值後，即逐漸予以清除？	贊成	+
		反對	+

C38202

請在兩面投票

B

WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

BALLOT—A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT—If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 95.

POLL—The place where you go to vote.

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

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

PROPOSITION—This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. All the propositions on this ballot deal with city government, and have a letter—such as Proposition A.

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

BONDS—If the city needs money to pay for a certain thing such as an airport, a sewer line or a school, it borrows the money by selling bonds. It then pays back this debt with interest. There are two kinds of bonds.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A $\frac{2}{3}$ majority of the voters must approve the issuing of general obligation bonds.

REVENUE BONDS—The money to pay back these bonds comes from the new facility itself (such as income from the airport or charges to users of the water system). All revenue bonds must be approved by a majority of the voters.

YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER

by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?

A—Anyone who:

- * is 18 years or older by election day;
- * is a citizen of the United States; and
- * has lived in San Francisco for 29 days just before the election. (Even if you have moved within the 29 days, you can still vote by using what is called an "absentee ballot." There is an application for one sent with this book (on page 95 of this book)). If you lose this one, call 558-3417.)

Q—What do I have to do to vote?

A—Sign up with the registrar. You can do this any time. But you must sign up more than 28 days before an election to vote in that election. If you need help to do this, call 558-3417. When you sign up, they will ask you:

- * your name;
- * where you were born;
- * where you live.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?

A—Only if you want to. If you don't want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say, "Independent" or "I don't want to tell."

Q—If I don't tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?

A—Yes. The *only* thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party's choice in a Primary election.

Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the Primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?

A—Yes, but you must go and sign up again.

Q—Once I have signed up, do I have to do it again?

A—Yes, if:

- * you have moved;
- * changed your name; or
- * you did not vote in the last *General* election. (The last *General* election was on November 2, 1976.)

Q—If I have been convicted of a crime, can I sign up to vote?

A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

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

A—All voters will choose a candidate for:

- * Supervisor
- * City Attorney
- * Treasurer

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?

A—San Francisco has eleven Supervisorial districts.

Q—Where do I go to vote?

A—Your voting place is printed next to your name and address sent with this Voters Handbook.

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

A—Yes, the workers at the voting place will help you. If they can't help you, call 558-6161.

Q—When do I vote?

A—This election will be Tuesday, November 8, 1977. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

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

A—Call 558-3061.

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

A—Yes.

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

A—Ask the workers and they will help you.

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

A—No.

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

A—Yes, if you don't have sufficient time outside of your working hours to vote, and if you tell your employer by Friday, November 4, 1977 that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you enough time, up to two hours, when added to the voting time available outside of working hours to vote.

YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER (Continued)

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

A—Yes. You can vote early by:

- * going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there; or
- * mailing in the application for an absentee ballot sent with this Voters Handbook ((on page 95 of this Voters Handbook)).

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?

A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?

A—You must write:

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

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

A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 8, 1977.

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

A—Call 558-6161 for information.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417 OR 558-3061.

OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON AT THIS ELECTION

SUPERVISOR

A Supervisor holds office for four years. A Supervisor is paid \$9,600 a year. This is \$184.62 a week.

The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget and sets the city tax rate. The Supervisors do not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can

put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. There are 11 people on the Board of Supervisors. In this election, all 11 Supervisors will be elected. One will be elected from each of the 11 districts in the city, by the people who live in that district. After this election, it will be decided which supervisors will serve for two years and which supervisors will serve for four years.

CITY ATTORNEY

The City Attorney holds office for four years. The City Attorney is paid \$49,734 a year. This is \$956.23 a week.

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


and to all city departments and 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 deputy city attorneys are appointed by the City Attorney.

TREASURER

The Treasurer holds office for four years. The Treasurer is paid \$33,683 a year. This is \$645.75 a week.

The Treasurer receives deposits, invests, and pays

out money which belongs to the city and county. The Treasurer has custody of all public funds, and makes payments as authorized by the City Controller.



MAP OF SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS

WANTED!

BY THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OF
SAN FRANCISCO

MEN AND WOMEN TO PARTICIPATE IN
GRASS ROOTS DEMOCRACY BY WORKING
ON ELECTION DAY, TUESDAY:

NOVEMBER 8, 1977

IN NEIGHBORHOOD POLLING PLACES.

 **REWARD:** \$32.50 TO \$42.50
FOR THE DAY.

HERE IS A CHANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE
WORK OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT.

Qualifications: You Must Be A Registered
Voter of San Francisco.

APPLY ROOM 155, CITY HALL

徵聘雙重語言人員

在選舉站協助選舉

薪酬三十二元五毛或以上

請即向市政廳一五五號室申請

CANDIDATES

FOR SUPERVISOR District Number 1

RONALD W. ANDERSON

My name is Ronald W. Anderson.

My residence address is at No. 4629 Geary Blvd., San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Attorney at Law.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: 20 years of business and legal experience. The last 8 years in my own law office.

Ballot Designation: Attorney.

Signature of Candidate.

RONALD W. ANDERSON

The sponsors for Ronald W. Anderson are:

Jack Anderson, 263 - 7th Ave.
Dolly T. Bajalia, 234 - 22nd Ave.
Judy Bajalia, 234 - 22nd Ave.
Susan J. Carlson, 442 Cabrillo, Real Estate Agent
Dorothy I. Carrillo, 829 - 43rd Ave., Telephone Sales Person
John W. Case, 4629 Geary Blvd., Apt. No. 1, Law Clerk
Burton S. Cazden, O.D., 753 Clement St., Optometrist
Richard H. Dausman, 700 - 43rd Ave., Payroll Supervisor
Fred C. Espey, 470 - 36th Ave., Attorney at Law
Jean C. Espey, 470 - 36th Ave., Housewife
Robert Gomes, 455 - 21st Ave. No. 3, Bartender
Albertina Harrison, 854 - 43rd Ave., Housewife
Carlos Harrison, 854 - 43rd Ave., Retired Tool Maker
Lorraine A. Heneberry, 824 - 43rd Ave., Retired Office Worker
Gladys Johnson, 829 - 43rd Ave., Retired Bakery Clerk
William J. Madley, 250 Point Lobos Ave. No. 501, Bank Officer
Ludmilla A. Mirskoft, 1605 Cabrillo St., Nurse Companion
Malcolm J. Starling, 846 - 43rd Ave., Warehouseman
Star Starling, 702 - 43rd Ave., Secretary
Sandra Verdier, 3601 Anza St., Waitress
Charles Ward, 2618 McAllister, Paperhanger

FOR SUPERVISOR District Number 1

THOMAS H. BOMAR

My name is Thomas H. Bomar.

My residence address is at No. 480 Eighth Avenue No. 3, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Attorney.

My qualifications for said office are as follows:

Chief Prosecutor, United States Department of Justice Juvenile Delinquency Program. Defense Attorney United States Bureau of Prisons and United States Board of Parole. Worked for and obtained significant reforms from within the system. Faculty Member, Golden Gate University School of Taxation, Tax Law Instructor. Project Leader, Office of the Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, the Pentagon. M.B.A. (Tax) and Law Degree (J.D.) with Honors, Golden Gate University.

Ballot Designation: Attorney.

Signature of Candidate: THOMAS H. BOMAR

The sponsors for Thomas H. Bomar are:

Brent S. Andrew, 846 - 27th Ave., Student
Stelios Mitchell Andrew, 846 - 27th Ave., Manager Economics & Statistics
Jeffrey M. Aron, M.D., 125 - 25th Ave., Physician
N. Arden Danekas, 1327 Cabrillo, Businessman
Peter J. Drachsler, 480 - 8th Ave., Real Estate Salesman
Harriette Ecker-Aron, 125 - 25th Ave., Homemaker
Steven Healey, 239 - 26th Ave., Draftsman
Sidney J. Hymes, 480 - 8th Ave., Attorney at law
Dimitri K. Ilyin, 76 - 6th Ave., Lawyer
Sandra J. Ketchum, 226 El Camino Del Mar, Housewife
Alex P. Laskoff, 122 - 26th Ave., Sales Representative
Richard H. Moss, 111 - 17th Ave., Attorney
Hiroshi Nagura, 636 - 25th Ave., Domestic Work
Celia Sasson, 480 - 8th Ave., Medical Counselor
Antoinetta M. Saulen, 14 Presidio Terrace, Babysitter
Pamela Schneider, 782 - 30th Ave., Teacher
Ronald P. Schneider, 782 - 30th Ave., Attorney
Arlene H. Smart, 153 - 25th Ave., Secretary
Marcus W. Turk, 80 Rossi, Merchant
John C. Williams, 17 - 17th Ave., Certified Public Accountant

CANDIDATES

FOR SUPERVISOR
District Number 1

BERNARD FINN BRADY

My name is Bernard Finn Brady.

My residence address is at No. 4120 Fulton Street No. 3, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is financial and pension planning consultant.

My qualifications for said office are as follows:

The people of the Richmond have spoken and demand a District Supervisor. My family has been active in San Francisco public affairs for four generations. I will represent the District in working for the social and economic development of the Richmond and for the benefit of all San Franciscans. My education and experience in financial services and industrial development will provide the Board with its first member capable of correlating taxes, spending and level of services. I have the knowledge to develop new sources of public and private funding to offset increasing costs and stabilize the taxpayer's burden.

Ballot Designation: Financial Consultant.

Signature of Candidate:

BERNARD FINN BRADY

The sponsors for Bernard Finn Brady are:

John O'Shea, 749 - 3rd Ave., Tavern Owner
Eleni M. Tourlos, 515 - 47th Ave., Student
George A. Schmitt, 541 Thirty-ninth Ave., Warm Air Heating Contractor
Morris R. Evenson, 583 - 10th Ave., Business Representative
Pauline Berry, 2528 Fulton, Public Health Nurse
Harry Marks, 547 - 25th Ave., District Merchant
Peter Sitov, 545 - 17th Ave., Retired
Lenore A. Macaleso, 312 - 18th Ave., Toy Store Manager
Vassiliki M. Hountalas, 518 - 48th Ave., Homemaker
Theodore G. Kaplanis, 600 - 18th Ave., Newspaper Columnist
Mary A. Zappia, 325 - 23rd Ave., Homemaker
Margaret L. Brady, 535 - 39th Ave., Public Relations Counsel
Geo. R. Rosenquist, 670 - 23rd Ave., Shipping Foreman
Maryann J. Hedden, 550 - 10th Ave., Nurse
Rajnikant Thakorbnai Desai, 155 - 15th Ave., Structural Engineer
Madelon F. Purtil, 530 - 48th Ave., Homemaker
Bernard R. Brady, 535 - 39th Ave., Retired
Anna Alexis Sitov, 545 - 17th Ave., Homemaker
Elizabeth M. Bain, 774 - 10th Ave., Secretary
John W. Hedden, 550 - 10th Ave., Entrepreneur
Lenore C. Fineman, 274 - 6th Ave., Dance Instructor
Thomas R. Purtil, 530 - 48th Ave., Communications Executive
Michael M. Hountalas, 518 - 48th Ave., Restaurateur
Morris Less, 142 - 9th Ave., Secretary Treasurer, Teamsters No. 216
Odessa W. Reed, 2528 Fulton, Linen Buyer
Joseph Macaluso, 312 - 18th Ave., Life Insurance Representative
Irene B. Anderson, 120 - 7th Ave., Doll Hospital Owner
George Nazzal, 4037 Balboa, Grocery Store Owner

FOR SUPERVISOR
District Number 1

BILL EISEN

My name is Bill Eisen.

My residence address is at No. 230 12th Avenue, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Certified Public Accountant.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a fifth generation San Franciscan and practicing Certified Public Accountant in the Richmond. I have devoted considerable time representing neighborhood interests, and I realize the need for a more responsive and accountable government. As your representative, I will fight to reduce wasteful spending and unfair taxation. I promise to support an equitable distribution of the tax burden, and I will work to create jobs, to reduce crime, to improve Muni and transportation for senior citizens, to preserve the family and individual character of our neighborhoods, and to provide a cleaner, safer environment.

Ballot Designation: Certified Public Accountant.

Signature of Candidate: BILL EISEN

The sponsors for Bill Eisen are:

Gregory Bartle, 245 Stanyan St., Clerk
Emma Baylacq, 433 - 34th Ave., Retired
Trudi Boesi, 566 - 37th Ave., Store Manager
Belle Brown, 135 - 28th Ave., Housewife
Steven Bruce, 535 - 4th Ave., Attorney
Josephine S. Bruguiera, 159 - 5th Ave., Retired
Floyd L. Edwards, Jr., 7627 Geary Blvd., Realtor
Lucie J. Fisher, 221 - 7th Ave., Retired Beautician
Elton Orval Healy, 776 - 15th Ave., Optometrist
Sushil Kakar, 5515 Anza, Chef
Carl Kulper, 614 - 40th Ave., Furniture Dealer
Steve Ladwiniec, 441 - 2nd Ave., Real Estate Broker
Leon Lassale, 800 - 29th Ave., Retired Maitre d'Hotel
Vera Lee, 364 - 3rd Ave., Teacher
Keith Lummis, 5507 Anza St., Writer
Martin D. MacClain, 530 Third Ave., Journalist
Harriet E. Miller, 659 - 26th Ave., Office Manager
Clayton T. Morrow, 723 - 17th Ave., Retired Accountant
Francis R. Nichols, 590 - 35th Ave., Retired
Ethel A. Oda, 300 Cabrillo, Teacher
Richard L. Pursley, 318 - 12th Ave., District Manager
Guerino Ricci, 2 Alta Mar Way, Retired
Gundula Schmidt, 4950 California St., YMCA Director
John F. Sellai, 206 - 32nd Ave., Florist
Dr. Lloyd A. Shinkai, 873 - 35th Ave., Optometrist
Laurel Sprigg, 7629 Geary, Savings Counselor
Daniel Sui, 563 - 5th Ave., Insurance Agent
Charles W. Turner, 245 - 8th Ave., Investigator
Anna Voloshin, 464 - 46th Ave., Retired
Julius F. Young, 276 - 5th Ave., Storekeeper

CANDIDATES

FOR SUPERVISOR

District Number 1

ROGER GRIMES

My name is Roger Grimes.

My residence address is at No. 2433 Lake Street, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Stationary Engineer.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: As a San Franciscan, father of three, and a stationary engineer employed by the city and county of San Francisco, in the Departments of Water, Airport, Public Works, and Port Commission, I have gained invaluable experience in city operation. I believe my technical and educational background will assist me in improving city service and in conserving our resources. Over the years, I have been meaningfully involved with many effective community action projects. As supervisor, I would pledge to bring a fair and honest approach to city government, and to work for improvement in the quality of life for all citizens.

Ballot Designation: Stationary Engineer.

Signature of Candidate: ROGER GRIMES

The sponsors for Roger Grimes are:

Helen Grimes, 2433 Lake St., Social Worker
William D. Frey, 6318 Geary, Restaurant Owner
Lesley I. Czechowicz, 466 - 23rd Ave., School Director
Agnes Kafafian, 662 - 30th Ave., Housewife
George Murphy, 839 - 24th Ave., Law Student
Charles Leston, 142 Seal Rock Dr., Shoemaker
Frank J. Grupico, 393 - 30th Ave., Retired Newspaperman
Dorothy Seidl, 105 - 21st Ave., Secretary
Patrick Lynch, 2925 Cabrillo, Construction Worker
Allen Berman, 103 - 8th Ave., Businessman
Susan Dorger, 146 Funston Ave., Teacher
Rebecca Boyd, 464 - 43rd Ave., Social Worker
Manuel S. Martinez, 590 - 24th Ave., Retired Auto Mechanic
Anton A. Schumacher, 425 - 22nd Ave., Retired Cook
Lenore Spagnully, 436 Funston Ave., Housewife and Student
Roger de Borbon, 419 - 38th Ave., Clerk
Jane E. Jens, 310 - 3rd Ave., Secretary
James M. Robertson, 256 - 26th Ave., Retired Manager
Winifred T. André, 2427 Lake, Teacher - S.F.U.D.
Edythe Snow, 496-32nd Ave., Retired Secretary
Doris E. Joffroy, 233 - 11th Ave., Real Estate Salesperson
Jeanne Strauss, 2255 Lake St., Teacher
Barbara A. Francis, 431 - 31st Ave., Teacher
Mildred T. Mager, 267 - 26th Ave., Retired Secretary
Mable R. Wallace, 692 - 15th Ave., Retired
James F. Wright, Jr., 369 Arguello Blvd., Retired
Edward O'Toole, 5532 Geary Blvd., Retired
Virginia Butler, 690 - 15th Ave., Retired
Dewey V. Fischer, 491 - 31st Ave., Retired

FOR SUPERVISOR

District Number 1

DON HILL

My name is Don Hill.

My residence address is at No. 496 - 26th Avenue, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Systems Analyst.

My qualifications for said office are as follows:

There is only so much that city governments can do. Many problems can be dealt with only by the state and federal governments. San Francisco's local officials have tried hopelessly to deal with problems beyond their control, while doing little to provide us with safe and clean streets, dependable public transportation, and affordable housing for the middle class. I know and understand the problems facing San Francisco. I have the common sense necessary to solve those problems.

Ballot Designation: Systems Analyst.

Signature of Candidate: DON HILL

The sponsors for Don Hill are:

James E. Butler, 523 - 27th Ave., Public Housing Manager
Marcia P. Hill, 5816 Geary St., Systems Analyst
Stanley Hasegawa, 645 - 9th Ave., Project Supervisor
Carol Lynne Hasegawa, 645 - 9th Ave., Systems Analyst
Maria L. Lardman, 473 - 2nd Ave., Businesswoman
Violet Hanada, 381 - 10th Ave., Intravenous Technician
Louise H. Jones, 558 - 29th Ave., Teacher
Fredrick D. Jones, 346 Funston Ave., Systems Analyst
Wen Xian Li, 463 - 16th Ave., Senior Systems Analyst
Kristina Morley, 615 - 25th Ave., Sales Rep.
Kathleen C. McConnell, 1751 Cabrillo, Mail Carrier
Norman J. Meshriy, 601 Lake St., Project Manager (Systems)
Mary Ellen Noland, 2212 Clement St., Sr. Systems Analyst
Suzanne Poyourow, 2306 Cabrillo, Auto Leasing
Edward K. Pond, 5049 Anza St., Insurance & Real Estate Broker
Carolyn Perlstein, 757 - 20th Ave., Teacher
Tatiana Rodionoff, 229 - 21st Ave., Student X-Ray Technician
Susan E. Ryan, 463 - 26th Ave., Accountant
Elma C. Sweeney, 534 - 27th Ave., Homemaker
John M. Sweeney, 534 - 27th Ave., Retired
Chan Der Sun, 554 - 25th Ave., Reproduction Technician
David W. Sims, 748 - 47th Ave., Retired
Beatrice A. Sims, 748 - 47th Ave., Housewife
James D. Williams, 854 - 48th Ave., Retired
Vincent Zacarias, 627 - 39th Ave., Business Man

CANDIDATES

FOR SUPERVISOR

District Number 1

GORDON J. LAU

My name is Gordon J. Lau.

My residence address is at No. 866 Funston Avenue, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors.

My qualifications for said office are as follows:

I will continue to work for fairer taxation of residential property, fair distribution of city services to all districts, eradicate unemployment/underemployment, decent housing, health services, decent education for adults and children, needs of seniors, public transportation, adequate fire and police protection.

I will work to insure the continuation of the residential/small community oriented business character of our district. Work to bring programs for our senior citizens, bi-lingual services, health services to the Richmond.

I will meet with residents in the Richmond on weekends and at night to resolve these issues.

Ballot Designation: Member, Board of Supervisors.

Signature of Candidate: GORDON J. LAU

The sponsors for Gordon J. Lau are:

Mary D. Lau, 866 Funston, Teacher
Walter Ballin, 447 - 15th Ave., Merchant
Lynne JoAnne Beeson, 787 - 39th Ave., Contract Monitor
Roger H. Bernhardt, 682 - 9th Ave., Professor of Law
Anthony J. Campilongo, 390 - 28th Ave., Teacher
Henry Der, 439 - 46th Ave., Executive Director
Betty J. Fong, 541 - 36th Ave., Legal Secretary
Nobusuke Fukuda, 130 - 22nd Ave., Social Worker
Robert O. Guillot, 211 - 14th Ave., Attorney
J. Rodney Johnson, 575 - 9th Ave., Community Planner
Robert E. Kiyota, 758 1/2 - 8th Ave., Congressional Assistant
Bonnie Ladin, 691 - 15th Ave., Organizer
Carole Jan Lee, 156 - 20th Ave., Homemaker
Melvin D. Lee, 450 - 22nd Ave., Engineer - Contractor
Michael G. W. Lee, 486 - 44th Ave., Attorney-at-law
Barbara Levy, 1824 Lake St., Housewife
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 655 - 21st Ave., Youth Program Administrator
Catherine W. O'Neill, 550 - 7th Ave., Retired Teacher
Bob Price, 163 - 18th Ave., Job Developer
Jack T. Quan, 427 - 20th Ave., Engineer
Roland Quan, 2332 Anza, Certified Public Accountant
Paul Rosenberg, 555 - 40th Ave., Member Democratic County Central Comm.
Terrence Ryan, 229 - 17th Ave., Business Manager
Sid O. Valledor, Sr., 138 - 11th Ave., Records Administrator
Yori Wada, 565 - 4th Ave., Buchanan YMCA Executive Director
Daniel H. Weinstein, 42 - 6th Ave., Attorney at law
Marilyn K. Weisberg, 845 El Camino del Mar, District Merchant
Raymond L. Weisberg, M.D., 845 El Camino del Mar, Physician
Margaret O. Yu, 195 - 2nd Ave., Head Teacher - Administrative

FOR SUPERVISOR

District Number 1

EDWARD LAWSON

My name is Edward Lawson.

My residence address is at No. 469 - 14th Avenue, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Urban Planner.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: As a longtime resident of the Richmond, I organized the successful fight to remove the traffic barriers. We must stop the practice of allowing a handful of self-appointed people to dictate what will be done in our neighborhood and in our city. I will take some of the money we're spending on police-community relations and spend it on catching criminals. I'll fight against higher taxes the way I fought against the barriers. In education, I believe in getting back to fundamentals. Muni service must be improved. I promise to fight for you and the city.

Ballot Designation: Urban Planner.

Signature of Candidate:

EDWARD H. LAWSON

The sponsors for Edward Lawson are:

Albert L. Boucher, 109 Seal Rock Dr., Senior Engineering Designer
Thomas O. Caylor, 6352 California St., Real Estate Sales
Michael F. Cetinich, 601 - 20th Ave., Student
Sung Huen Cheng, 458 - 16th Ave., Businessman
Charlotte J. Elam, 1029 Anza St., Customer Services Representative
Fredric S. Freund, 80 West Clay Park, Real Estate Sales and Management
Louise J. Frischknecht, 799 - 16th Ave., Retired
Elizabeth A. Fuller, 447 - 14th Ave., Job Counselor
Beverly Ann Grove, 647 - 2nd Ave., Secretary
Marie T. Hong, 550 - 11th Ave., Grocery Store Owner
Loa Jensen, 799 - 16th Ave., Counselor
Beverley J. Johnson, 485 - 14th Ave., Meat Wrapper - Safeway Stores
Wallace Lee, 314 - 22nd Ave., Merchant
Donald Magnin, 36 Presidio Ter., Importer
Luigi Martinelli, 481 - 14th Ave., Merchant
Donald C. McNear, 11 - 17th Ave., Advertising Executive
Otto E. Meyer, 88 West Clay Park, Vintner
Masao Mikami, 563 - 40th Ave., Investor
Albert Nalbandian, 154 - 17th Ave., Florist
Robert G. Nelson, 527 - 26th Ave., Insurance Broker
Frank P. Noto, 6841 Geary Blvd., U.S. Army Officer
Ronald K. Omori, 551 - 12th Ave., Electrical Contractor
Julia G. Porter, 142 - 27th Ave., Civic Leader
Carlos Poza, 477 - 14th Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Valerie Rodetsky, 165 Stanyan St., Homemaker
Herbert M. Rosenthal, 475 - 14th Ave., Attorney
Barbara Schneider, 530 - 10th Ave., Bookkeeper
William P. Siao, 715 - 11th Ave., Businessman
Louis Stein, 485 - 37th Ave., Non-Profit Corp. Executive
Patrick J. Walsh, 524 - 4th Ave., Retired City Employee

CANDIDATES

FOR SUPERVISOR District Number 1

JOHN MALONEY

My name is John Maloney.

My residence address is at No. 711 Twelfth Avenue, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is General Contractor.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: A family man, I have been a resident and homeowner of this district for twenty-three years. I opposed the Pan-handle Freeway and collected over 3,000 signatures to remove the traffic barricades. I am a member of the Planning Association for the Richmond, Richmond District Council and was recently elected to the Inner Richmond Citizens Action Committee. I am chairman of the Public Improvement Committee which is planning a community center in and for the Richmond District.

Ballot Designation: General Contractor.

Signature of Candidate: JOHN MALONEY

The sponsors for John Maloney are:

Eustatheos Argyres, 326 - 26th Ave., Retired Businessman
Alexis Viripaef, 512 - 10th Ave., Insurance Broker
Olga Golovin, 715 - 12th Ave., Nurses Aide
Eileen O'Kane, 727 - 12th Ave., Retired SF School Teacher
Adeline Attwood, 950 Cabrillo St., Retired
Margot Ury, 746 - 12th Ave., Housewife
Oskar Ury, 746 - 12th Ave., Physician and Surgeon
Efethia Argyres, 326 - 26th Ave., Teacher
Acrivoula Argyres, 326 - 26th Ave., Data Processor
Irene Koupas, 6316 California St., Retired
James Koupas, 6316 California St., Retired
Bernice R. Bowen, 743 - 12th Ave., Housewife
Robert McGuire, 457 - 28th Ave., Gas Station Owner & Operator
Wallace S. Towle, 767 - 12th Ave., Retired Lumberman
John Lyons, 881 - 11th Ave., Restaurant Owner
Nicholas A. Evans, 734 - 11th Ave., Retired
Claudine A. Buchholz, 1045 Cabrillo St., Retired
Arthur Hofmayer, 676 - 11th Ave., Copywriter
Joan Mitchell, 755 - 11th Ave., Teacher
Thomas J. Keaveney, 727 - 12th Ave., Accountant
Mary Constantine, 6924 Fulton St., Retired
Stamo D. Thomas, 319 - 26th Ave., Government
Peter Georgeades, 713 - 31st Ave., Bartender

FOR SUPERVISOR District Number 1

ATHANASIOUS (LOU) MAUNUPAU

My name is Athanasius (Lou) Maunupau.

My residence address is at No. 829 Arguello Blvd., San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Postal Clerk.

My qualifications for said office are as follows:
For 20 years I have been a resident of District One. During those years I have witnessed the changes, some good, some bad, that have taken place within the district, and the City of San Francisco. Spiraling property taxes, unemployment, crime, transportation, commuter traffic, unchecked utility increases commands my immediate attention. My family consist of myself, my wife Ilze and Son-Louis. My family is of the Roman Catholic faith. For the last 2 years I have attended San Francisco State University seeking a B.A. in Labor Studies. Presently I am 7 units short of meeting B.A. requirements.

Ballot Designation: Postal Employee (Labor Official).

Signature of Candidate:

ATHANASIOUS LOU MAUNUPAU

The sponsors for Athanasius Maunupau are:

Rudolfo Austrih, 4038 Cabrillo, Clerk
Elizabeth Austrih, 4038 Cabrillo, Clerk
Danny Balancio, 3305 Balboa, Watch Repair
Nadine Barkus, 3125 Turk Blvd., Postal Clerk
Genevieve A. Bocar, 375 Arguello, Postal Clerk
Alice E. Burgest, 370 - 3rd Ave., Postal Clerk
Amade T. Demander, 795 - 37th Ave., Retired
Timothy H. Devault, 427 - 18th Ave., Postal Clerk
John Jaskiewicz, 3414 Fulton, Postal Clerk
Richard F. Lane, 551 - 20th Ave., Property Tax Representative
Hang Lim, 457 Second Ave., Fireman
Ilze Maunupau, 829 Arguello, Housewife
Louis A. Maunupau, 829 Arguello, Student
Joseph Melovich, 159 - 7th Ave., Mail Carrier
Verniss Morrison, 819 Arguello, Retired
Barbara L. Nareau, 2760 McAllister, Sales Assistant
Valentina Post, 188 - 16th Ave., Postal Clerk
Lonnie F. Robbins, 831 Arguello, Teacher
Lillian Sanderson, 821 Arguello, Housewife
Moses Shepherd, 586 - 16th Ave., Postal Clerk
Beverly Strickling, 833 Arguello, Housewife
James A. Strickling, Jr., 833 Arguello, Educator
Henry Wong, 470 - 15th Ave., Postal Clerk
Kenneth J. Zane, Jr., 855 Arguello, Postal Worker
Marie K. Zane, 855 Arguello, Unemployed

CANDIDATES

FOR CITY ATTORNEY GEORGE AGNOST

My name is George Agnost.

My residence address is at No. 124 San Pablo Avenue, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Chief Trial Attorney, City Attorney's Office.

My qualifications for said office are as follows:

Having served for twenty-five years in the City Attorney's Office and presently as Chief Trial Deputy in charge of all litigation involving the City, I submit my candidacy on a record of experience and accomplishment in this vital office. The ever increasing complexity of City government requires experience and expert services in the transaction of the City's extensive legal business and court representation. I pledge to totally dedicate my extensive experience and knowledge of municipal law to an excellence of leadership and to afford the highest quality of legal representation on behalf of all citizens of our City.

Ballot Designation: Chief Trial Attorney, City Attorney's Office.

Signature of Candidate: **GEORGE AGNOST**

The sponsors for George Agnost are:

George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of San Francisco
Thomas M. O'Connor, 250 Magellan Ave., City Attorney
A. Marquez Bautista, 2424 Jones St., Attorney at Law
Thomas J. Cahill, 248-17th Ave., Retired Chief of Police, San Francisco
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
H. K. Wong, 28 Bernard St., Businessman
Cyril Magnin, 999 California St., Merchant
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Attorney at Law
Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arballo Drive, Executive Vice President, Property Development Firm
Masao Ashizawa, 1862 Post St., Merchant and Contractor
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Grace Duhagon, 1582-30th Ave., Travel Agency Owner
John A. Sutro, 3598 Jackson St., Attorney at Law
John Francis Henning, Jr., 450 Rivera, Attorney
Francis C. Miralda, 65 Aptos Ave., Salesman
William Moskovitz, 1177 California St., No. 1501, Retired
Walter A. Haas, 2100 Pacific Ave., Honorary Chairman, Garment Manufacturing Company
Elmer E. Robinson, 1200 California St. Apt No. 8-A, Attorney at Law; Judge of Superior Court, Retired
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Political Consultant
Burnham Enersen, 40 Arguello Boulevard, Attorney at Law
James J. Rudden, 148 Chenery St., Corporation Executive
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Ezio M. Paolini, 538 Molino Drive, Attorney at Law
Stephen Walter, 2504 Leavenworth St., Manufacturer
Samuel B. Stewart, 2258 Broadway St., Lawyer
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason, Attorney at Law
Benjamin H. Swig, 950 Mason St., Hotel Owner and Operator
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway St., Merchant
Thomas E. Feeney, 126 Miraloma, Attorney

FOR CITY ATTORNEY GIL GRAHAM

My name is Gil Graham.

My residence address is at No. 17 Macondray Lane, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Public Interest Attorney.

My qualifications for said office are as follows:
The office must change.

I would provide a new spirit of leadership in the City Attorney's Office, making it more visible, responsive and helpful to the public.

My active record of representing community groups in public interest cases, my education at Harvard Law School and London School of Economics, and my administrative experience as Deputy Coordinator of Neighborhood Legal Assistance and Director of Lawyers Committee for Urban Affairs, makes me the best candidate for City Attorney.

Group endorsements include Chinese-American, Alice B. Toklas and Young Democratic clubs; La Raza Lawyers Association; Campaign for Economic Democracy; and Filipino Organizing Committee. Gil Graham—the only candidate who will make a difference.

Ballot Designation: Public Interest Attorney.

Signature of Candidate: **GIL GRAHAM**

The sponsors for Gil Graham are:

Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland Ave., Television Director/Chr. SF Dem. County Central Committee
John Riordan, 150 Commonwealth Ave., Attorney, Board of Governors, S.F. Community College District
Lillian K. Sing, 3005 Jackson, Attorney, Commissioner, Human Rights Comm.
Luisa Ezquerro, 212 Fair Oaks, Teacher
Gordon S. Brownell, 1801-Hyde St., Coordinator, NORML
Jean F. McClatchy, 3371 Jackson, Public Relations
Joletha Head, 114 Colby St., Staff Aide
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer, Pres., Comm. on Status of Women
Antonio A. Graftio, 768 Natoma St., Counselor/Director, Filipino Org. Comm.
L. Ling-chi Wang, 2479 Post St., University Professor
Polly B. Arzaga, 126-15th Ave., Pres, Filipino-Amer. Council
Eugene Coleman, 239 Ramsell St., Administrator
Juanita Del Carlo, 1390 Hampshire, Project Director, Fire Commission
Douglas J. Engmann, 408 Stanyan St., Management Cons.
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
A. Cecil Williams, 50 Parker, Minister-Glide Memorial Ch.
Sue Carol Hestor, 4536-20th St., Attorney
Frank Fitch, 2347A Market, Diversion Service Representative
Idaree Westbrook, 780 Clayton, Education, R&D
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Buchanan YMCA Executive Dir.
Terrance Ryan, 229-17th Ave., Business Manager
Daniel J. Silva, 3556-23rd St., Director Community Program
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones St., Transportation Analyst
Sue Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Conservationist, Planning Comm.
Howard M. Wexler, 2625 Sacramento, Attorney; Pres. of Redevelopment Agency
Henry R. Wilson, 378 Waller, Teacher
Alvin H. Baum, Jr., 2009 Green St., Attorney and City Planning Consultant
Hiram C. Smith, 1247 Fulton St., Attorney
Nancy W. Katz, 2 Whiting St., Photographer
Nancy Walker, 375 Highland, Diversion Service Rep.

CANDIDATES

FOR CITY ATTORNEY

JIM REILLY

My name is Jim Reilly.

My residence address is at No. 1800 Franklin St., No. 506, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Attorney-at-Law.

My qualifications for said office are as follows:

My purpose in running is to eliminate the stagnancy, insensitivity and inefficiency that have been the hallmark of the City Attorney's office under the present 40-year legal dynasty.

San Francisco cannot afford a City Attorney's office where conflicts of interest, political favoritism and discriminatory practices take precedence over the needs and concerns of the public.

As a private attorney, I have devoted my 25-year legal career to the practice of criminal, civil and administrative law. I believe this experience and my commitment to protecting the public—not the office—make me well qualified to serve as City Attorney.

Ballot Designation: Attorney-at-Law.

Signature of Candidate: JIM REILLY

The sponsors for Jim Reilly are:

George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., Member, State Board of Equalization

Kathryn P. Reilly, 1200 Ortega St., Homemaker

Frank N. Alioto, 2898 Vallejo, Restaurant Owner

Ann Eliaser, 3074 Pacific Ave., Consultant

Robert A. Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher

Chadwick Clark Ertola, 658 Greenwich St., Garage Attendant

William Jack Chow, 626 Grant Ave., Attorney at Law

Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Drive, Contractor

William M. Plath, 814 Grove St., Chef

Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere Int'l Vice Pres. Ladies

Garment Workers Union

Patriek Sarsfield Hallinan, 117-27th Ave., Attorney at Law

Agripino R. Cerbatos, 142 Amber Drive, Elect. Engineer

Msr. C. J. McKenna, 756 Mission St., Pastor, St. Patricks

Parish

Angie Alarcon, 240 San Carlos St., Legislative Consultant

Wayne Friday, 1095-14th St., Business Person

Sam Jordan, 4006-3rd St., Caterer

Rev. Jun Hatoyama, 1521 Shrader, Church Minister

Timothy J. Twomey, 2026 Lawton St., Labor Union Repr;

Int'l Vice Pres S.E.I.U.

Philip J. Siggins, 290 Avila St., Executive Director

George Wah Ong, 52 Almaden Court, Insurance Agent

Rev. John C. Bee, 1411 Shafter Ave., Pastor St. Stephen

Church

Nicerita D. Revelo, 37 Sheldon Court, Investigator

John J. Lyons, 681-11th Ave., Retired

Claire C. Wiles, 2201 Broadway St., Film Producer

Stanley L. Basterash, 555 Corbett Ave., Architectural

Representative

Ted Frazier, 2370 Filbert St. No. 104, Community Worker

Morry Stein, 1050 North Point, Apt No. 1507, Retired

Furniture Dealer

Derrald Etheley, 2424-15th St., Community Worker

Jose Leone Uriarte, 205 Jersey, Insurance Underwriter

Joseph B. Zaarour, 330 Country Club Drive, Business Tax

Consultant

CANDIDATES

FOR TREASURER KAY PACHTNER

My name is Kay Pachtner.

My residence address is at No. 155 Vicksburg Street, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Consumer Economist.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: San Franciscans have a right to know the truth about what's happening to their money.

The taxpayers are facing their first billion dollar budget. Property taxes have risen 30 to 35% in the last two years. The economic health of our City depends on public officials who speak out. As a consumer economist who founded the most effective consumer protection organization in America, I have helped return \$1.4 million to thousands of individuals, watchdogged financial institutions—published nationally acclaimed consumer guides—exposed massive governmental waste and inefficiencies. I will be a tough guardian of public money.

Ballot Designation: Consumer Economist.

Signature of Candidate: KAY PACHTNER

The sponsors for Kay Pachtner are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, State Legislator
Angie Alarcon, 240 San Carlos, Legislative Consultant
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores, School Director
Robert H. Bahmer, 153 Vicksburg, Retired Archivist of the U.S.
William K. Coblentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Bellisle Daley, 795 Geary St., Confidential Sec't to Sheriff
Del Martin, 651 Duncan, Author-Lecturer
Ina F. Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive/Home Executive/Planning Commiss.
Joan S. Dillon, 50 Gardenside, Librarian
Ann Eliaser, 3074 Pacific Ave., Community Consultant
John P. Figone, Jr., 1040 Union St., Pres. SF Fire Commission
Frank Fitch, 2347A Market, Diversion Service Representative
James M. Foster, 67 Waller St., Criminal Justice Specialist
Joseph Freitas, Jr., 2 Belmont Ave., District Attorney
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley St., Police Commissioner
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President ILWU
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood, Sheriff, C&C of San Francisco
Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland, TV Director/Chairman SF Dem. Central Comm.
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Elinore E. Lurie, Ph.D., 21-21st Ave., Sociologist
George R. Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Mayor of San Francisco
Joan McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
William M. Roth, 2721 Pacific Ave., Businessman
Lillian K. Sing, 3005 Jackson, Attorney-at-Law
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones St., Transportation Analyst-State PUC
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Buchanan St., YMCA Director
Nancy G. Walker, 375 Highland, Diversion Service Representative
Idaree Westbrook, 780 Clayton, Education for Research & Development

FOR TREASURER THOMAS C. SCANLON

My name is Thomas C. Scanlon.

My residence address is at No. 631 Vicente Street, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Treasurer, City and County of San Francisco.

My qualifications for said office are as follows:

A native San Franciscan with twenty-nine years of dedicated service to the taxpayers of San Francisco. As your Treasurer for these last six years, I have through careful, prudent management of your tax dollars, generated interest income in excess of \$125 million. Computerized cash management which I instituted, helped produce interest earnings last fiscal year alone of \$24.5 million. This income represents a tax reduction of \$76.00 for each and every homeowner in San Francisco! I seek to be returned to office by you on the basis of proven competence, experience, innovative, and aggressive performance.

Ballot Designation: Incumbent.

Signature of Candidate:

THOMAS C. SCANLON

The sponsors for Thomas C. Scanlon are:

Margaret M. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Registrar-Mercy High School, Housewife
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Louis F. Batmale, 444 Yerba Buena Ave., Retired Chancellor-S.F. Community College District
William H. Chester, 432 Gold Mine Drive, Retired Union Official
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Public Accountant
George T. Choppelas, 311-26th Avenue, Attorney at Law
William P. Clecak, 139 Lake Merced Hill South, Lawyer
Eleanor R. Crabtree, 1900 Gough Street, Housewife
Armond De Martini, 110-32nd Ave., Retired Educator
Jess T. Esteve, 696-12th Ave., Publisher-The Mabuhay Republic
John F. Foran, 900 Rockdale Drive, State Senator
Virginia Fusco, 34 Cervantes Blvd., Sec., Marina Civic Impr. & Property Owners Assn., Inc.
Franz E. Glen, 50 Crestline, Electrician
Ruth Church Gupta, 1910-Green Street, Attorney at Law
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Louis T. Kruger, 23 Miguel, Attorney at Law
Bernice M. Lanigan, 1638-23rd Ave., Office Manager, Teamster Pension Trust
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Legislator
Mortimer F. McInerney, 120 Vale Avenue, Lawyer
William Moskovitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene J. Muscat, 315 San Leandro Way, Educator
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Avenue, Retired City Employee
Paul Rosenberg, 555-40th Avenue, Member, Democratic County Central Committee
Michael S. Salarno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Business Man owner Radio & TV Shop
Edward E. Serres, 132 Ewing Terrace, Attorney at Law
Benjamin H. Swig, 950 Mason St., Hotel Owner & Operator
John E. Troxel, 30 Linares Ave., Attorney
Rose M. White, 306 Delano Ave., Business Rep. Industrial Carpenters No. 2565
H. P. Wright, 2320 Judah, Insurance Education
Thomas W. S. Wu, D.D.S., 598-38th Avenue, Dentistry

PARK IRRIGATION BONDS

Ballot Title

IRRIGATION SYSTEM OF THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1977.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of \$9,270,000 for the purpose of improvement of the irrigation system of the Recreation and Park Department of the City and County of San Francisco.

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since 1971, the Recreation and Park Department has been carrying out a plan to improve its facilities. Now it wants to install automatic irrigation equipment at many of its parks and recreation areas. Right now, gardeners do most of the watering by hand, during the day. This is believed to waste water, prevent daytime use of recreational areas and lower water pressure to residential neighborhoods.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would let San Francisco borrow \$9,270,000 by issuing **general obligation bonds**. The money would be used to install automatic irrigation equipment in Golden Gate Park; 25 neighborhood parks and recreation areas; por-

tions of John McLaren and Crocker Amazon playgrounds; and four city golf courses. This equipment, used at night, would save an estimated 300 million gallons of water a year and free gardeners for other duties. The interest and principal on **general obligation bonds** are paid out of tax revenues.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue **general obligation bonds** totalling \$9,270,000 to install automatic irrigation equipment in city parks and recreation areas.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue these bonds for that purpose.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

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

Bond Redemption	\$ 9,270,000
Bond Interest	4,049,925
Debt Service	<u>\$13,319,925</u>

Based on a five year construction program, the average annual debt requirement for nineteen years would be approximately \$701,000 which is equivalent to one and ninety hundredths (\$.0190) cent in the tax rate.

The following statement is made pursuant to the provision of the San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.37.

The average dollar amount of the increase in the tax rate would cost the owners of real property as-

essed at \$5,000, \$8,750, and \$12,500 is estimated as follows:

Assessed Value	Assessed Value Reduced by \$1,750 Homeowner's Exemption	Assessed Value Not Reduced by Homeowner's Exemption
\$ 5,000	\$0.62	\$0.95
8,750	1.33	1.66
12,500	2.04	2.38

The following statement is submitted pursuant to the provisions of the State of California Election Code, Section 5301.

Based on consideration of interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1977-1978 assessment roll, it is estimated that the tax rate required to be levied to fund the proposed bond issue during the first fiscal year after the sale of bonds would be forty-two hundredths (\$.0042) of one cent. Based on five sales to complete the issue, it is estimated that two and ninety-one hundredths (\$.0291) cents would be the highest rate required during the nineteen year redemption period to fund the proposed bond issue, which rate is estimated to occur during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

PARK IRRIGATION BONDS

A

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes On "A"

Save Water and Money

Proposition "A" is the \$9,270,000 Water Conservation—Automatic Irrigation Recreation and Park Bond. Vote yes on "A" because it will save the City water and save you, the taxpayer, money.

Gardening experts estimate that a change from hand watering of parks, athletic fields, and playgrounds to automatic irrigation systems will save between 45% and 55% of water now being used. Hand watering is wasteful. Automatic irrigation systems will reduce evaporation, distribute water evenly, and control the amount of water used. Passage of Proposition "A", based on present water usage, will save 300,000,000 gallons yearly.

Yes On "A"—Better Park Use

Automatic irrigation systems will make it possible to water the City's athletic fields, parks, golf courses, and playgrounds at night. This will permit us fuller daytime use of our parks and discourage nighttime vandalism. It will result in stronger neighborhood water pressure since parks will be watered during periods of low consumer demand.

Yes On "A"—Better Park Maintenance

Most of Golden Gate Park and the City's 120 neighborhood parks, squares, and athletic fields are hand watered. Most other U. S. cities use automatic irrigation systems because of their efficiency and cost savings. Automatic irrigation will free our skilled gardeners to spend their time planting and trimming our City's green spaces, thereby improving the appearance of San Francisco's parks and making the City a more pleasant place to live. No presently employed gardeners will lose their jobs.

Endorsed by:

Mayor George R. Moscone
Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Terry A. Francols
Supervisor Alfred J. Nelder
Supervisor

Dorothy von Beroldingen
Public Utilities Commission
Recreation and Park

Commission:

Eugene L. Friend
Loris DiGrazia
Msgr. Peter Armstrong
Tommy Harris
Lidia M. La Garda
Amy Meyer
Keith Eickman

City Planning Commission:

Ina F. Dearman
Toby Rosenblatt
Charles Starbuck, III
Susan J. Bierman
Gordon J. Lau
Franco Mancini
Rudolph Kesenheimer
Susan Kesenheimer
William D. Evers
Margot Patterson Doss
Walter A. Haas
Daniel E. Koshland
Kevin and Sheila Starr
Claire C. Pilcher
Marron Kendrick
Esther Marks
John H. Kirkwood
John H. Jacobs

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes On "A"

CITYWIDE BENEFITS

Every neighborhood and district in San Francisco will benefit from Proposition "A". In addition to this bond money, the Recreation and Park Department has allocated an additional \$1.6 million from approved State bonds for this project. This State money, coupled with Proposition "A", will allow all major parks, playfields, golf courses, and large green spaces to be converted to efficient automatic watering systems within five years.

Yes On "A"—A Vote for the Future

Proposition "A" will enable the Recreation and Park Department to utilize in Golden Gate Park water reclaimed from the City's new Wastewater Management Program. This is sound ecology. Proposition "A" will make it possible to save tremendous

amounts of water which we now know is a limited resource. As an efficient maintenance tool, it will save you, the taxpayer, money by saving the City water. Finally, it will give the gardeners more time to cultivate and beautify our City parks.

Yes On "A"—Golf Fund

The golf courses will pay their own way. Any golf revenues above those annually allocated to the City's General Fund are used for golf course improvements. The Controller's Office estimates that over \$2,000,000 will be available from green fees over the life of the bond, which will be used to pay for automatic irrigation of the golf courses. Therefore, money for golf course improvements will not come from property taxes.

Diane Hunter
Anne Halsted
Co-Chairpersons

(Continued)

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

PARK IRRIGATION BONDS

A

(Argument for "A", continued)

Members Open Space/Park Renovation Citizens Advisory Committee

Hervy Luster
Stanley Herzstein
George Duesdieker
Howard A. Chickering
Phoebe Brown
Alex Angelo
Diane Hunter
Madeline Pring
Stuart Wein
Betty Landis
Eugene Coleman

Donna Yick
Claire Pilcher
Anita Patton
Kirby Ortiz de Montellano
Rosemary Menninger
Anne Halsted
Dorothy Erskine
Marvin Edwards
Mary B. Connolly
Alan Wendroff
Rodrigo Reyes

Additional Endorsements

Phillip Burton, Congressman
Frances McAteer
James Fussell Jr.
Supervisor Ronald Pelosi
Marjorie Stern
Richard K. Miller
N. Arden Danekas
Ann Fogelberg
Julia Porter
Supervisor Peter Tamaras
Supervisor John Barbagelata

Rose Sarao
Supervisor Robert Gonzales
Mary Margaret Casey
Supervisor Dianne Feinstein
Steve Rubisa
Lilia Medina
Senator Milton Marks
Supervisor Robert Mendelsohn
Betty Parshall
Len Heinz

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Continuing its deliberately subversive policies of mismanaging publicly entrusted REC/PARK property by benefiting things rather than people, the Commissioners propose public funds be used to advantage adjacent landlords with green views. Instead of maintaining REC/PARK facilities to benefit people, irresponsible and unresponsive Commissioners want automatic sprinklers at taxpayers' expense, thus eliminating jobs for gardeners, while

recreational facilities for people deteriorate into urban slums. Then, as they sold out Fleishhacker pool for commercial parking lots and captive feline compounds, they will declare more depressed recreational areas surplus, unusable by people for public recreational purposes. No more public funding for REC/PARK projects until Commissioners start acting to benefit people! Vote NO on A!

Kamini K. Gupta

Ordinance authorizing Propositions A & B appears on page 84

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

Ballot Title

FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1977. To incur a bonded indebtedness of \$6,000,000 for the purpose of improvements of the fire protection facilities of the San Francisco Fire Department, including the purchase of a new fireboat.

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Since the 1906 earthquake and fire, San Francisco has had programs to improve its fire protection system. A bond issue in 1971 paid for the most recent improvements, including an extension of the high pressure fire fighting water system which operates independently from the city's domestic water supply. However, there are still parts of the city which are not served by that high pressure system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would let San Francisco borrow \$6,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. This money would pay for the next series of improvement projects in San Francisco's master plan to improve fire protection facilities.

These would include extending the high pressure water system, buying a new and faster fire boat, building more underground water cisterns and completing various other modernization and improvement projects. The interest and principal on general obligation bonds are paid out of tax revenues.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue general obligation bonds totalling \$6,000,000 to complete certain improvements in the city fire protection system.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue these bonds for that purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

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

Bond Redemption\$ 6,000,000
Bond Interest 2,640,000
Debt Service Requirement\$ 8,640,000

Based on a three year construction program, the average annual debt requirement for seventeen years would be approximately \$508,000 which amount is equivalent to one and thirty-eight hundredths (\$.0138) cent in the tax rate. Upon completion of the construction program, a decrease in operation and maintenance expenses is expected. This is estimated to save \$400,000 which amount is equivalent to one and nine hundredths (\$.0109) cent in the tax rate.

The following statement is made pursuant to the provisions of the San Francisco Administrative Code, Section 2.37.

The average dollar amount of the increase in the

tax rate would cost the owners of real property assessed at \$5,000, \$8,750 and \$12,500 is estimated as follows:

Assessed Value	Assessed Value Reduced by \$1,750 Homeowner's Exemption	Assessed Value Not Reduced by Homeowner's Exemption
\$ 5,000	\$0.45	\$0.69
8,750	0.97	1.21
12,500	1.48	1.73

The following statement is submitted pursuant to the provisions of the State of California Election Code, Section 5301.

Based on consideration of interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1977-1978 assessment roll, it is estimated that the tax rate required to be levied to fund the proposed bond issue during the first year after the sale of bonds would be ninety-nine hundredths (\$.0099) of one cent. Based on three sales to complete the issue, it is estimated that one and ninety-one hundredths (\$.0191) cent would be the highest rate required during the seventeen year redemption period to fund the proposed bond issue, which rates is estimated to occur during the fiscal year 1980-1981.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION B

The San Francisco Fire Department is internationally recognized for its fire-fighting ability, its efficiency and its modern approach to its assigned task of protecting the lives and property of those who live and work in our city. As a result, fire insurance rates have been unusually low for a densely built city consisting mostly of wood frame structures.

In 1971, the Fire Department commenced upon a multi-stage program to reduce operating costs while improving fire protection. The first two stages were approved by the voters in 1971 and 1974 respectively.

The 1977 Fire Protection Bond Issue constitutes the necessary next step in this program and is the first effort in many decades to extend the Fire Department's outstanding "High Pressure" water system, a system especially designed for earthquake resistance. Proposition "B" will replace our 1954 vintage fireboat with a more modern, faster boat

that will be cheaper to operate. Proposition "B" will reduce personnel costs by automating the Ashbury Water Control Center. Proposition "B" will reconstruct fire protection facilities that have become unreliable due to age.

Proposition "B" means better protection for lives and property.

Proposition "B" means continued low fire insurance rates.

Proposition "B" means reduced operating costs.

Proposition "B" means modern, effective fire protection.

Protect Your Pocketbook and Your City—

Vote Yes On "B"

Endorsed by:

Supervisor Dorothy von Beroldingen

Andrew C. Casper, Chief, Fire Department

No argument against Proposition B was submitted.

Ordinance authorizing Propositions A & B appears on page 84

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



AIRPORT REVENUE BONDS

Ballot Title

AIRPORT REVENUE BONDS. Shall the Airports Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of \$90,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, improving and developing airport facilities at San Francisco International Airport, including an industrial waste treatment plant, additions to terminals, remodeling and modifications of terminals, baggage handling facilities, boarding areas, aircraft aprons, pedestrian access facilities, parking facilities, engineering and planning expense, and other works, properties or structures necessary or convenient for San Francisco International Airport?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1970, San Francisco voters created the Airports Commission and gave it power to issue revenue bonds to finance airport development. In 1976, the airport sold \$143,000,000 in those bonds to begin its present expansion program. That expansion program is now either completed or under construction. The next step in the development program is to modernize or replace old facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would let San Francisco borrow \$90,000,000 to continue airport development by issuing revenue bonds. The money would be used to build a new industrial waste treatment plant to meet State water pollution standards; to replace concourses and loading piers which are

obsolete and do not meet today's fire and safety codes; to replace inadequate customs facilities for overseas passengers; and to modernize the 23-year-old Central terminal and the links between the present terminals and the garage. If costs permit, there will also be smaller projects. The revenue bonds will be paid for out of money taken in by the airport.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want San Francisco to issue revenue bonds totalling \$90,000,000 to replace and modernize the older parts of San Francisco airport.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want San Francisco to issue bonds for that purpose.

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

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

Bond Redemption	\$ 90,000,000
Bond Interest	83,700,000
Total Debt Service Requirement..	<u>\$173,700,000</u>

Based on a two year construction program the

estimated average amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would be approximately \$5,603,000 annually for thirty-one years.

The revenue bonds are payable from and are secured by a charge on the net revenues of the San Francisco International Airport, and such net revenues are pledged to the security and payment of the bonds. The Airports Commission is not obligated to pay the principal of or interest on the bonds except from net revenues, and neither the credit nor the taxing power of the City and County of San Francisco is pledged for the payment of the principal of or interest on the bonds.

How Supervisors Voted On "C"

On July 25 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Barbagelata, Francois, Kopp,

Mendelsohn, Nelder, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

NO: Supervisors Feinstein and Molinari.

The resolution was signed by Mayor Moscone on August 4.

AIRPORT REVENUE BONDS

C

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION C

San Franciscans deserve an airport that is uncluttered, efficient, safe, and environmentally sound. Proposition "C" will help accomplish those goals at **NO COST TO THE CITY'S TAXPAYERS.**

Proposition "C" will:

- Construct a waste treatment plant that will finally stop the dumping of Airport pollutants into San Francisco Bay.

- Reconstruct and repair many old and deteriorating piers that are unsafe and inefficient.

- Rebuild portions of the Customs Area of the Airport which, because of their inadequacy, have caused hours of delay for hundreds-of-thousands of travelers.

Proposition "C" will not:

- Mean more noise pollution. Proposition "C" is not an expansion program but merely a reconstruction and remodeling of unsafe and inefficient structures.

- Cost the taxpayers a dime. By State law, the only people obligated to pay the cost of Proposition "C" are the various tenants of the Airport—the airlines, restaurants, etc.

- Add to our bonded indebtedness. These are revenue bonds, secured by the income of the Airport, and under no circumstances can the homeowners and renters of the City be held responsible for paying their costs.

To help complete the Airport. To make necessary safety and environmental repairs. **WE URGE A "YES" VOTE ON PROPOSITION "C".**

Terry A. Francois

Member, Board of Supervisors

Bob Mendelsohn

Member, Board of Supervisors

Peter Tamaras

Member, Board of Supervisors

Dorothy von Beroldingen

Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION C

As this City's chief executive, San Francisco's Airport means more to me than a departure and arrival point for approximately 20 million people a year. It is a large enterprise that must be run efficiently, economically, and safely for not only the tourists—our largest industry—but also for the taxpayers of San Francisco. That's the primary reason why I strongly urge a YES vote on Proposition "C".

Proposition "C" provides funds for building a modern sewage plant that will finally stop the dumping of inadequately treated waste into San Francisco Bay. Using the force of law, a State agency requires that the City build this badly needed plant. Our own concerns for environmental quality of the Bay also require its construction.

Proposition "C" will tear down and replace aging and unsafe portions of the Central Terminal which are sinking into the ground and literally falling apart.

All reconstruction will bring the Airport up to current earthquake, fire, safety, and environmental codes. There will also be special emphasis on using materials and equipment that will result in substantial savings of energy.

And Proposition "C" will reconstruct and rebuild the woefully inadequate Customs section of the overcrowded South Terminal—a facility that handles the bulk of international flights. Passengers, airlines, and even Time Magazine have singled out this facility as totally inadequate.

Most important of all, this necessary remodeling and refurbishing will cost the property taxpayers of this City nothing. All costs of this \$90 million bond issue will be repaid out of Airport revenues—the fees and rents of the airlines, restaurants and other tenants of the facility.

As Mayor, I'm sure you share my interest in having an environmentally sound, structurally safe, energy and economically efficient Airport—an Airport that is not only self-sufficient, but actually contributes millions of dollars each year to the City's general fund.

Those reasons mandate a "YES" vote on Proposition "C".

George R. Moscone, Mayor

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

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION C

Vote "Yes" On Proposition "C"

PROPOSITION "C" IS FREE!!

The proposed Airport Revenue Bonds will be paid solely from the rents and fees collected from airlines and tenants of the Airport. **THIS BOND ISSUE COSTS YOU, THE TAXPAYER, NOTHING.** State law prohibits property taxpayers from being responsible for retiring these bonds.

PROPOSITION "C" FOR SAFETY AND FOR IMPROVING OUR ENVIRONMENT.

Proposition "C" is needed to replace and strengthen facilities, some of which date back to the piston-engine aircraft era. A portion of these bonds will be earmarked for the necessary State-mandated construction of a sewage treatment plant that will finally stop inadequately treated pollutants from flowing into San Francisco Bay.

PROPOSITION "C" IS NOT EXPANSION.

Proposition "C" will not finance any Airport expansion but, instead, will be used for essential environmental, safety, energy, and convenience improvements to the facility.

PROPOSITION "C" FOR AN EFFICIENT AIRPORT

San Francisco's Airport is self-sufficient. All costs of operating and maintaining the facility (fifth busiest in the U.S.) are paid by the tenants of the Airport. Even the original 1954 construction bond issue, approved by two-thirds of the City's voters, is being retired by Airport revenues and not property taxes. Over \$5 million a year—about .15c on the tax rate—is added to the City's general fund from the interest earned on Airport revenues.

John F. Crowley
Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Labor
Council
Agar Jaicks
Chairman, S.F. Democratic
County Central Committee
Juanita Del Carlo
Benjamin Tom
Board of Education
Jess T. Esteve
William Dauer
Executive Vice President
Chamber of Commerce
Aileen C. Hernandez

Stanley M. Smith
Secretary
Building and Construction
Trades Council
Rev. Victor L. Medearia
Pastor, Double Rock
Baptist Church
Thomas J. Mellon
Chief Administrative Officer
(Retired)
City of San Francisco
Jane McKaskle Murphy
Gary Near
Alessandro Baccari
James Herman
President, ILWU

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION C

Vote "Yes" On Proposition "C"

San Francisco International Airport accommodates millions of passengers every year from overseas. The customs area, however, is a tiny set of cubicles and very small baggage room which is so cramped, hot, and antiquated that it reminds one of Ellis Island during the early years of this century. It needs rebuilding so badly that U.S. Customs has threatened to close it down unless we correct such degrading conditions. So, too, do we need a sewage treatment plant to stop the dumping of Airport waste into the Bay. Finally, Proposition C will pro-

vide money to repair old, dilapidated piers which are unsafe.

Vote "Yes" On "C"

This is a revenue bond issue. The bonds will be paid by Airport revenues, **NOT** by property taxes. The City is not liable on the bonds. We need these repairs and reconstruction work. Please join me in voting "Yes" on Proposition C.

Quentin L. Kopp
President, Board of Supervisors

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

AIRPORT REVENUE BONDS



ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

THE CITY CANNOT AFFORD IT!!

- San Francisco has one of the highest per capita bonded indebtedness of American cities.
- The City's top financial advisors (which include the Chief Administrative Officer and Controller) have said this bond is INADVISABLE.
- Not one cent of our Airport's income goes to the City to reduce taxes, yet San Francisco taxpayers would be at risk on these bonds for 30 years.

THIS BOND IS ONLY HALF THE PLAN!!

- The Airport Commission has approved \$170 MILLION—Proposition C is just the beginning! If these bonds pass, the Airport bond debt alone will approach ONE BILLION DOLLARS, including interest (or TWICE the public investment in the much larger LA Airport).
- THIS WILL TOTAL \$3220 PER SAN FRANCISCO FAMILY.

WHEN WILL IT STOP?

- We allowed them \$98 MILLION in 1968.
- The Supervisors allowed them \$143 MILLION in 1976.
- The new North Terminal will DOUBLE Airport capacity next year! ISN'T THIS ENOUGH?

DON'T BE FOOLED!!

- This bond includes \$3 million for the INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT PLANT, however Airport officials admit Airport income could finance it.

EPA TERMED THE EXPANSION "ENVIRONMENTALLY UNSATISFACTORY"

- Air pollution
- Excessive noise
- Congested freeways
- Tripled energy use.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

Signatures against Proposition C

Robert Bahmer	Tony Kilroy
Susan Bierman	Gordon Lau
Charles Bolton	Jerry Levine
Dian Blomquist	David Looman
Gary Borvice	Bill Maher
Gerald Cauthen	Ken McEldowney
Rene Cazenave	Mary McMahon
Marie Cleasby	Harvey Milk
Daniel Clinton	John Molinari
Ralph Coffman	Lewis Porter
Eleanor Coffman	Richmond Environmental
George Colbert	Action
Elizabeth Colton	Norman Rolfe
Robert Covington	Paul and Prentice Sack
Arden Danekas	San Francisco Black
Douglas Engmann	Political Caucus
Dorothy Erskine	San Francisco Federated
David Finn	Young Democrats
Ann Fogelberg	San Franciscans For
Peter Forney	San Francisco Tomorrow
Rita George	John Sanger
Ron Green	Bert Schwarzschild
Anne Halsted	Carol Ruth Silver
Sylvester Herring	Ron Smith
Haight Ashbury Community	Sue Smith
Development Corporation	Charles Starbuck
Terence Hallinan	Zack Stewart
William Hanekamp	Arnold Townsend
Sue Hestor	Dick VanAggelen
Tip Hillan	Kathleen VanVelsor
John Holtzelaw	Calvin Welch
Diane Hunter	Peter Witmer
Mark Kasky	Michael Wong

Resolution authorizing Proposition C appears on page 86

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

D

AIRPORT REVENUE BOND PROCEDURE

Ballot Title

Shall issuance of airport revenue bonds be subject to Board of Supervisors approval and shall said Board be required to determine that projected revenues will be sufficient to retire said bonds?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Charter now says that the Board of Supervisors must submit to the voters any recommendation by the Airports Commission for a revenue bond issue to acquire, build, improve or develop airports or airport facilities. The Supervisors cannot reject the recommendation or change it.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would give the Board of Supervisors the power to decide whether or not an airport bond issue should go on the ballot.

The Supervisors could also change the size of the bond issue.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to decide whether or not an airport bond measure will go on the ballot and in what amount.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present system where the Board of Supervisors must submit bond issues recommended by the Airports Commission to the voters.

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On August 8 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzales, Kopp, Molinari, Nelder, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.

NO: Supervisors Barbagelata and Francois.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D**



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

7.306 Airport Revenue Bonds

(a) Upon the recommendation of the airports commission, the board of supervisors ((shall)) may by resolution submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco subject to the approval, amendment or rejection of the board of supervisors in each instance, at an election held for that purpose, the proposition of issuing bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it now reads or may hereafter be amended, for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, improving or developing airports or airport facilities under the jurisdiction of the airports commission in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the airports commission. Prior to submitting the proposition to the voters, the board of supervisors shall make a determination that projected airport revenues will be sufficient to retire the proposed revenue bonds as they become due taking into consideration anticipated interest rates. If the proposition is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the proposition, the airports commission may from time to time authorize by appropriate resolution the sale of bonds; provided, however, notwithstanding any other provisions in this charter, no election shall be required.

(1) for bonds approved in fact by the board of supervisors prior to January 1, 1977; or

(2) for bonds necessary to fund airport capital improvements approved in principle by a resolution adopted by three-fourths of the members of the board of supervisors prior to April 1, 1977; or

(3) for bonds issued to refund an existing indebtedness if the refunding bonds would result in lower total bond payments.

(b) Revenue bonds issued pursuant to this section shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed that which may be fixed and prescribed by the airports commission without regard to the limitations contained in the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bonds issued by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this section shall not constitute or evidence indebtedness of the city and county but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the said commission payable solely out of revenues received by the commission from airports or airport facilities operated, leased or controlled by it.

(c) Airport revenue bonds issued ((for such purposes)) pursuant to this section shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in section 6.401 of this charter. Nothing in this section shall prevent the city and county from issuing general obligation bonds for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, improving or developing airports or airport facilities under the commission's jurisdiction, subject to the bond issue procedure provided for in this charter.

**Apply for Your
Absentee Ballot
Before 5 p.m., Nov. 1st**

D

AIRPORT REVENUE BOND PROCEDURE

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION D

Vote Yes on Proposition "D"—a measure to give your elected officials a voice in deciding whether airport Revenue Bonds are to be issued for future airport improvement projects.

At the present time, the Charter provides in effect that if the Airports Commission decides to submit an airport Revenue Bond Issue to the voters, the City and County Board of Supervisors has no option but must agree to put the question on the ballot at a municipal election.

It appears obvious that the decision in such cases should be made by those who were elected by the voters to represent them—the Board of Supervisors, rather than by the appointed officials of the Airports Commission. It is also logical that the Airports Commission should be responsible for planning and *recommending* such measures as Revenue Bond Issues, as a part of its basic Charter-assigned roles of airport possession, management, supervision, operation and control.

This measure would also allow the government to refund existing indebtedness if it would result in lower total bond payments and resulting savings to the City.

The budgetary and fiscal policy questions involved in deciding whether to add to the City's indebtedness, whether funded by airport revenues or as a general obligation of the government, must be decided by those who are charged with ensuring the City's fiscal soundness—the Board of Supervisors.

Make sure that control of all aspects of bond issue decision-making is in those elected to make such decisions.

Vote Yes on "D".

Endorsed by:

Supervisor John L. Molinari

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Thomas Scanlon

No argument against Proposition D was submitted.

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

DUTIES OF THE MAYOR



Ballot Title

Shall the Mayor of the City and County be expressly required to devote his entire time and attention to the duties of his office?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Charter does not require the mayor to give up any outside occupation or business activity.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E would amend the charter to require the mayor to work full-time as mayor and give up any outside occupation or business activity.

A YES VOTE MEANS: You want the mayor to be required to devote his entire time and attention to the duties of the office.

A NO VOTE MEANS: You want to keep the charter as it is and permit the mayor to have an outside occupation or activity.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On July 5 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Feinstein, Francois, Kopp, Mendelsohn, Molinari, Nelder, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

NO: Supervisors Barbagelata, Gonzales and Pelosi.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION E

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

3.100 Functions, Powers and Duties

The mayor shall be the chief executive officer of the city and county upon whom process issued by authority of law shall be served. He shall be an elective officer and his compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter. **The mayor shall devote his entire time and attention to the duties of the office, and shall not devote time or attention to any other occupation or business activity.**

He shall furnish an official bond in the sum of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000).

He shall appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, an executive secretary and one confidential secretary, and one stenographer. The board of supervisors may annually appropriate additional sums to be expended by the mayor for purposes and duties incidental to the administration of the office of mayor, which shall be subject to the provisions of this charter relative to appropriations and the payment of claims.

He shall, at the first meeting of the board of supervisors in October of each year, communicate by message to the supervisors a general statement of the condition of the affairs of the city and county, and recommend the adoption of such measures as he may deem expedient and proper.

The mayor shall be responsible for the enforcement of all laws relating to the municipality and for the review and submission of the annual executive budget; he shall supervise the administration of all departments under boards and commissions appointed by him; he shall receive and examine, without delay, all complaints relating to the administration of the affairs of the city and county, and immediately inform the complainant of findings and actions thereon; and he shall **((co-ordinate))** coordinate and enforce **((co-operation))** cooperation between all departments of the city and county. The mayor shall have the power to postpone final action on any franchise that may be passed by the supervisors until such proposed franchise shall have been voted on at the next election.

The mayor shall appoint such members of boards or commissions and other officers as provided by this charter.

He shall appoint for the unexpired term of the

office vacated, a qualified person to fill any vacancy occurring in any elective office.

The mayor shall have a seat but no vote in the board of supervisors and in any board **((of))** or commission appointed by him, with the right to report on or discuss any matter before such board or commission concerning the departments or affairs in his charge. He shall have power to designate a member of the board of supervisors to act as mayor in his absence. Should he fail, neglect or refuse so to do, the supervisors shall elect one of their number to act as mayor during his absence. When a vacancy occurs in the office of mayor, it shall be filled for the unexpired portion of the term by the supervisors. In case of a disaster which causes the mayor to be absent or unavailable and the supervisors for any reason whatsoever are unable to elect one of their number to act as mayor or to fill any vacancy that might occur in the office of mayor, the following persons shall act as mayor in the order of succession hereinafter designated: (1) president of the board of supervisors, (2) chairman of the finance committee of the board of supervisors, (3) senior member of the board of supervisors, who is that member having the greatest number of years of service as a member of the board, and in the event that one or more members have equal seniority then by alphabetical order of surname among such members, and (4) chief administrative officer. Said person so designated shall act as mayor during such period of absence or unavailability of the mayor until such time as the supervisors can take appropriate action either to elect an acting mayor or to fill the vacancy as the case may be. Every person who has served as mayor of the city and county, so long as he remains a resident thereof, shall have a seat in the board of supervisors and may participate in its debates, but shall not be entitled to a vote or to compensation.

In case of public emergency involving or threatening the lives, property or welfare of the citizens, or the property of the city and county, the mayor shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to summon, organize and direct the forces of any department in the city and county in any needed service; to summon, marshal, deputize or otherwise employ other persons, or to do whatever else he may deem necessary for the purpose of meeting the emergency. The mayor may make such studies and surveys as he may deem advisable in anticipation of any such emergency.

DUTIES OF THE MAYOR

E

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION E

A "Yes" Vote On Proposition "E"—Full-Time Commitment to the Office of the Mayor.

A "Yes" vote on Proposition "E" means unequivocally that the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco shall hold one job—that of chief executive of this one billion dollar municipal enterprise.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "E".

The current Mayor's salary is \$54,946.00. Remarkably, although there are conflict of interest clauses, the Charter, as presently written, contains no requirement that the Mayor direct his full time and attention to the office. Therefore, it is conceivable that the Mayor could continue to serve, for example, as a partner in a law firm or other busi-

ness venture. With the extensive responsibilities of government management and the complexity of issues in need of mayoral attention, it is imperative that the Mayor serve solely in that capacity. This would not only remove the hint of conflict of interest but, more importantly, it would guarantee that full time is spent on the business of providing efficient and effective San Francisco Government with no possible distractions.

A "Yes" vote on Proposition "E" will specify in the San Francisco Charter what San Franciscans expect from their highest elected and highest paid municipal official: full-time commitment to the job.

Endorsed by:

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

No argument against Proposition E was submitted.

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

F

TERM OF CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

Ballot Title

Shall the maximum term of office of the Chief Administrative Officer be fixed at ten years?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Chief Administrative Officer is appointed by the Mayor and approved by the Board of Supervisors to serve until retirement.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F would amend the city charter to limit the chief administrative officer's

time in office to a maximum of 10 years.

A YES VOTE MEANS: You want to limit the term of the chief administrative officer to 10 years.

A NO VOTE MEANS: You do not want to limit the term of the chief administrative officer.

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On August 8 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Francois, Gonzales, Kopp, Molinari, Nelder, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.

NO: Supervisor Barbagelata.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F**

F

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

3.200 Appointment; Qualifications; Term of Office

The mayor shall appoint a qualified person as chief administrative officer, subject to confirmation and approval by the board of supervisors. The appointee shall have been a resident of the State of California for at least five years immediately preceding his appointment. The requisite qualifications of such appointee shall be administrative and executive ability and experience for the position to be filled. No person appointed and qualified as chief administrative officer shall serve a term of office longer than ten (10) years; provided, however, that the term of the person so appointed shall not extend beyond the age of compulsory retirement as set

forth in the retirement provisions of this charter.

He shall be subject to suspension and removal in the same manner as elective officers. He shall also be subject to removal by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the board of supervisors, on the basis of written charges, and, if he so request, only after a public hearing on such charges before the board of supervisors not less than five days nor more than fifteen days after the filing thereof, and prior to the date on which the supervisors shall vote on the question of his removal, but on the filing of written charges, and pending and during such hearing, the supervisors, by majority vote, may suspend him from office. The written charges and any reply thereto by the chief administrative officer shall be entered at length in the journal of the board of supervisors. The action of the board of supervisors in removing the chief administrative officer shall be final.

Argument

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION F

Vote "Yes" On Proposition "F"

A "Yes" vote on Proposition "F" will change the Charter provision which grants a life term to the Chief Administrative Officer. Proposition "F" changes the Chief Administrative Officer's term to ten (10) years.

Presently, retirement, resignation, or removal from office for grossly negligent conduct are the only possible ways of terminating the term of a Chief Administrative Officer. The responsibilities and areas of authority under the Chief Administrative Officer's jurisdiction are extensive. The administrative departments under the Chief Administrative Officer include: Finance and Records, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, Public Health, County Agricultural Departments, Health Advisory Board, and the Coroner's Office.

VOTE "YES" ON "F."

The position of Chief Administrative Officer, as a Mayoral appointee subject to confirmation by the Board of Supervisors, must remain independent to carry out the responsibilities of his office with aggressive leadership, but with some restraint on tenure. Therefore, it is logical to provide a ten (10) year term of office so that a CAO may be held accountable for continued, innovative performance in office, but still not be beholden to any one appointing power. Reduction of the lifetime term to ten (10) years would not politicize the office but would serve to maintain a fresh, high quality of performance by the occupant of the office.

A "Yes" vote on Proposition "F" will make possible this goal.

Endorsed by:

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

No argument against Proposition F was submitted.

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

G

BUDGET REDUCTIONS

Ballot Title

Shall the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors be empowered to decrease amounts requested by City and County departments for employees' compensation without specifying the positions to be affected by such decrease?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In preparing the City budget, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors may make cuts in departments budgets only by listing specific items to be reduced or eliminated.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G would allow the Mayor or the Supervisors to decrease the total amount to be spent by departments' wages and salaries without actually specifying what item or items should be cut out. It would then be up to individual

Department Heads to make the specific cuts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to let the Mayor or the Supervisors cut proposed total spending on wages and salaries without having to say exactly what should be reduced.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, the Mayor and the Supervisors continue to specify exactly what cuts they want made if they wish to reduce spending on wages and salaries.

Controller's Statement on "G"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not increase the cost of government. It may decrease the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be determined.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On August 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Barbagelata, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Kopp, Molinari, Nelder, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

None of the Supervisors present voted "NO."

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G**

G

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

6.203 Powers and Duties of the Mayor

The mayor shall hold such public hearings on these budget estimates as he may deem necessary and he may increase, decrease or reject any item contained in the estimates, he may, without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services contained in the estimates, excepting that he shall not increase any amount nor add any new item for personal services, materials, supplies or contractual services, but may add to the requested appropriations for any public improvement or capital expenditure; but he shall add to requested appropriations for any public improvement or capital expenditure only after such items have first been referred to the department of city planning and a report has been rendered thereon regarding conformity with the master plan. It shall be the duty of the department of city planning to render its reports in writing within thirty days after said referral. Failure of the department of city planning to render any such report in such time shall be deemed equivalent to a report. The budget estimates of expenditures for any utility, within the estimated revenues of such utility, shall not be increased by the mayor.

Not later than the 15th day of April in each year, the mayor shall transmit to the board of supervisors the consolidated budget estimates for all departments and offices of, and the proposed budget for, the city and county for the ensuing fiscal year, including a detailed estimate of all revenues of each department and an estimate of the amount required to meet bond interest, redemption and other fixed charges of the city and county, and the revenues applicable thereto. He shall, by message accompanying such proposed budget, comment upon the financial program incorporated therein, the important changes as compared with the previous budget, and bond issues, if any, as recommended by him.

The mayor shall submit to the board of supervisors, at the time that he submits said budget estimates and said proposed budget, a draft of the annual appropriation ordinance for the ensuing fiscal year, which shall be prepared by the controller. This shall be based on the proposed budget and shall be drafted to contain such provisions and detail as to furnish an adequate basis for fiscal and accounting control by the controller of each revenue and expenditure appropriation item for the ensuing fiscal year.

6.205 Powers and Duties of the Board of Supervisors

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ten days after receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance. The board of supervisors may, by a two-thirds vote of all members thereof, shorten, extend

or otherwise modify the time fixed in this section or in sections 6.200, 6.202, 6.203 or 6.206 of this charter for the performance of any act by any officer, board or commission.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, and may without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services contained in the proposed budget, but shall not increase any amount or add any new item for personal services or materials, supplies, or contractual services, for any department, unless requested in writing so to do by the mayor, on the recommendation of the chief administrative officer, board, commission or elective officer, in charge of such department.

The board of supervisors may increase or insert appropriations for capital expenditures and public improvements, but shall do so only after such items have first been referred to the department of city planning and a report has been rendered thereon regarding conformity with the master plan. It shall be the duty of the department of city planning to render its reports in writing within thirty days after said referral. Failure of the department of city planning to render any such report in such time shall be deemed equivalent to a report.

The budget estimates of expenditures for any utility, within the estimated revenues of such utility, shall not be increased by the board of supervisors.

In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimate and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency.

Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed three-quarters of one cent (\$.0075) on each one hundred dollars (\$100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent (\$.0075) on each one hundred dollars (\$100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county and provided further that proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.407 (a) of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th of May, nor later than the 1st day of June, the board shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall pass the necessary appropriation ordinance.



DENTAL PLAN

Ballot Title

Shall the City and County, the Unified School District and the Community College District contribute to an employees' dental plan, the contribution per employee to be equal to the average contribution per employee made by the ten most populous California counties having such a plan?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City provides health care plans for its employees. In January of each year the ten largest California counties are surveyed to find out the average contributions made for their employees' health plans. This information is used to help decide how much San Francisco pays. The City does not have a dental plan for its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H would create a dental plan for City employees, July 1, 1978. Sur-

veys of dental plans in the ten largest counties would be made to find out the average amount of the costs being paid by those counties. The City would then pay its share of the costs of the dental plan, based on the average.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want City employees to have a dental plan.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want City employees to have a dental plan.

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, it is estimated that, based upon an actuarial report, the annual increase in the cost of government would be approximately \$2,600,000. Based on the 1977-1978 assessment roll, this estimated increase is equivalent to seven and six hundredths (\$.0706) cents in the tax rate.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 8 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-1 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Francois, Gonzales, Kopp, Molinari, Nelder, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.

NO: Supervisor Barbagelata.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H**

H

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

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation

In January of each year, at a public hearing, the health service board shall review and determine the adequacy of medical care provided for members of the system and the adequacy of fee schedules and the compensation paid for all services rendered and it may make such revisions therein as it deems equitable but such revisions shall not become effective until approved by ordinance of the board of supervisors adopted by three-fourths of its members.

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the ten counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, exclusive of dental or optical care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said ten counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

Commencing in 1978, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of those counties surveyed pursuant to the preceding paragraph which have a dental plan for their members, to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of dental care plans for each employee of such county. In accordance with said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said counties toward the dental care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. In the event that any of the counties surveyed use a composite rate for a dental plan the health service board shall determine the portion of the composite rate used for the employee only and use that portion in determining the average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428 the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established,

including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System.

The city and county, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1978, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution" as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423 respecting the survey of dental plans. The amount so contributed pursuant to this paragraph shall be used solely for the establishment and maintenance of a dental plan.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons

(Continued on Page 89)

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION H

This measure would provide dental coverage for city employees at a cost of less than \$8.00 per month. This is far less than what the average cost is for dental plans in other public jurisdictions. The Board of Supervisors placed this measure on the ballot because a survey of the Civil Service Commission showed that most employees (80%) in the public and private jurisdictions surveyed already have this benefit, and because this was negotiated by city employee unions without a strike. Even with this dental plan, city employees will remain far behind

in overall health care benefits in relation to other cities and counties throughout California.

The unions who negotiated this benefit are Service Employees International unions, and they represent the lowest paid city employees. Despite this fact, many of the employees they represent received little or no wage increase this year, and need and deserve this modest benefit.

Service Employees International
Unions Joint Council
Vince Courtney

No argument against Proposition H was submitted.

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

PENSION INCREASE



Ballot Title

Shall pensions of male employees retired prior to July 1, 1977 be increased by recomputing said pensions on the basis of mortality tables which will be applicable on January 1, 1978?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Pensions for City employees who retired before July 1, 1977 were based on separate life expectancy tables for men and women. A single table is now being used for both male and female employees. However, it does not apply to those who retired before July 1, 1977.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would increase pensions for male employees who retired before

July 1, 1977. This increase would be based on a life expectancy table which is the same for males and females.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the pensions of retired male employees.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to increase the pensions of retired male employees.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on an actuarial report, the cost of government would be increased by \$177,000. Based on the 1977-1978 assessment roll, this is equivalent to forty-eight hundredths (\$.0048) of one cent in the tax rate.

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On August 8 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Barbagelata, Francois, Gonzales, Kopp, Molinari, Nelder, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.

None of the Supervisors present voted "NO."

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION I

NOTE: The following section is proposed to be added to the Charter.

8.538 Increasing of Certain Retirement Allowances in Effect Prior to July 1, 1977

Every retirement allowance payable to a male person, or to the beneficiary of a male person, retired prior to July 1, 1977, as a member under the provisions of sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.544 or 8.568 and subject to an optional modification pursuant to an election exercised under section 16.75 of the San Francisco Administrative Code is hereby increased for time commencing January 1, 1978, to the amount it would have been if such allowance had been computed, on the date such allowance was first effective,

on the basis of the mortality tables applicable to the retirement system on January 1, 1978.

This section does not give any person retired under the provisions of sections 8.507, 8.509, 8.544 or 8.568, or such person's successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to January 1, 1978.

Any adjustment of retirement allowances made pursuant to the provisions of section 8.526 of this charter for time after June 30, 1978, shall be based upon the amount of the original retirement allowance plus the amount of the increase to be applied by the provisions of this section.

Argument

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION I

Vote "Yes" for Proposition "I"

PROPOSITION "I" will abolish sex discrimination against a limited number of retired employees who suffered a differential in their retirement allowances by reason of the rules in effect at the time of their retirement.

The Retirement Board has adopted new rules, effective July 1, 1977 for those retiring, and taking certain options, that male and female employees be treated equal in all benefits received.

Fair Play Means Equal Treatment for All

It is an injustice to continue to penalize the limited number of employees retired prior to July 1, 1977 who would be affected by this proposition because of difference of sex, while correcting the inequity for those retired after the effective date.

Those affected by this proposition are miscellaneous employees who have reduced their retirement allowances to insure their personal cash contributions towards their retirement allowance.

Moderate Costs

The actuarial cost shows that a limited number of

retired employees affected would receive added retirement benefits averaging 87 cents per week. This cost would decrease in succeeding years as mortality would eventually eliminate all beneficiaries.

Proposition "I" Is Fair and Equitable

Vote "Yes" On Proposition "I"

RETIRED EMPLOYEES OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

William T. Reed, Chairman, Retirement Committee
Honorable Quentin L. Kopp, President, Board of Supervisors

COMMITTEE:

Wm. Wollesen
Kayte Firpo
John D. Kavanaugh
Ray Kimbell
Alma Quinn
Alfred Del Carlo
Gerald Murphy
Joe Carew
Chas. Foster
William T. Reed
Jaykes Ford
Jake Fischer
Stanley Kilcoyne
Miriam Steinbeck
James Gleeson
George Burr
Irving Breyer
Beryl Arent

Kay Scanlon
John Simpson
Ivan Flamm
Joseph McElligott
John Lyons
Gerald Gallagher
John Brennan
Charles Fanning
Harry Berz
Frank Marchetti
Clement Clancy
Ray Leavitt
Thomas Shannon
John Goodwin
Frank Foehr
John Harrington
Elizabeth Cody
Chas. Shinkwin
Howard Dunn

No argument against Proposition I was submitted.

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

DISABILITY HEARING OFFICERS

J

Ballot Title

Shall applications for disability leave, disability retirement or death allowances be heard by independent hearing officers?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When a City employee or survivor applies for disability retirement or for a death allowance, the Retirement Board determines if the request is to be granted.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would provide for an independent hearing officer to decide on applications for disability leave, disability retirement or death allowance. The final decision of the hearing officer could not be changed by the Retirement

Board. Any appeal would have to be made to the courts.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want a hearing officer to rule on applications for disability leave, disability retirement or death allowances.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Retirement Board to continue to hear such applications.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be additional costs, the amount of which cannot be estimated at this time.

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On June 6 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-2 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Barbagelata, Gonzales, Kopp, Mendelsohn, Nelder, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

NO: Supervisors Feinstein and Molinari.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J**

NOTE: The following section is proposed to be added to the Charter.

8.518 Hearing Officer.

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3.671, subsection (C) of Section 8.509, Sections 8.515, 8.516, 8.547, 8.548, 8.559-3, 8.559-4, 8.571, 8.572, 8.584-3, 8.585-3, 8.585-4, 8.586-3, 8.586-4, 8.588-3, 8.588-4, any application for disability leave, disability retirement, or death allowance made pursuant to said subsection or said sections of this charter shall be heard by a qualified and unbiased hearing officer employed under contract by the city and county and selected by procedures set forth in the rules of the retirement board. Following public hearing, the hearing officer shall determine whether such application shall be granted or denied.

At any time within thirty (30) days after the service of the hearing officer's decision, the applicant or any other affected party, including the retirement system, may petition the hearing officer for a rehearing upon one or more of the following grounds and no other:

- a) That the hearing officer acted without or in excess of his powers.
- b) That the decision was procured by fraud.
- c) That the evidence does not justify the decision.
- d) That the petitioner has discovered new evidence material to him, which he could not, with reasonable diligence, have discovered and produced at the hearing.

Upon the expiration of thirty (30) days after the petition for rehearing is denied, or if the petition is granted, upon the expiration of thirty (30) days after the rendition of the decision on hearing, the decision of the hearing officer shall be final. Such final decision shall not be subject to amendment, modification or rescission by the retirement board, but shall be subject to review by the retirement board only for the purpose of determining whether to seek judicial review, and such final decision shall be deemed for all purposes to be the decision of the retirement board.

The provisions of this section shall become operative on January 1, 1978.

Polls are open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M.

DISABILITY HEARING OFFICERS

J

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION J

Vote "Yes" On Proposition "J"

A "Yes" vote on Proposition "J" will mean that applications by city employees for disability retirement, disability leave, or death allowance benefits will be considered by a qualified and unbiased hearing officer. Substantial amounts of taxpayers' money are involved in such disability awards, which have been increasing in total amount over the past three years. There have been many complaints from taxpayers and applicants about the decision-making process.

The Board is made up of three city employees plus nominees of the San Francisco Bar Association, San Francisco Medical Society, San Francisco Real Estate Board, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, and the President of the Board of Supervisors. In January, 1977, there was a backlog of 300 cases.

Vote "Yes" On "J"

Without Proposition "J", this backlog will necessarily continue because the workload of individual cases is only a portion of the Retirement Board's responsibility. It also must regularly consider investment questions, overall administration of the Retirement System, and approval of a budget of various expenditures and contracts. With the passage of Proposition "J", the Retirement Board will

more expertly and effectively perform its duties in administering the over \$700,000,000 Retirement System portfolio. Equally as important, a non-city employee hearing officer will provide the taxpayers, who bear the cost of disability retirement benefits, and applicants alike with the impartiality and professionalism the law requires.

The impartial hearing officer method has been utilized with success in several California counties and is presently utilized by the State's Workers Compensation Appeals Board. A "YES" vote on Proposition "J" will provide an unbiased, skilled, and full-time person to decide disability retirement cases speedily under recognized legal rules. It also gives the City for the first time the right to appeal from awards which the Retirement Board believes are unjustified or excessive. A "Yes" vote on Proposition "J" will further benefit the Retirement System itself because its Board will be able to devote its time and energy totally to major policy matters.

VOTE YES ON "J"

Submitted by:

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:

William J. Murphy, Past President

San Francisco Retirement Board

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Vote No On Proposition J

Proposition J should be defeated! Why? For three major reasons: 1) It is not in the best interests of the taxpayers; 2) It is unfair to city and county employees; 3) It saddles the Retirement Board and its staff with an unsound, unworkable system.

First, why should the taxpayers be burdened with paying for the full cost of employing hearing officers when, under current conditions, there is no cost to the taxpayers. Last fiscal year the Retirement Board heard 165 disability cases. Had a hearing officer heard those cases, under normal fee costs, it would have cost the city in excess of \$41,000.

Secondly, it is unfair to City employees that Proposition J will deprive them of the right to appeal a hearing officer's decision to the Retirement Board. Instead, the only avenue of appeal is to the courts, a very time-consuming, costly procedure. When a

City employee is dismissed for cause as a result of a decision of a hearing officer, that decision is appealable to the Civil Service Commission.

Why shouldn't this same due process be made available to employees whose applications for disability retirement are denied by a hearing officer?

Finally, how can the Retirement Board and its staff effectively administer an unsound, unworkable system? The Retirement Board will be forced to appeal unfavorable decisions to the courts, requiring unnecessary expenditures of city funds and the employment of a substantial legal staff.

Vote No On Proposition J

Your Retirement Board is charged with the responsibility of determining the long-range costs of disability applications. A hearing officer is a dis-

(Continued)

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



DISABILITY HEARING OFFICERS

(Argument Against Proposition J, continued)

interested third party whose decisions would transcend the ultimate cost to the City. Can we really afford this kind of system?

Proposition J is a half-way measure at best. It is ill-conceived and falls far short of its intended goal. The City cannot afford to experiment with a proposed

system that is too costly and, in effect, denies due process and sound administrative procedures.

Vote No On Proposition J

San Francisco Fire Fighters No. 798
James Ferguson
Leon Bruschera

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Vote "No" On Proposition "J"

Proposition J will not reduce the number of disability retirements awarded to firefighters and police officers by the present Retirement Board. It will, however, place an additional burden on the city budget by creating a very expensive new position.

WILL NOT REDUCE INJURIES This Charter amendment will not reduce the number or severity of injuries incurred by firefighters and police officers in the performance of their duties. This is the real cause of disability retirements. The proposed hearing officer will be required by law to operate under the same Charter and State Labor Code sections which now govern the granting of disability benefits. The legal test will remain the same—claims must be substantiated by medical evidence. A hearing officer cannot change this.

CANNOT REDUCE JUST CLAIMS The clear implication of the supporters of Proposition J is that the present Retirement Board is either granting "phony retirements" or that a hearing officer will disallow legitimate claims. As to "phony claims", the present Retirement Board is composed of three members appointed by the Mayor, three

elected by city employees and the seventh is the President of the Board of Supervisors. The city's interest, plainly then, is weighted four to three. Thus a firefighter or police officer cannot be granted disability benefits unless he convinces the city members of the merits of his claim.

If the proponents desire the hearing officer to disallow a certain number of legitimate claims, their desire is most unjust to the injured firefighter or police officer and will most certainly be remedied in the courts at a high litigation expense to the city.

FAULTY STATISTICS Proponents comparison of statistics in San Francisco with statistics in other jurisdictions compares pears and bananas. They fail to mention that these other jurisdictions have totally different structures and procedures. They also fail to include the differing injury rates in highly different work environments. No other California city uses a hearing officer procedure.

Vote No On Proposition J

Michael S. Hebel
Elmer M. Ballard
Attorneys at Law

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

SUPERVISORS' ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

K

Ballot Title

Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be empowered to appoint his or her administrative assistant who shall serve at the pleasure of said member?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant, who does research, attends meetings, answers phone calls and carries out other duties assigned by the supervisor. The 11 jobs are supposed to be covered by regular civil service rules. In practice, however, the supervisors have always hired and fired their own assistants without civil service examinations.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would remove these jobs from civil service provisions of the City

Charter. If it passes, supervisors would be permitted to select their administrative assistants without examination and to discharge them at will.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want members of the Board of Supervisors to be able to hire and fire their administrative assistants.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want administrative assistants to be hired and fired according to civil service procedures.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On July 25 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Nelder, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

NO: Supervisors Barbagelata, Kopp, Molinari.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K**

NOTE: The following section is proposed to be added to the Charter.

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants to Members of the Board of Supervisors

Notwithstanding any other provisions or limitations of this charter, specifically section 8.300, there may be one (1) administrative assistant for each member of the board of supervisors, who shall be appointed by the member and shall serve at the member's pleasure. These individuals shall be responsible for such duties and responsibilities as the member shall prescribe.

No argument for Proposition K was submitted.

No argument against Proposition K was submitted.

Polls are open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M.

C.A.O.'s EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT



Ballot Title

Shall the Chief Administrative Officer be empowered to appoint his executive assistant who shall serve at the pleasure of the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Chief Administrative Officer has one executive assistant, who is selected by examination in the civil service process and carries out duties assigned by the Chief Administrative Officer.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would remove the job of executive assistant to the Chief Administrative Officer from civil service. If it passes, the Chief Administrative Officer would be able to se-

lect an executive assistant without examination and would be able to discharge the assistant at will.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Administrative Officer to be able to hire and fire the executive assistant.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Administrative Officer's executive assistant hired and fired according to civil service procedures.

Controller's Statement on "L"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "L"

On August 8 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-2 on the question of placing Proposition L on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Francois, Gonzales, Kopp, Molinari, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.

NO: Supervisors Barbagelata and Nelder.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION L

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

3.201 Functions, Powers and Duties

The chief administrative officer shall be responsible to the mayor and to the board of supervisors for the administration of all affairs of the city and county that are placed in his charge by the provisions of this charter and by ordinance, and to that end, except as otherwise provided in section 9.102 of this charter, and the general laws of this state respecting the registration of voters, the holding of elections and all matters pertaining to elections in a city and county, he shall have power and it shall be his duty to exercise supervision and control over all administrative departments which are under his jurisdiction; to appoint the heads of departments under his control and the members of advisory and other boards provided by this charter or by ordinance to be appointed by the chief administrative officer; to prescribe general rules and regulations for the administrative service under his control; to have a voice but no vote in the board of supervisors, with the right to report on or to discuss any matter before the said board concerning the affairs of the departments in his charge; to make such recommendations and propose

such measures to the mayor, the board of supervisors, or committees thereof, concerning the affairs of the city and county in his charge as he may deem necessary; to coordinate the functioning of the several departments of the city and county charged with powers and duties relating to control of traffic; and to provide for the budgeting and control of publicity and advertising expenditures of the city and county.

The chief administrative officer may designate an officer or an employee in any department under his jurisdiction to exercise the powers and perform the duties of any county office not specifically designated by this charter.

The chief administrative officer may designate the recorder to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the registrar of voters and to occupy the offices of registrar of voters and recorder, receiving a single salary therefor to be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint his executive assistant who shall serve at his pleasure, and which position shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter; provided, however, that any person who has civil service status to the position of executive assistant on the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.

Argument

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION L

Vote Yes On Proposition "L"

The Chief Administrative Officer appoints many of the key administrators under his jurisdiction, but cannot appoint his own assistant. This Charter Amendment will correct that situation by allowing the Chief Administrative Officer to appoint one person in his own office. Every other Chief Administrative Officer, County Administrator, and City Manager in the State of California appoints his own chief assistant.

Most of the administrators in San Francisco City government responsible for operating large departments appoint their chief assistant. Some appoint several assistants and bureau chiefs. This is considered good administrative practice because the assistant must be responsive to the policies of the administrator, and a greater choice is provided among qualified candidates.

The Chief Administrative Officer manages a substantial portion of City government. Included under his jurisdiction are 14 departments, encompassing the Department of Public Health and the Department of Public Works, the Yerba Buena Convention Center, and the Wastewater Management Project. The size and complexity of the administrative responsibilities of the Chief Administrative Officer require that his chief of staff be responsive to policy dictates of the office. This Charter Amendment will not affect the civil service status of the incumbent.

Endorsed by:

Roger Boas, Chief Administrative Officer

Thomas J. Mellon

Neil D. Chaitin

Woodward Kingman, Executive Vice President,

Crocker National Bank

Leonard E. Kingsley

William D. Evers, Attorney

No argument against Proposition L was submitted.

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

FIRE DEPT. PROMOTIONAL EXAMS

**M**

Ballot Title

Shall the promotional procedure in the Fire Department be changed so as to reduce seniority credits and providing additional credits for educational and professional courses?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Firefighters who take tests for promotion receive extra points for their years of service in the department. They can receive as many as 15% extra points for long service. For example, on a test with 1000 possible points, a firefighter with long service could receive an extra 150 points. There are no extra points at present for college or university education in fire-related subjects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M would reduce the extra points for long service to a maximum of

8% on any promotional test. It would also provide extra points for college or university study in fire-related subjects. These extra points would range from 5% to 7% of the total points in an exam.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want fewer extra points for seniority in Fire Department promotion tests and you want to allow extra points for higher education in fire-related subjects.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present points system for seniority in Fire Department promotional tests.

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "M"

On August 8 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-0 on the question of placing Proposition M on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Barbagelata, Francois, Gonzales, Kopp, Molinari, Nelder, von Beroldingen.

None of the Supervisors present voted "NO."

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

8.327 Promotions in Uniformed Forces of Police and Fire Departments

(a) Except as specifically provided in this or other sections of this charter, all promotions in the uniformed forces of the police and fire departments, respectively, shall be made from the next lower civil service rank attained by examinations, as herein set forth, giving consideration also to meritorious public service and seniority of service and a clean record in the respective departments, and all promotive examinations in said departments shall be entirely of a written character and all questions asked or problems given in said examinations shall pertain to matters concerning the duties of the position or rank for which the examination is held.

The civil service commission shall provide for promotion in the police department on the basis of examinations and tests as hereinabove set forth at least once every four years for each promotive position or rank in the police department and questions asked or problems given in said examination shall be related to material taken from a bibliography promulgated within the police department from time to time by the police commission which will be prepared in consultation with the civil service commission; provided, however, that any such bibliography shall be promulgated within the police department not less than six months prior to the date of any promotive examination within the police department.

The civil service commission shall provide for promotion in the fire department on the basis of examinations and tests within at least forty-nine months of the date of adoption of the most recent eligible list for each promotive position or rank for which examination is held. Such examinations and tests may be entirely of a written character, or of a type as may be recommended by the fire commission and approved by the civil service commission. The civil service commission shall consult with the fire commission on the construction and content of such examinations and tests and shall construct them from materials developed or recommended by the San Francisco Fire Department in order to select the best and highest qualified members of said department for promotion.

(b) Fifteen per cent of the total credits obtainable under any promotive examination for eligibles for the police ((or fire)) department shall be allowed for seniority of service, which said credits shall be distributed as follows:

((Examinations for Eligibles for the Police Department))

(1) For Promotion to the Rank of Sergeant of Police:

One per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the department until a total of fifteen per

cent of the credits of the entire examination is reached;

(2) For Promotion to the Rank of Lieutenant of Police:

Six-tenths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the department until a total of nine per cent of said total credits of the entire examination is reached, and in addition thereto six-tenths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the rank of corporal or sergeant until a total of six per cent of the credits of the entire examination is reached.

(3) For Promotion to the Rank of Captain of Police:

Forty-five hundredths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the department until a total of nine per cent of said total credits for said examination is reached, and in addition thereto six-tenths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the rank of lieutenant until a total of six per cent of the credits of the entire examination is reached.

(4) In addition to the foregoing credits for seniority, six per cent of the total credits allowed for said examination shall be allowed each applicant for a clean record in the department. All members of the department who have performed acts of meritorious public service and have not heretofore received credit for such meritorious public service in a promotional examination and all members of the department who shall perform acts of meritorious public service prior to March 5, 1954, shall be allowed in addition to a maximum of four credits for said examination according to the judgment of the commission. Credits for meritorious public service, in a promotional examination within the police department shall not be allowed by the civil service commission except as herein provided.

((Examination for Eligibles for the Fire Department))

(c) Eight ((Fifteen)) per cent of the total credits allowed for any promotive examination in the fire department shall be allowed for seniority of service, which said credits shall be distributed as follows:

(1) ((5)) For Promotion to the Rank of Lieutenant in the Fire Department:

One per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the fire department until a maximum of eight ((fifteen)) per cent is reached;

(2) ((6)) For Promotion to ((the Rank of Captain)) all Ranks Above Lieutenant in the Fire Department:

((Six-tenths of one per cent)) One and six-tenths per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service

(Continued on Page 89)

FIRE DEPT. PROMOTIONAL EXAMS

M

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION M

A Yes vote on Proposition "M" will bring needed change to the promotional examination procedures in the Fire Department.

As it is now, promotion in the Fire Department is excessively influenced by seniority. The younger firefighter is disadvantaged by the award of up to fifteen years of seniority credits to a more senior firefighter. At the same time, no examination credits are given for education which adds to the competence and professionalism of the firefighter.

Also, all promotive tests in the Fire Department must be entirely written. Officer candidates must be tested for leadership, communication skills and resourcefulness—an entirely written examination cannot properly evaluate these attributes.

Proposition "M" will reduce the excessive impact of seniority in the Fire Department while encouraging younger firefighters to promote. It will reward firefighters who voluntarily improve their skills by completing designated fire science and other educational courses. Moreover the City will be given the flexibility in testing procedures needed to select the

highest and best qualified persons for promotion in the Fire Department.

Proposition "M" will modernize the Fire Department promotional procedures at no cost to the taxpayer. It will permit highly motivated and better qualified firefighters to move up through the ranks. This will ensure that the excellent fire service with which San Francisco has been blessed for so many years will continue to provide the taxpayer with a dollar return on every dollar spent.

Endorsed by:

Terry A. Franco

John P. Figone, Jr., President, Fire Commission

Joyce J. Ream, Vice President, Fire Commission

Agnes Barnhill, Commissioner

Juanita Del Carlo, Commissioner

Curtis McClain, Commissioner

Andrew C. Casper, Chief of Department

Emmet D. Condon, Deputy Chief of Department

Wilbert K. Battle, President, Officers For Justice-Peace

Officers Association

Morris Bernstein

Henry Der

Gordon J. Lau, Esq.

Grant Mickins

Yori Wada, Director, Buchanan YMCA

Civil Service Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Vote No On Proposition "M"

Proposition "M" is a further attempt to end the merit system in San Francisco. Proposition "M" would inject politically oriented oral examinations into the promotional testing procedures in the San Francisco Fire Department. They could be designed to make sure you support the "right" person for political office to score high on these examinations. This kind of political intrusion into the civil service system would only lead to favoritism and reward for political campaign activities. Civil Service already has the Rule of Three, which allows the department head to choose any of the top 3 candidates.

Another reason to vote No on Proposition "M" is, you have one of the outstanding fire departments in the country with the present system—don't tamper

with it. It has produced outstanding chiefs and other officers that are universally acknowledged as tops in their field. You have an excellent Fire Department, let's keep it that way! Vote No on Proposition "M".

The oral exam could also become the instrument or tool of racism and discrimination. The Oral Review Board could systematically select non-minorities to score high, thereby excluding them from promotional jobs. It would make discrimination easier against minorities, women, older employees, and the discrimination would be virtually impossible to prove.

Support your Fire Department! *Vote No on "M"*.
San Francisco Fire Fighters No. 798

James Ferguson, President

Leon Bruschera, Secretary

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

N

PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACT

Ballot Title

Shall the Board of Supervisors be empowered to increase the monetary limits within which public works projects may be performed by City and County departments from \$5,000 to \$10,000?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City departments can use City employees to perform construction, improvement or repair jobs as long as the estimated cost of the job is less than \$5000. Above that, the job must be performed by a private contractor.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N would increase the limit on jobs that can be done by City workers to \$10,000.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the limit to \$10,000 on work that can be done by City employees.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the \$5000 limit.

Controller's Statement on "N"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, of itself, increase the cost of government. It could permit a decrease in the cost of government, the amount of which, being dependent on future administrative action, cannot be estimated at this time.

How Supervisors Voted on "N"

On July 11 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-0 on the question of placing Proposition N on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Barbagelata, Francois, Kopp, Mendelsohn, Molinari, Nelder, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

None of the Supervisors present voted "NO."

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION N**

N

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

7.201 Public Works Contract Procedure by Ordinance

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter and in particular the provisions of section 7.200, the board of supervisors shall by ordinance determine the monetary limits not to exceed **((five thousand dollars (\$5,000))) ten thousand dollars (\$10,000)**, within which the construction, reconstruction or repair of public buildings, streets, utilities or other public works or improvements may be done by contract or by written order or by the employment of the necessary labor and purchase of the necessary materials and supplies directly by the city and county, consistent, save as to monetary limits, with the manner provided for in section 7.200 and section 7.100.

Argument

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION N

Vote Yes on Proposition "N"—a measure to enable the City and County government to obtain construction work by written order or by use of its own labor and materials, so long as the overall cost of such work does not exceed \$10,000. If desired, the work could be performed by formal contract procedures without regard to the dollar limitation.

It is frequently very advantageous for the City and County to be able to do its own work on minor projects, or to obtain the work by a simple written job order, rather than to utilize the more complex formal contract procedure. Experience has shown that such work can often be performed more efficiently and with better cost-effectiveness by not going through the time-consuming contract procedure.

For the past nine years the dollar limitation for using the simplified job performance and job ordering procedures has been \$5,000. Construction costs and prices of materials and supplies have increased to the point where the work performed in 1968 for \$5,000 now will cost at least \$10,000. This charter amendment would serve to continue this highly desirable practice, and would only change the dollar limit to meet the rising costs of economic inflation.

Help to ensure that the City's ability to carry forward its smaller construction jobs quickly and efficiently, with greater cost-effectiveness.

Vote Yes on Proposition "N"

Endorsed by:
Supervisor John L. Molinari

No argument against Proposition N was submitted.

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

O

PROGRESSIVE PAYMENTS

Ballot Title

Shall a contracting officer be empowered, upon making certain determinations with respect to a City and County contract, to authorize an increase in the amount of progressive payments thereunder?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco makes partial payments to contractors while they work on city projects. At present, these payments can add up to 90% of the value of the work completed. For example, a contractor who has completed half (or \$500,000) of a \$1 million contract can receive 90% of the completed work, or \$450,000 as a partial payment. Near the end of a contract, a substantial amount of money is held back even if only a small portion of the work remains to be done.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition O would increase the partial payments to a maximum of 95% after the contract is at least half completed. It would also allow a further increase in the partial payment near the end of a contract.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the size of partial payments to contractors on city projects.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present limit on partial payments to contractors on city projects.

Controller's Statement on "O"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "O"

On August 8 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-0 on the question of placing Proposition O on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Barbagelata, Francois, Gonzales, Kopp, Molinari, Nelder, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.

None of the Supervisors present voted "NO."

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION O



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

7.202 Progressive Payments

Any contract may provide for progressive payments, if the advertisement for sealed proposals shall so specify. No progressive payments under any contract shall be made which, with prior payments, shall ((at any time)) exceed in amount ninety per cent of the value of the work and labor and materials furnished; ((, and no contract shall authorize or permit the payment of more than ninety per cent of the total contract price before the completion of the work required by such contract and acceptance thereof by the head of the department concerned.)) provided, however, that when the department head or the purchaser of supplies, as the case may be, who is authorized to approve or sign the contract pursuant to section 7.200 (hereafter in this section 7.202

called the "city representative") determines that the contract is fifty per cent or more complete, contractor is making satisfactory progress and there is no specific cause for greater withholding, progressive payments may be made not to exceed in amount the lesser of either ninety-five per cent of the value of the work and labor and material furnished or ninety-five per cent of the contract price, and provided further that when the city representative determines that the contract is ninety-five per cent complete, funds withheld may be reduced to an amount equal to one hundred twenty-five per cent of the estimated value of the work yet to be completed as determined by the city representative.

If the advertisement for sealed proposals shall so specify and if adequate provisions are made to protect the city and county from loss, any contract may provide for progressive payments for equipment and material purchased by the contractor for the project and stored by the contractor prior to actual physical incorporation into the project.

Argument

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION O

A "Yes" vote on Proposition O will change San Francisco's antiquated contract payment practices to conform to modern contracting procedures. It will allow progress payment methods similar to those presently being employed by Federal, State and other local agencies.

Proposition O will benefit the City in two ways: (1) it will result in lower bids on City contracts, and (2) it will encourage more contractors to bid on City projects.

The Charter now allows the City to make "partial" or "progress" payments as work is completed. The Charter, however, limits these payments to 90% of the value of the work completed. The City is required to retain the remaining 10% until completion of the contract. In abstract, the 10% retention would appear a wise safeguard. In practice, it has proven excessive and costly. There have been numerous instances where the City was required by the Charter to withhold large sums already "earned" by contractors because of comparatively insignificant amounts of work remaining incomplete. Contractors must

promptly pay suppliers and meet weekly payroll expenses. To meet these expenses, contractors finance the work pending payment by the City. The cost of financing is reflected in higher bid prices. Contractors who do not have the capacity to meet these financing demands are precluded from bidding on City projects.

Proposition O will allow the City only to reduce the retention to 5% when 50% of the project has been satisfactorily completed. This will reduce the cost to the contractor of financing the work. The reduction in cost will result in lower bids to the City.

Proposition O provides adequate protection to the City. Progress payments will not be accelerated unless satisfactory progress is demonstrated. Additionally, until completion of the contract the City will retain more money than is actually necessary to finish the project.

A "Yes" vote on Proposition O will save the City money, improve contract administration and promote increased participation in City contracting.

Endorsed by:

Supervisor Quentin L Kopp

No argument against Proposition O was submitted.

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

P

OFFICIAL ADVERTISING

Ballot Title

Shall official City and County advertising be published in any newspaper which is printed on three or more days per week and has a weekly circulation of 50,000 or more?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Charter requires that the City publish official notices in a daily newspaper that has a circulation of at least 8000 copies. The newspaper is selected by bid.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition P would allow the City to publish official notices in a newspaper printed at least three days a week. It must have a weekly circulation of at least 50,000 copies.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to be able to publish official notices in either daily or non-daily newspapers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to publish official notices in daily newspapers only.

Controller's Statement on "P"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, the cost of government would not be increased. There may be a decrease in cost, the amount of which cannot be determined at this time.

How Supervisors Voted on "P"

On August 8 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-2 on the question of placing Proposition P on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Barbagelata, Francois, Gonzales, Kopp, Molinari, Nelder.

NO: Supervisors Pelosi and von Beroldingen.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION P**

P

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

10.100 Definitions

(a) "Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.603 of the charter.

(b) "Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

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

(d) 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.

(e) References throughout this charter to the exclusion or the exemption from the civil service provisions of this charter shall be construed to mean, exclusive of those civil service provisions that relate to examination, appointment and removal.

(f) Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary, this provision with respect to advertising shall control. Whenever advertising or publication is required by the provisions of this charter, it shall mean one publication ((in each edition of the official newspaper of the city and county printed and circulated in San Francisco on any one day, unless a greater number of publications is specifically required; provided that notices inviting bids shall be published for at least three consecutive days, except as provided in section 7.200 of this charter.))

((The official newspaper is hereby defined to be a daily newspaper of general circulation, published in

the city and county and which has a bona fide daily circulation of at least 8,000 copies. Whenever the official newspaper is not able to publish and circulate for any reason, the board of supervisors shall designate by resolution a substitute medium or media designed to give reasonable publicity in lieu of publication in the official newspaper, until such time as the official newspaper resumes publication and circulation.)) in a newspaper of general circulation published in San Francisco. A newspaper of general circulation shall be defined as a newspaper published for the dissemination of local or telegraphic news and intelligence of a general character, which has a bona fide circulation of at least 50,000 copies per calendar week and is printed in the city and county on three or more days in a calendar week. The board of supervisors shall pass an ordinance by July 1, 1978 defining and designating a newspaper or newspapers as the official newspaper or official newspapers for advertising or publication for specific types of official advertising for the city and county as defined and described by the board of supervisors in said ordinance. The board of supervisors by ordinance may provide that a copy of each edition of said newspaper or newspapers of general circulation carrying official advertising shall be delivered free of cost to each branch of the public library of the city and county.

Whenever such newspaper or newspapers of general circulation are not able to publish and circulate for any reason, the board of supervisors shall designate by resolution a substitute medium or media designed to give reasonable publicity in lieu of publication in a newspaper or newspapers of general circulation until such time as such newspaper or newspapers resume publication and circulation.

**Workers are needed at the polls in many
San Francisco neighborhoods. Apply now
in room 155, City Hall**

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION P

Vote "Yes" On Proposition "P"

Vote YES on Proposition "P"—a measure to enable the City and County government to place official advertising in a newspaper published three days or more per week and thereby try to achieve significant economies and a reduction of such costs.

Each month the various City government departments spend thousands of dollars for official advertising, in order to inform citizens of those important matters which are required by law to be advertised. Public notice advertising now costs the City more than a quarter of a million dollars a year. Under the existing Charter language, only a *daily* newspaper can be utilized.

In San Francisco at this time there are two daily newspapers, but they are both served by only one classified advertising entity. Thus, a situation exists in which advertising rates for official printing are set by one entity. The rates have risen drastically over the past few years. Competition is the crux of the American system. This amendment encourages competition, permits it to happen.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "P"

The proposed amendment contains provisions which will allow for utilizing a daily newspaper for advertising the relatively few matters which, under the law, must be advertised on a daily basis. Proposition "P" will enable the City to put its eggs in more than one basket to provide the greatest benefit at a cost savings.

Proposition "P" will open the door to competition, thus enabling the City and County of San Francisco to obtain the maximum favorable return for its advertising dollar. Proposition "P" will help reduce the cost of government and still provide for fully adequate advertising of official business to keep all citizens properly informed.

VOTE YES ON "P"

Endorsed by:

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Supervisor John J. Barbagelata

No argument against Proposition P was submitted.

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

ELECTRICIANS' SALARY DEMANDS

Q

Ballot Title

Shall a schedule of compensation based upon the last demand of employees represented by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 6, be approved?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Electricians and related electrical workers employed by the city receive certain working conditions and benefits, in addition to their wages. Representatives of the electricians asked for certain improvements in their contract for this year, but were turned down by city officials. A partial comparison of the demands with the present conditions and benefits is provided below.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition Q would provide the improved working conditions and benefits to the city's electrical workers.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to provide the improved working conditions and benefits demanded by electrical workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present working conditions and benefits for electrical workers.

Comparison of Union Demands and City Provisions

Union Demands

City Provides

(for electrical inspectors) \$200 per month for using own car	18¢ per mile
city to supply technical publications	nothing
7-hour work day	8-hour work day
(for linemen and/or electricians) work week shall be Monday-Friday	work week is 5 consecutive days
\$25 per day out-of-town expenses	\$20 per day
all overtime be voluntary, with a two-hour minimum	overtime can be required, with no minimum
40-hour work week	35-hour work week
journeymen start at highest pay scale	all employees work up, by steps, to highest scale in the classification
delete inclement weather provisions	employees receive no pay when properly notified that work is not available because of weather
city to pay for meals when working overtime	no provision
overtime be paid at double hourly rate	time and one-half for overtime
night differential of 10% for the first shift and 15% for the second	6¼% night differential
(all electrical classes) one additional holiday	11 holidays



ELECTRICIANS' SALARY DEMANDS

Controller's Statement on "Q"

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

Should the proposed proposition be approved, in my opinion, the total increase in the cost of govern-

ment would be approximately \$1,640,000 of which \$1,056,000 will be from ad-valorem taxes. Based on the 1977-1978 assessment roll, this estimated increase is equivalent to two and eighty-seven hundredths (\$0.0287) cents in the tax rate.

How Proposition Q Got On The Ballot

Propositions Q, R and S are on the ballot as a result of a new provision of the City Charter, adopted last year, which requires that unsettled contract disputes between city officials and city employees be put before the voters to decide. In this first use of

that Charter provision, voters will grant or reject demands by unions representing city electricians (Proposition Q), plumbers (Proposition R) and sheet metal workers (Proposition S).

**Apply for Your
Absentee Ballot
Before 5 p.m., Nov. 1st**

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION Q



AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 115-77, SALARY STANDARDIZATION ORDINANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1977-78, CHARTER SECTIONS 8.400, 8.401 AND 8.407, MISCELLANEOUS EMPLOYEES, PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 9.108(b), TO REFLECT ADDITIONAL RATES AND WORKING CONDITIONS FOR EMPLOYEES REPRESENTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL NO. 6, BASED UPON THE LAST DEMANDS OF SAID EMPLOYEES.

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

Section 1. Pursuant to the provisions of Charter Section 9.108(b), Ordinance No. 115-77, Salary Standardization Ordinance, Fiscal Year 1977-78, Charter Sections 8.400, 8.401 and 8.407, Miscellaneous Employees, is hereby amended by adding Section XV thereto, reading as follows:

SECTION XV.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this ordinance to the contrary, and based upon the last demand of employees represented by the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 6, said employees shall be entitled to additional working conditions as follows:

For Class 6248-Electrical Inspector and all related classes.

The City and County shall supply transportation for each Inspector, or if supplied by the employee, he shall be compensated at the rate of \$200.00 per month.

The City and County shall supply all technical publications necessary for an Inspector to perform his duties.

When filling a higher classification, regardless of the length of time, the employee shall be paid the higher position rate of pay.

When Inspectors are required to provide electrical estimates, such as in the RAP program, there shall be provided sufficient training in estimating in order to perform that job function.

The normal work day shall be a seven (7) hour day.

For Class 7338-Lineman and all related classes.

Journeyman Lineman filling the position of foreman or any other higher position regardless of the length of time involved shall receive the higher position rate of pay.

The work week shall be Monday through Friday, inclusive.

The present \$20.00 per day subsistence should be increased to \$25.00 per day on a seven (7) day basis.

All overtime must be on a voluntary basis with a minimum of two (2) hours.

The work week shall be a 40-hour work week with no more than eight (8) hours work performed within a 24-hour period unless overtime is paid.

All employees must get two (2) days off in a period of seven (7) days.

Qualified Journeymen shall start at the highest wage increment.

Exemption from the inclement weather provisions.

When working overtime, the City and County shall pay for meals.

Overtime shall be compensated at double the hourly rate.

There shall be a shift differential of 10 per cent for the first shift and 15 per cent for the second shift.

For Class 7345-Electrician and all related classes.

The City and County shall supply all necessary hand tools or provide insurance for tools supplied by the employees.

The normal work week shall be 40 hours, Monday through Friday, with eight (8) hours work completed in not more than nine (9), and all other time to be at the overtime rate.

Qualified Journeymen shall start at the top pay increment.

All employees required to work at an area beyond the City and County limits shall be paid travel pay.

Where applicable, the above changes in working conditions shall include Class 7364-Powerhouse Operator and all related classes and Class 7379-Electric Transit Mechanic and all related classes. Class 7379-Electric Transit Mechanic and all related classes shall have the working conditions included in the Memorandum of Understanding for automotive machinist and automotive mechanic; as well as any and all meet and confer sessions that are allowable under applicable statutes to meet and confer on these issues.

For all electrical classifications.

A grievance procedure.

Additional holidays.

For any classification not receiving a pay increase, a shorter work day or work week with no decrease in wages.

Delete the salary range and substitute a flat rate for all classes where required by the applicable sections of the Charter.

No argument for Proposition Q was submitted.

No argument against Proposition Q was submitted.



PLUMBERS' SALARY DEMANDS

Ballot Title

Shall a schedule of compensation based upon the last demand of employees represented by the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry, Local No. 38, be approved?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Plumbers and related workers employed by the city receive certain working conditions and benefits, in addition to their wages. Representatives of the plumbers asked for certain improvements in their contract for this year, but were turned down by city officials. A partial comparison of the demands with the present conditions and benefits is provided below.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition R would provide the improved working conditions and benefits to the city's plumbers.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to provide the improved working conditions and benefits demanded by plumbers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present working conditions and benefits for plumbers.

Comparison of Union Demands and City Provisions

Union Demands

City Provides

(for plumbers) journeymen start at highest pay scale	all employees work up, by steps, to highest scale in the classification
work week shall be 35 hours Monday-Friday, with overtime after 7 hours in a day	work week of 35 hours, for any 5 consecutive days, with overtime after 8 hours
repeal inclement weather provisions	employees receive no pay when properly notified that work is not available because of weather
pay for travel time	18¢ a mile for using own car

Controller's Statement on "R"

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

Should the proposed proposition be approved, in my opinion, the increase in the cost of government would be approximately \$27,000 of which \$18,000 will be from ad valorem taxes. Based on the 1977-1978 assesment roll, this estimated increase is equivalent to five hundredths (\$0.0005) cents in the tax rate.

HOW PROPOSITION R GOT ON THE BALLOT

Propositions Q, R and S are on the ballot as a result of a new provision of the City Charter, adopted last year, which requires that unsettled contract disputes between city officials and city employees be put before the voters to decide. In this first use of that Charter provision, voters will grant or reject demands by unions representing city electricians (Proposition Q), plumbers (Proposition R) and sheet metal workers (Proposition S).

**TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION R**

R

AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 115-77, SALARY STANDARDIZATION ORDINANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1977-78, CHARTER SECTIONS 8.400, 8.401 AND 8.407, MISCELLANEOUS EMPLOYEES, PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 9.108(b), TO REFLECT ADDITIONAL RATES AND WORKING CONDITIONS FOR EMPLOYEES REPRESENTED BY THE UNITED ASSOCIATION OF JOURNEYMEN AND APPRENTICES OF THE PLUMBING AND PIPEFITTING INDUSTRY, LOCAL NO. 38, BASED UPON THE LAST DEMANDS OF SAID EMPLOYEES.

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

Section 1. Pursuant to the provisions of Charter Section 9.108(b), Ordinance No. 115-77, Salary Standardization Ordinance, Fiscal Year 1977-78, Charter Sections 8.400, 8.401 and 8.407, Miscellaneous Employees, is hereby amended by adding Section XIV thereto, reading as follows:

SECTION XIV.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this ordinance to the contrary, and based upon the last demand of employees represented by the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry, Local No. 38, said employees shall be entitled to additional working conditions as follows:

A flat rate of pay for Journeymen and related classes and not a range.

A normal work week schedule of 35 hours.

A normal work week schedule of Monday through Friday.

An overtime schedule which becomes operative after seven (7) hours service daily.

An exemption from the inclement weather layoff provisions.

Payments for travel time.

No argument for Proposition R was submitted.

No argument against Proposition R was submitted.

Apply for Your Absentee Ballot Early

See Page 95

S

SHEETMETAL WORKERS' SALARY DEMANDS

Ballot Title

Shall a schedule of compensation based upon the last demand of employees represented by the Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Local No. 104, be approved?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Sheet metal workers employed by the city receive certain working conditions and benefits, in addition to their wages. Representatives of the sheet metal workers asked for certain improvements in their contract for this year, but were turned down by city officials. A partial comparison of the demands with the present conditions and benefits is provided below.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition S would provide the improved working conditions and benefits to the city's sheet metal workers.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to provide the improved working conditions and benefits demanded by sheet metal workers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present working conditions and benefits for sheet metal workers.

Comparison of Union Demands and City Provisions

Union Demands

City Provides

(for sheet metal workers) normal work day shall be 8 hours per day, 40 hours per week, Monday-Friday	40-hour week from April 1 to Sept. 30 and 35-hour week from Oct. 1 to March 31
work week shall be Monday-Friday	work week is 5 consecutive days
\$25 per day out-of-town expenses	\$20 per day
all overtime be voluntary, with a two-hour minimum	overtime can be required, with no minimum
journeymen start at highest pay scale	all employees work up, by steps, to highest scale in the classification
delete inclement weather provisions	employees receive no pay when properly notified that work is not available because of weather
city to pay for meals when working overtime at least four hours	no provision
overtime to be paid at double hourly rate	time and one-half for overtime
night differential of 12% for swing shift and 18% for graveyard shift	6 1/4 % night differential
when working outside city, employee using his car to receive 30¢ per mile and employee riding as passenger to receive 15¢ per mile to and from job	18¢ per mile for using own car

SHEETMETAL WORKERS' SALARY DEMANDS

S

Controller's Statement on "S"

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

Should the proposed proposition be approved, in my opinion, the total increase in the cost of govern-

ment would be approximately \$37,500 of which \$30,000 will be from ad-valorem taxes. Based on the 1977-1978 assessment roll, this estimated increase is equivalent to eight hundredths (\$.0008) cent in the tax rate.

How Proposition S Got On The Ballot

Propositions Q, R and S are on the ballot as a result of a new provision of the City Charter, adopted last year, which requires that unsettled contract disputes between city officials and city employees be put before the voters to decide. In this first use of

that Charter provision, voters will grant or reject demands by unions representing city electricians (Proposition Q), plumbers (Proposition R) and sheet metal workers (Proposition S).

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROPOSITION S

AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 115-77, SALARY STANDARDIZATION ORDINANCE, FISCAL YEAR 1977-78, CHARTER SECTIONS 8.400, 8.401 AND 8.407, MISCELLANEOUS EMPLOYEES, PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 9.108(b), TO REFLECT ADDITIONAL RATES AND WORKING CONDITIONS FOR EMPLOYEES REPRESENTED BY THE SHEET METAL WORKERS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION, LOCAL NO. 104, BASED UPON THE LAST DEMANDS OF SAID EMPLOYEES. Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Pursuant to the provisions of Charter Section 9.108(b), Ordinance No. 115-77, Salary Standardization Ordinance, Fiscal Year 1977-78, Charter Sections 8.400, 8.401 and 8.407, Miscellaneous Employees, is hereby amended by adding Section XIII thereto, reading as follows:

SECTION XIII.

Notwithstanding any provisions of this ordinance to the contrary, and based upon the last demand of employees represented by the Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Local No. 104, said employees shall be entitled to additional working conditions as follows:

The normal work day shall be eight (8) hours per day, 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., forty (40) hours per week, Monday through Friday.

Journeymen Sheet Metal Worker filling the position of foreman or any other higher position regardless of the length of time involved shall receive the higher position rate of pay.

The work week shall be Monday through Friday inclusive.

The present \$20.00 per day subsistence shall be increased to \$25.00 per day on a seven (7) day basis.

All overtime shall be on a voluntary basis with a minimum of two (2) hours.

Employees shall get two (2) days off in a period of seven (7) days.

Qualified Journeymen shall start at the highest wage increment.

Exemption from the inclement weather provisions.

When working at least four (4) hours overtime the City and County shall pay for meals.

Overtime shall be compensated at double the hourly rate.

There shall be a shift differential of 12 per cent for the evening or swing shift and 18 per cent for the night or graveyard shift. Shift work shall mean work performed immediately following the regularly scheduled work day and for the stated number of hours as follows: Not less than five (5) consecutive days shall constitute a shift schedule and all shift schedules shall end only on a Friday.

Employees who perform work which is less than the 40 hour week shall not be considered part time employees and shall be treated equally with other City and County employees.

The City and County shall supply all necessary hand tools or provide insurance for tools supplied by employees represented by this Union.

All rates of pay shall be designated on an hourly basis and not bi-weekly or monthly.

All employees required to work at an area beyond the City and County of San Francisco in other than employer provided ground transportation, and using their personal automobiles, shall receive 30 cents per mile each way travel expense from the San Francisco County line to the job site and return. Employees riding as passengers to that site and return shall receive 15 cents per mile each way as travel expense.

No argument for Proposition S was submitted.

No argument against Proposition S was submitted.



**DECLARATION
OF POLICY**

INTERNATIONAL HOTEL

Ballot Title

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall the City and County of San Francisco purchase the International Hotel, bring the building up to code and transfer same to the San Francisco Housing Authority to be used for low-rent housing?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The International Hotel at 848 Kearny St. is a privately-owned, three-story building with 150 rooms. Until the tenants were evicted, it provided low rent housing, primarily for elderly and minority people. The owner of the building wants to tear it down in order to use the site for other purposes.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition U asks if the City should buy the International Hotel, fix the building

up so it meets the standards set by law, and transfer it to the San Francisco Housing Authority to be used for low-rent housing.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to buy the International Hotel and fix it up so that it can be used for low-rent housing.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to buy the International Hotel.

Controller's Statement on "U"

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

Should the proposed declaration of policy be approved, it is my opinion, the increase in the cost of government would be approximately \$2,500,000 as a one time cost.

Based on the 1977-1978 assessment roll, this estimated increase is equivalent to six and seventy-nine hundredths cents (\$0.0679) in the tax rate.

How Proposition U Got On The Ballot

Proposition U was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On August 29, the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the question of the International Hotel be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Molinari, and von Beroldingen.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION U

"Housing is our right! Fight forced dispersion of national minority communities like Chinatown-Manilatown."

N. Diao
Asian Americans for Equality

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION U

Over 2500 units of low-rent housing have been demolished in the Chinatown-Manilatown area in the last ten years. None were replaced. Corporate business systematically destroyed the Manilatown community, once ten square blocks—buying properties, and demolishing homes, community centers, and shops. Today, the same destruction ravages Chinatown. For decades, discrimination prevented most Chinese and Filipinos from living and working outside their communities. Their labor has been exploited in the sweatshops, ships, factories and farms of this country. The rich have reaped untold profits from this oppression by paying subsistence wages, charging high rents, delivering the worst educational and social services.

The International Hotel tenants fought eviction for nine years because of these conditions. Their valiant struggle against the attacks on them and their community has won them the admiration and support of millions nationwide. The brutal eviction of the elderly tenants by 400 police and sheriffs, costing \$250,000, has not ended the fight. Everytime people fight for a decent life, the rich always say it

will cost too much—but it's the people who end up paying while the rich get off the hook. This year, homeowners face 9% property tax increases, while big business gets 10-20% decreases. Needed social services for the elderly and the "working poor" are being cut back. At the same time, \$30 million of our taxes each year goes to banks holding municipal bonds. We say, let the banks and big business bear the cost for low-rent housing. Tax their profits, not our wages.

Four Seas Investment Corporation, and others, will tell voters that this Proposition is an attack on private property, on the right of people to own homes and other possessions. But what's at stake is not people's rights to own these things, but big business' right to profit by throwing people into the streets and tearing down their homes. We must stand up to this. We need more decent low-rent housing. Vote YES on Proposition U.

Paulette Liang, spokeswoman
Workers Committee to Fight for International
Hotel and Victory Building 397-0629

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION U

Five thousand families are on the Housing Authority's waiting list. No low-rent housing has been built in five years. Inflationary rent hikes hurt everyone. Even homeowners suffer punitive taxes they can ill afford.

Thousands of housing units have been destroyed in the past decade. Concrete highrises and expensive condominiums replace people. Yet little of the taxes paid by these technical wonders goes toward low-rent housing. People have been swept this way and that in the name of Progress—"progress" always accompanied by human suffering. The heart of the International Hotel issue is whether people have housing rights, or whether the rights of commerce reign supreme over human beings.

Contrary to slanderous editorials, there were no code violations in the residential portion of the International Hotel. The building is structurally sound and safe, and under tenants' management it was clean and orderly. The International Hotel has been placed on the National Register of Historic Places by the U.S. government, in recognition of its cultural significance.

Purchase of the hotel or its site is a step towards recognizing housing needs of common people in San Francisco. Economically, buying it is a bargain—a good investment, adding 155 much needed low-rent units for the city. Rents collected from the building will return to the city treasury most of the cost. The

(continued)

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



DECLARATION OF POLICY

INTERNATIONAL HOTEL

(Argument for Proposition U, Continued)

need for low rent housing will not go away by itself. The brutal eviction of the elderly International Hotel tenants highlighted the need for low-rent housing, and the inability of our institutions to meet that need.

Proposition U is not a mandate for the city to purchase the hotel, but a "Yes" vote would recognize the urgent need for low-rent housing and encourage the city to begin concrete action towards resolving this issue. Vote "Yes" on Proposition U.

International Hotel Tenants Association.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION U

WE URGE A "YES" VOTE ON PROPOSITION U!

Asian Community Center
Campbell, Norma
Cecchetti, Christina—
San Francisco
Women's Centers
Centro de Cambio
Chan, Diana Ming
Chew, Laureen—Teacher
Chew, Martin—Attorney
Chin, Gordon
Chin, Lonnie—Teacher
Chin, Phil
Chinatown Tenants
Organizing Committee
Choy, Philip
Chuck, Rev. Harry
Colter, Rossie
Community Educational
Services
Davis, George—Secretary/
Treasurer O.P.E.I.U.
Local 3 AFL-CIO
Donlin, Bert—Retired Vice
President, ILWU Local 10
Edwards, Robert—President,
Shipsalers ILWU
Fong, Katheryn
Gant, Alvin—General
President, National Post
Office Mailhandlers Local
302, Div. LIUNA
Gilman, Earl—President,
Social Services No. 535

Goodman Building
Tenant's Union
Helmick, Barbara
Hernandez, George A.
Hing, Bill Ong—Attorney
Holtzclaw, John
Hutch, Ella Hill—Vice
President, Board of
Directors BART
Ishida, David
Ja, Kew Yuen—M & J Co.
Jan, Elmer
Jew, Virginia
Jing Wu Chinese
Physical Association
Johnson, Walter—President,
Dept. Store Employees
Union Local 110
Kerridge, Kathy
Kim, Tom—Bay Area
Coalition of Koreans
Kitagaki, Nobuo
Kojimoto, Kathy—SEIU
Local 535
Kuroiwa, Spencer
Lee, Carole Jan—
Commissioner, Commission
Status of Women
Lee, Michael—Attorney
Lee, Pam
Lee, Patricia—Attorney
Lew, Eunice—Teacher

Logue-Riskin, Ruth—
S.F. Gray Panthers
Low, Tom—Attorney
Lowe, Rolland—Physician
Lowe, Russ
McClain, Curtis
Mission Childcare
Consortium, Inc.
Mori, Jeff
National United Workers
Organization—Bay Area
Chapter
Olson, Reeva—Office
Employees Local 3
On, Pamela
Ouye, Sandy
Ping Yuen Tenants
Association
Prowler, David
Quan, David—Program
Director, Asian American
Community Mental Health
Training Center
Riskin, Alexander—Chair,
Gray Panthers
Ruiz, Sam
San Francisco Wu Shu
Troupe
Shek, Lilian—Attorney
Spikes, Eleanor
Stallings, Randall—
Coordinator, Unitarian
Universalist Service
Committee
Steele, Percy Jr.

Suncin, George—Horizons
Unlimited
Tang, Julie—Counselor,
S.F. Community College
Townsend, Arnold—WAPAC
Unemployed Workers
Organizing Committee
Vietnam Veterans Against
the War
Wada, Patty
Wada, Yori—Director,
Buchanan YMCA
Waller, Rich
Wang, Linda
Wang, Ling-chi—Asst.
Professor, U.C. Berkeley
Wang, Wayne
Williams, Cleophas
President, ILWU No. 10
Kay, George—Secretary,
ILWU No. 10
Wong, Steve—Everybody's
Bookstore
The Worker Newspaper
Xin Hua Mutual Aid
Association
Yee, Christine—Community
Worker
Yee, Emily
Yee, Harold
Yee, Ruth—Director,
Chinatown Community
Children's Center
Yuey, Joe
Zinn, Lina

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION U

WE SUPPORT THE INTERNATIONAL HOTEL TENANTS ASSOCIATION

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION U

American Jewish Congress,
Northern California
Division
Archdiocese of San Francisco,
Commission on Social
Justice
Art Agnos, Assemblyman.
Ray Balberon, President—
Mission Media Arts
John L. Burton, Member
of Congress
Gary Borvice
Robert Covington
Eugene Coleman
Rodger L. Dillon, President,
Local 87, SEIU
Rita George
Ron Green
Gil Graham
Terence Hallinan
Joseph Hall, President,
S.F. NAACP

La Raza Information Center
La Raza Centro Legal
Gordon Lau
John Molinari, Supervisor
Jack Morrison
Harvey Milk
Peter Mendelsohn,
Commissioner
Mission Neighborhood
Centers, Inc.
Michael Nolan
Jim Queen
Ray Rivera
Rick Stokes
Carol Ruth Silver
Lillian K. Sing, President,

Chinese-American
Democratic Club
Donald Stang, President
S.F. National Lawyers
Guild
San Francisco Council of
Churches, Executive
Committee
Jack Trujillo
Arnold G. Townsend
The Rev. Dr. A. C. Ubalde, Jr.
Cecil Williams
Ruth Wellington
Nancy G. Walker
Margo Warnecke, S.F.
Landmarks Board
Commission

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION U

More low rent housing in San Francisco is a good idea. But buying the International Hotel is a bad idea. Purchasing and upgrading this 70 year old condemned building would cost millions of *your* tax dollars. At most, it could house about 150 tenants. All San Franciscans, those who desperately need decent low rent housing as well as those taxpayers who must subsidize it, should reject this extravagant and wasteful scheme.

Buying the hotel will be very expensive. It's located near the financial district, four blocks from the Transamerica "pyramid." Land in this area brings top dollar and the City will have to pay the going rate. Acquiring the property could take years as the courts decide what price the City must pay. And once the property is finally bought, hundreds of thousands more dollars will have to be poured in just to bring the building up to City Health and Safety Codes. Compliance with present earthquake standards would require gutting and reconstructing the entire building.

But the tremendous expense and years of delay aren't the only reasons why the I-Hotel is a bad idea. Many of the forty tenants in the Hotel have moved a few blocks south to another hotel on Kearny Street. So far, they are the only ones who have said they want to live in the I-Hotel.

When thousands of San Franciscans live in squalor, does it make sense to spend millions of dollars for the benefit of this small group? When the City now owns acres of vacant land, does it make sense to take valuable commercial property off the tax rolls? When more and better new housing could be built for less than the price of the I-Hotel, does it make sense to pour your tax dollars into a rotting hulk which can house so few?

We think not. We urge you to demand the *best* low rent housing your money can buy for *all* who need it. Vote **NO** on Proposition U.

James Prisin-Zano
Former Regional Attorney,
Federal Public Housing Administration

Ballot Title

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall the City and County of San Francisco restore, renovate and place into use Fleishhacker Pool and its facilities?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Fleishhacker Pool, a six million gallon salt water swimming pool located between the San Francisco Zoo and the Great Highway, was built in 1925. It was closed by the Health Department in 1971 because sewage was seeping into the pool through cracks and polluting the water. The pool is now empty and unused.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition V asks the voters whether or not Fleishhacker Pool should be restored, renovated and put back into use.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to restore Fleishhacker Pool.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to restore Fleishhacker Pool.

Controller's Statement on "V"

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

Should the proposed declaration of policy be approved, in my opinion, the increase in the cost of government would be approximately \$11,000,000 for restoration and renovation of Fleishhacker Pool swimming facilities, and an annual cost of \$160,000

for Maintenance.

Based upon the 1977-1978 assessment roll, this estimated increase is equivalent to twenty-nine and eighty-eight hundredths (\$.2988) cents in the tax rate for the restoration and renovation, and forty-three hundredths (\$.0043) cent for the annual maintenance.

How Proposition V Got On The Ballot

Proposition V was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On August 29, the Registrar received a request from 7 supervisors asking that the question of Fleishhacker Pool be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Feinstein, Francois, Kopp, Molinari, Nelder, Pelosi, and von Beroldingen.



ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION V

Fleishhacker Pool

Save the world's largest landlocked swimming pool! Stop city government's planned demolition of our only olympic size pool and its replacement by a huge, unneeded **THREE MILLION DOLLAR**

PARKING LOT. Federal funding will minimize cost to the city. Sutro Baths and Playland are already lost. **Vote YES! Keep Fleishhacker Pool!**

Committee To Save Fleishhacker Pool
Michael Nurre

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION V

FLEISHHACKER POOL has been an historic living landmark since 1925. Though owned by all San Franciscans, unfortunately responsibility for its well-being has never been in enthusiastic hands. It has constantly been treated by its supposed trustees worse than Cinderella. We as owners of the pool complex must now make our own policy for use of our own unique swimming and diving facilities. We should not be fooled by self-serving Zoo Corporation red-herring arguments. The REC/PARK mismanagers want to give the pool area, enjoyed by millions while properly maintained, to a private corporation free of cost and public control, for use mainly as a commercial parking lot for a huge com-

mercial Zoo complex. Opposition to this proposition is thus being indirectly subsidized by REC/PARK resources, and is hypocritical as the Commission refuses to consider relocation or even planning for establishment of comparable facilities. As citizens we should insist that our pool be restored for use as swimming and diving facilities. Restoration can be as simple as a \$2,500,000 clean-up job to as high as we want to go, but that decision comes later. Save our Pool. **Vote YES on V.**

Kamini K. Gupta, Chairman
San Francisco Council of Lions
Clubs Fleishhacker Project Committee
Charles W. Meyers, Member

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION V

Vote No On "V"

A WHITE ELEPHANT

Fleishhacker Pool is a white elephant. The people voted "NO" years ago when they stopped coming to swim in the cold. It makes no sense to spend over \$23 million to restore Fleishhacker Pool when San Franciscans already know it's the wrong place for a major outdoor swimming facility. We can't afford to make the same mistake twice.

Who Is Going to Pay for It?

We already know that only a few San Franciscans will use Fleishhacker Pool, yet ALL San Franciscans will have to pay the price tag for restoration, over \$23 million. They will then have to pay year-after-year for the complicated engineering maintenance required by today's public health standards. We don't need a swimming facility used by only an elite few. The Zoo serves more people in

two weeks than Fleishhacker Pool did in its entire last year of operation.

The Zoo Needs the Land

It's time to give the San Francisco Zoo a break. The Zoo belongs to all the people of San Francisco. Nearly one million people visit it each year and it can't move to another location. Restoration of Fleishhacker Pool conflicts directly with the Zoo's need for space for animals. The Zoo has begun to develop new naturalistic exhibits necessary for the preservation of our endangered and threatened wildlife. These animals can't survive without our help. The Zoo needs the land and San Francisco does not need another white elephant.

Vote NO on "V".

San Francisco Zoological Society
James J. Ludwig
Chairman of the Board

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



**DECLARATION
OF POLICY**

FLEISHHACKER POOL

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION V

Vote "No" On "V"

\$23,801,933 RESTORATION COST

Engineering estimates indicate that the cost of restoring Fleishhacker Pool would be \$23,801,933. This is a great deal of money to spend on a pool which, in its last years of operation, attracted very few swimmers. The pool is located near the Ocean in the worst possible location in San Francisco for outdoor swimming because of cold and windy weather. In 1971, because of low attendance, the pool was costing the City \$2.60 per swimmer to operate.

No On "V"—Harm to Zoo

Proposition "V" would prevent implementation of the Zoo Master Plan. It would also block any Federal financing of needed Zoo improvements that are expected to be made as part of the Wastewater

Management Program. The pool area is desperately needed if San Francisco is to have a first-class zoo.

No On "V"—Times Have Changed

Since Fleishhacker Pool was built in 1925, the City has constructed year-round, enclosed, neighborhood swimming pools. These pools serve the recreational needs of San Franciscans. If the City decides it needs a large outdoor pool, there are more suitable locations where it can be built. Fleishhacker Pool has outlived its usefulness. It would be folly to spend any money on its restoration.

Eugene L. Friend
President

Endorsed by:

Loris DiGrazia
Msgr. Peter G. Armstrong
Tommy Harris

Ms. Lidia M. La Garda
Mrs. Amy Meyer
Lucien A. Sabella

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



Ballot Title

DECLARATION OF POLICY: Should the Board of Supervisors enact legislation which would phase out those billboards containing off-site advertising over a period allowing full amortization of costs to billboard companies?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Billboards are allowed in most commercial areas of San Francisco, except in special sign districts. They are not allowed in residential areas.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition W would ask the Board of Supervisors to ban all billboards from the City, with the owners given time to recover their investments. This ban would not apply to signs

which advertise the companies occupying the buildings where the signs are located.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to ban all billboards from San Francisco and want the owners to have time to recover their investments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to ban all billboards in the City.

Controller's Statement on "W"

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

Should the proposed declaration of policy be approved, and should the Board of Supervisors enact an ordinance legally permitting the elimination of all off site advertising by means of a plan of amortization of costs to billboard companies in one year, in my opinion, the estimated loss of revenue to the City and County would be approximately \$37,300. This estimated loss is equivalent to one tenth (\$0.0010) of one cent in the tax rate.

How Proposition W Got On The Ballot

Proposition W was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On August 30, the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the question of billboards be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Feinstein, Molinari, Nelder, Pelosi, and von Beroldingen.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION W

San Franciscans have made major efforts to improve and beautify our neighborhoods and enhance our unique scenic views. These efforts have resulted in residential zoning limitations, remodeling and refurbishing of private homes and commercial structures, tree planting, and the restoration of an atmosphere of charm and livability that has made our City famous.

A major obstacle to this improvement program is the twelve hundred to fifteen hundred billboards that dominate many streets, hills, rooftops, and freeways blocking views of our Bay and annoying residents. Many billboards are not modest general advertising signs on wooden frames, but large displays in jarring dayglow colors, embellished with neon and supported by heavy metal superstructures.

One has but to visit a city such as Washington, D.C., which has phased out all billboards, to realize the startling and beautifying effect that the absence of billboards has had on this older city. Many neighborhood and civic groups believe that billboards contribute to blight as they become larger, more imposing, and intrusive.

Why should visitors to San Francisco be greeted by mammoth cigarette and liquor advertisements

by the side of the freeway? Why should the scenic and architectural beauty of San Francisco be marred by glaring dayglow painted signs? Why should the side of a beautifully rehabilitated victorian be covered by a billboard?

The answer is that if the people of San Francisco believe that billboards have become a public nuisance and an unwanted blight on our landscape then we have a duty to see that they are removed in a manner consistent with governmental prerogatives and constitutional guarantees.

Legislation to phase out billboards has strong enemies in the powerful and political East Bay located billboard lobby. Legislation has been held up for one year despite the support of dozens of neighborhood groups, civic organizations, local merchants and businessmen. This is the reason we submit this policy statement to you, the voters of San Francisco.

Do *you* want billboards with off-site advertising phased out. Just look around and let us know.

Supervisors

Ronald Pelosi

Dianne Feinstein

Alfred Nelder

John L. Molinari

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION W

There are more than 1,200 billboards in San Francisco, with more than 50 new ones being erected each year. These large, often brightly lighted advertising signs visually pollute our city. They are an avoidable insult to the great beauty of San Francisco. Having an attractive city is necessary to maintaining one of San Francisco's largest industries—tourism. If passed, this resolution will result in legislation phasing out these obnoxious signs. And who needs them? The economic impact on San Francisco will be minimal.

The owners of the existing signs will be treated

fairly, as required by law, in that the cost of the signs will be amortized over 7 to 10 years. Despite years of effort, ordinances and lawsuits, San Francisco has been unable to eliminate billboards, even though other well known tourist cities, such as Honolulu and Washington, D.C., have done so.

Vote YES on Proposition W. Vote for a more beautiful San Francisco. These are your views. Exercise your right to control them.

Dorothy Erskine
William D. Evers
Ann Fogelberg
John H. Jacobs

Jude Laspa
Marilyn (Toby) Levine
Peter McCrea
Claire Pilcher

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



ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION W

Q. WHAT DOES PROPOSITION "W" MEAN?

A. Proposition "W" means prohibition of all Off-Site advertising signs in the city and their removal without payment.

Q. WHAT DOES "AMORTIZATION" MEAN?

A. If the city wanted to amortize your property or business, it means they wouldn't pay you for it—they would just let you use it longer, i.e. for a definite period of months or years and then take it away.

Q. HOW WOULD IT BE ENFORCED?

A. After the period of amortization, the billboard owners would be required to remove the structures, at their expense. If they did not, they could be jailed or fined, or both.

Q. WHAT IS THE LOSS TO THE OWNER OF THE BILLBOARDS?

A. The loss to the owner of the billboards is millions of dollars invested in their busi-

nesses and their jobs as well as the jobs of the people who work for them.

Q. WHAT IS THE LOSS TO THE CITY?

A. The city would lose one form of communication, which not only informs, but entertains and provides a colorful, graphic change in the urban view. San Francisco would lose part of its historical heritage.

Hundreds of property owners who receive rent from the billboard companies would lose over a million dollars each year in income. The city would lose tax revenues accordingly.

Q. WHAT THEN IS THE REAL MEANING OF PROPOSITION "W"?

A. Proposition "W" is a police-state type of action proposed by some elitist members of the Board of Supervisors to take property without compensation. It simply is not fair. Vote No on Proposition "W". It's wrong.

Arthur W. Goff, President
C.S.O.A.A.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION W

It is time that the San Francisco Board of Supervisors started taking responsibility for the steady decline of jobs in our city. While they are making public speeches about trying to help the unemployment situation, some supervisors are actually trying to destroy countless jobs by putting Prop. "W" on the ballot.

Proposition "W" would completely destroy the billboard industry in San Francisco. In addition to taking jobs from hard working employees, Prop "W" would deprive carpenters, painters, teamsters, laborers, electricians, artists plus secretaries, salesmen, accountants, and other office workers of badly needed jobs!

Prop "W" is totally unfair against a San Francisco industry. Who knows what job they will try

to eliminate next? How many more jobs will go down the drain at the whim of a few supervisors? Working people in San Francisco are tired of political speeches about solving the unemployment problem when these same politicians are actually taking away our jobs with things like Prop "W". They should be bringing jobs to San Francisco not destroying businesses that help people.

Prop "W" is against workers. Vote NO on "W".

Stanley M. Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building and Construction
Trades Council

John F. Crowley, Secretary San Francisco
Labor Council, AFL-CIO

Jack Goldberger, President
Joint Council of Teamsters



**DECLARATION
OF POLICY**

BILLBOARD REMOVAL

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION W

We do not understand why our fellow supervisors have decided to put Proposition "W" on the ballot. San Franciscans do not want to drive the billboard industry out of our city. We can only conclude these supervisors are promoting Measure "W" for their own political purposes.

San Francisco is "everybody's favorite city". Billboards have been a traditional part of San Francisco since before the turn of the century.

There is no evidence that billboards impair traffic safety, harm the environment, offend tourists or

decrease property values. We do know that Prop-
"W" will eliminate jobs, tax revenue and a valuable form of social, political and public service advertising for San Francisco's charities and community groups.

We urge all thinking San Franciscans to join us in voting NO on Prop "W".

Supervisor Peter Tamaras
Supervisor John Barbagelata
Supervisor Terry A. Francois

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION W

We are deeply concerned about the constitutional and legal implications of Proposition "W". Any effort to arbitrarily eliminate a form of free speech such as billboard advertising is clearly a violation of the First Amendment and poses a threat to the constitutional freedoms of all San Franciscans.

This proposition is in direct conflict with the law of our state. The Outdoor Advertising Act of the State of California (S5200) and following section of the Business and Professions Code provides in S5226 as follows:

"Outdoor advertising is an integral part of the business and marketing function, and an established segment of the national economy, and

should be allowed to exist in business areas, subject to reasonable controls in the public interest."

Proposition "W" shows a callous disregard for both California law and the *Constitution* on the part of some self-serving supervisors who profess to protect the rights of all San Franciscans. We urge our fellow citizens who value their rights of free speech and equal protection under the law to join us in voting NO on Proposition "W".

LAWYERS FOR FREE SPEECH

R. Barry Churton
Margaret H. Edwards
J. Rodney Johnson
Hon. Frank B. Blum

William J. Dowling III
J. Raymond Healy
Peter L. Muhs
Paul M. Hupf

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION W

Throughout the years, the American Advertising Federation has devoted countless hours to obtain free public service advertising for many worthy San Francisco non-profit charities and community groups. We have requested free advertising space and time for these public safety and volunteer citizen groups from all forms of media. Without exception, the billboard industry has willingly given free billboards for these worthy causes during the past 75 years.

All the following organizations and community groups have asked for and received free public service advertising from the San Francisco billboard industry in 1976-77:

A.C.L.U.—Bill of Rights Day
AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY

AMERICAN RED CROSS
AMERICAN WOMEN'S ORT
BAY AREA URBAN LEAGUE
CALIFORNIA DENTAL ASSN.
CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
"55 MEANS 55"
CALIFORNIA LEAGUE FOR THE
HANDICAPPED
CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
SAN FRANCISCO CATHOLIC CHARITIES
CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF
LATTER-DAY SAINTS
CAMPFIRE GIRLS
FISH AND GAME DEPT.
EASTER SEAL SOCIETY
ELKS "HONOR THE FLAG"
FAIR HOUSING FEDERAL HUD PROJECT

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



GOODWILL INDUSTRIES
THE GUARDSMEN
BAY AREA COUNCIL ON SOVIET JEWRY
ST. LUKE'S HOSPITAL
JEWISH WELFARE FEDERATION
MONTFORD POINT MARINES NATIONAL
CONVENTION—AUGUST 1977
FIRST BLACKS TO SERVE AS
U.S. MARINES
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS
JERRY LEWIS TELETHON
NATIONAL SECRETARIES ASSN.
PARENTS WITHOUT PARTNERS
SALVATION ARMY
SAN FRANCISCO BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA
SAN FRANCISCO CITIZENS LEAGUE
SAN FRANCISCO DE MOLAY
SAN FRANCISCO MUSEUM OF ART
SAN FRANCISCO SYMPHONY
FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION—
“KEEP OFF THE GAS”
UNITED WAY CRUSADE
Y.M.C.A.
CALIFORNIA FAIR PLAN

CALIFORNIA NURSES ASSN.
DELANCY STREET
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS
ST. JUDE'S HOSPITAL
HIRE THE HANDICAPPED
UNITED NEGRO COLLEGE FUND—“A
MIND IS A TERRIBLE THING TO WASTE”
“BUCKLE UP FOR SAFETY”
SAN FRANCISCO ZOO COMMISSION
SICKLE CELL ANEMIA RESEARCH
FOUNDATION
STATE OF CALIFORNIA—DEPT. OF
HEALTH—INDUSTRIAL CANCER

It is not intended to imply that all of the above-named organizations or their members would join us in voting “NO” on Proposition “W”, but we know they appreciate the help they have received from the billboard industry in promoting their worthwhile causes.

AMERICAN ADVERTISING FEDERATION
Georgette Soulie
Director Western Region Services

**ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR ELECTION ON
BOND ISSUES, PROPOSITIONS A & B**

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1977, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: \$9,270,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM OF THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; \$6,000,000 FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, INCLUDING A FIREBOAT; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL 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 8th day of November, 1977, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

(a) IRRIGATION SYSTEM OF THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1977

\$9,270,000 to pay for additions to and improvement of the Recreation and Park System of the City and County of San Francisco, including facilities, equipment, and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for additions to and improvement of the irrigation system of the Recreation and Park System of the City and County of San Francisco.

(b) FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1977

\$6,000,000 to pay for additions to and improvement of the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco, including facilities, equipment, a fireboat, and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for additions to and improvement of the fire protection system of the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated costs of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were

fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolutions and in the amounts specified:

Irrigation System of the Recreation and Park Department Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 510-77, \$9,270,000;

Fire Protection System Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 511-77, \$6,000,000.

That each of said resolutions was passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors, that Resolutions No. 510-77 and 511-77 were approved by the Mayor, and in each of said resolutions it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Municipal Election to be held Tuesday, November 8, 1977, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Municipal 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 Municipal Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Municipal 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 Municipal Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or about October 15, 1977.

(Continued on next page)

CONTINUATION OF A & B

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

(a) "IRRIGATION SYSTEM OF THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1977.

To incur a bonded indebtedness of \$9,270,000 for the purpose of improvement of the irrigation system of the Recreation and Park Department of the City and County of San Francisco."

(b) "FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1977.

To incur a bonded indebtedness of \$6,000,000 for the purpose of improvements of the fire protection facilities of the San Francisco Fire Department, including the purchase of a new fireboat."

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

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

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special election, each voter to vote for 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 Irrigation System of the Recreation and Park Department Improvement bond proposition described in paragraph (a) of Section 1 of this ordinance 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 therein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 8 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

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

Section 7. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the Fire Protection System Improvement bond proposition described in paragraph (b) of Section 1 of this ordinance 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 therein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 8 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

The votes cast for and against the said proposition shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on the 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; provided, when published in the San Francisco Examiner this ordinance shall be accompanied by a sentence in Spanish and in Chinese stating that the ordinance is posted in Spanish and Chinese at the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Room 235, City Hall. Also, this ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in one or more newspapers published daily in Chinese

(Continued on Next Page)

CONTINUATION OF A & B

in the City and County of San Francisco, and it shall be published twice in a Spanish language newspaper which has a substantial circulation in the City and County of San Francisco. This ordinance published in Spanish and Chinese shall be posted in the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Room 235, City Hall.

Passed for Second Reading—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, August 1, 1977.

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Feinstein, Gonzales, Kopp, Nelder, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

Absent: Supervisors Francois, Mendelsohn, Molinari.

Read Second Time and Finally Passed—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, August 8, 1977.

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Francois, Gonzales, Kopp, Molinari, Nelder, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.

Absent: Supervisors Feinstein, Mendelsohn, Tamaras.

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

G. H. BOREMAN, Clerk.
GEORGE R. MOSCONE, Mayor.
Approved: August 16, 1977.

RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR ELECTION ON REVENUE BONDS, PROPOSITION C

RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE QUALIFIED VOTERS OF SAID CITY AND COUNTY THE PROPOSITION OF ISSUING REVENUE BONDS PURSUANT TO SECTION 7.306 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND THE REVENUE BOND LAW OF 1941 IN THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF \$90,000,000 TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, IMPROVING AND DEVELOPING AIRPORT FACILITIES AT SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT; AND CONSOLIDATING SAID SPECIAL REVENUE BOND ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 8, 1977.

WHEREAS, Section 7.306(a) of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that, upon the recommendation of the Airports Commission, the Board of Supervisors shall by resolution submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election held for that purpose, the proposition of issuing bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, as it now reads or may hereafter be amended, for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, improving or developing airports or airport facilities under the jurisdiction of the Airports Commission in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Airports Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Airports Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, by Resolution No. 77-0129, adopted May 3, 1977, pursuant to said Section 7.306(a), has recommended that the Board of Supervisors, by resolution, submit to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election held for that purpose on November 8, 1977, the proposition of issuing bonds in the principal amount of \$90,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, improving and developing airport facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Airports Commission, at San Francisco International Airport, as generally described in a staff report to said

Commission dated April, 1977 and entitled "San Francisco International Airport Expansion Program, Modernization and Replacement Phase," in accordance with the terms and conditions recommended by the Airports Commission in said Resolution No. 77-0129;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

Section 1. A special revenue bond election is hereby ordered and will be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, November 8, 1977, at which election there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the City and County the proposition of issuing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 7.306 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco and the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 of the State of California for the purpose of providing funds for acquiring, constructing, improving and developing airport facilities, under the jurisdiction of the Airports Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, at San Francisco International Airport, all as set forth in the following proposition:

AIRPORT REVENUE BONDS

Shall the Airports Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of \$90,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, improving and developing airport facilities at San Francisco International Airport, including an industrial waste treatment plant, additions to terminals, remodeling and modification of terminals, baggage handling facilities, boarding areas, aircraft aprons, pedestrian access facilities, parking facilities, engineering and planning expense, and other works, properties or structures necessary

(Continued on next page)

CONTINUATION OF PROPOSITION C

or convenient for San Francisco International Airport?

Section 2. Said revenue bonds in the principal amount of \$90,000,000 (herein called the "Bonds") are proposed to be issued to finance improvements to an enterprise (herein called the "Enterprise") which is hereby defined to be San Francisco International Airport, including the existing airport and all additions, betterments, extensions and improvements thereto. Said existing airport and the proposed improvements thereto shall constitute a single unified, integrated enterprise, and the revenues therefrom shall be pledged to the payment of the Bonds.

(a) The purpose for which the Bonds are proposed to be issued is to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, improving and developing airport facilities at San Francisco International Airport, including any expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, as generally described in a staff report to the Airports Commission dated April, 1977 and entitled "San Francisco International Airport Expansion Program, Modernization and Replacement Phase."

(b) The estimated cost of the acquisition, construction, improvement and development is \$90,000,000. Said estimated cost includes expenses incidental thereto or connected therewith, engineering, inspection, legal and fiscal agent's fees, costs of the bond election and of the issuance of the Bonds, bond reserve funds and working capital and bond interest estimated to accrue during the construction period and for a period of not to exceed twelve months after completion of construction.

(c) The principal amount of the Bonds proposed to be issued is \$90,000,000.

(d) The maximum rate of interest on the Bonds proposed to be issued shall not exceed 9 per cent a year, payable annually or semiannually.

Section 3. The Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified voters of the City and County of San Francisco at said special revenue bond election the proposition set forth in Section 1 of this resolution, and designates and refers to said proposition in the form of ballot hereinafter prescribed for use at said election.

(a) Said special revenue bond election shall be held and conducted, and the votes thereat canvassed and the returns thereof made, and the result thereof ascertained and determined as herein provided; and in all particulars not prescribed by this resolution, said special election shall be held and the votes canvassed pursuant to law for general municipal elections in the City and County.

(b) All persons qualified to vote at municipal elections in the City and County upon the date of the election herein provided for shall be qualified to vote upon the proposition submitted at said special revenue bond election.

(c) Said special revenue bond election is hereby consolidated with the general municipal election to

be held in the City and County on November 8, 1977, pursuant to the Charter of the City and County. The precincts, polling places and officers of election for said special revenue bond election shall be the same as those established and designated for said general municipal election. Reference is hereby made to the notice of election by the Registrar of Voters, setting forth the precincts, polling places and officers of election for said general municipal election, to be published in the *San Francisco Examiner* on or about October 15, 1977 for more particular description of said precincts, polling places and officers of election.

(d) The ballot used at said general municipal election and said special revenue bond election hereby consolidated therewith shall have printed thereon, in addition to all other matters required by law, the following proposition:

AIRPORT REVENUE BONDS	
<p>Shall the Airports Commission of the City and County of San Francisco issue revenue bonds in the principal amount of \$90,000,000 pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 to provide funds for acquiring, constructing, improving and developing airport facilities at San Francisco International Airport, including an industrial waste treatment plant, additions to terminals, remodeling and modification of terminals, baggage handling facilities, boarding areas, aircraft aprons, pedestrian access facilities, parking facilities, engineering and planning expense, and other works, properties or structures necessary or convenient for San Francisco International Airport?</p>	YES
	NO

(e) 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 revenue bond election, each voter to vote for 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

(Continued on next page)

CONTINUATION OF PROPOSITION C

proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

If and to the extent that voting machines are used at said special revenue bond election such machines shall be so arranged that any qualified voter may vote for said proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "Yes" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for said proposition, and may vote against it by pulling down a lever over the word "No" under or near a statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote against said proposition. The statement of said proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material used in voting machines shall read substantially as follows:

\$90,000,000 Airport Revenue Bonds for San Francisco International Airport

Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with law.

Section 4. If the proposition set forth in section 1 of this resolution shall be authorized by the qualified voters of the City and County by the votes of a majority of all the voters voting on said proposition, the Bonds may be issued and sold for the purpose set forth in section 2 of this resolution.

The Bonds are to be revenue bonds, payable exclusively from the revenues of the Enterprise and such other funds from any source as may be legally available for such purpose and may be used by the City and County for such purpose without incurring indebtedness. The Bonds are not to be secured by the taxing power of the City and County, and shall be issued under Section 7.306 of the Charter of the City and County and the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 of the State of California. The principal of and interest on the Bonds and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof shall not constitute a debt of the City and County, nor a legal or equitable pledge, charge, lien or encumbrance upon any of its property, or upon any of its income, receipts or revenues except the revenues of the Enterprise and any other funds that may be legally applied, pledged or otherwise made available to their payment. The Bonds, if authorized, shall be special obligations of the Airports Commission and shall be secured by a pledge of and shall be a charge upon, and shall be payable, as to the principal thereof, interest thereon, and any premiums upon the redemption of any thereof, solely from and secured by a lien upon the revenues of the Enterprise and such funds as may be described in the resolution authorizing the issuance of the Bonds.

The Bonds shall not constitute or evidence indebtedness of the City and County but shall constitute and evidence only indebtedness of the Airports Commission payable solely out of revenues received by

the Airports Commission from airports or airport facilities operated or controlled by it. The Bonds shall not be included in the bonded debt limit provided for in Section 6.401 of the Charter.

The revenues of the Enterprise and any interest earned on said revenues shall be deposited in the Airports Revenue Fund in accordance with Section 6.408(a) of the Charter of the City and County and shall be appropriated, transferred, expended and used in accordance with Section 6.408(b) of the Charter.

The Airports Commission may provide for the issuance of additional bonds pursuant to Section 7.306 of the Charter of the City and County and the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, improving or developing airport facilities at San Francisco International Airport, or any extensions or additions thereto, either on a parity with the Bonds herein proposed to be authorized or subject to such limitations as the Airports Commission may specify at the time of the issuance of the Bonds.

Any Bonds authorized pursuant to this resolution, and the pledge of revenues of the Enterprise to the payment thereof, shall not in any manner reduce the rights of the holders of any revenue bonds secured by said revenues and outstanding at the time of issuance of the Bonds authorized pursuant to this resolution, but shall be issued only in conformity with any applicable limitations then in force for the benefit of such holders.

Section 5. This resolution 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 publications shall constitute notice of said election; provided, when published in the *San Francisco Examiner* this resolution shall be accompanied by a sentence in Spanish and in Chinese stating that the resolution is posted in Spanish and Chinese at the office of the Board of Supervisors, Room 235, City Hall. Also, this resolution shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in one or more newspapers published daily in Chinese in the City and County of San Francisco, and it shall be published twice in a Spanish language newspaper which has a substantial circulation in the City and County of San Francisco. This resolution published in Spanish and Chinese shall be posted in the Office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Room 235, City Hall.

Adopted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, July 25, 1977.

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Francois, Kopp, Mendelsohn, Nelder, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

Noes: Supervisors Feinstein, Molinari.

Absent: Supervisor Gonzales.

(Continued on Next Page)

CONTINUATION OF PROPOSITION C

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

G. H. BOREMAN, Clerk.
GEORGE R. MOSCONE, Mayor.
Approved Aug. 4, 1977

CONTINUATION OF TEXT OF PROPOSITION H

(Continued from Page 43)

to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents, retired persons' dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the dental care plan of the health service system fund for any

employee presently provided with a dental care plan funded through the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District or the San Francisco Community College District; provided, however, that should said funding be terminated then such employees shall become eligible to participate in the dental plan and the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall contribute the average contribution in accordance with the survey conducted by the health service system in accordance with section 8.423. Such employees shall become eligible on July 1st of the next fiscal year after termination.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on ((November 7, 1972.)) November 8, 1977, shall be effective July 1, ((1973)) 1978.

CONTINUATION OF TEXT OF PROPOSITION M

(Continued from Page 56)

in the fire department ((until a total of nine per cent is reached; and in addition thereto there shall be allowed six-tenths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination for each year of service)) as an officer in the rank ((of lieutenant)) held by the applicant at the time of the examination until a total of ((six)) eight per cent of the credits of the entire examination is reached.

((((7) For Promotion to all Ranks Above Captain in the Fire Department:))

((Forty-five hundredths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the fire department until a total of nine per cent of said credits is reached, and in addition thereto there shall be allowed six-tenths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination for each year of service as an officer in the rank held by the applicant at the time of the examination, until a total of six

per cent of the credits of the entire examination is reached.))

((((8) In addition to the foregoing credits for seniority six per cent of the total credits allowed for said examinations shall be allowed to each applicant for a clean record in the department.))

(3) A member of the fire department who receives an overall passing mark on a promotional examination and has been the subject of departmental disciplinary action resulting in suspension(s) shall have deducted from the score attained on the entire examination the product of two-thirds of a point times the number of days suspended. In the event said deduction results in a score in the entire examination below the passing mark established by the civil service commission, the member shall be deemed to have failed the examination; provided, however, that no candidate having taken a promotional examination that could have subjected the examinee to point deduction

(Continued on Next Page)

CONTINUATION OF TEXT OF PROPOSITION M

tions as herein provided may be subjected to point deductions for this same departmental disciplinary action in future promotional examinations.

(4) In promotional examinations in the fire department, seniority of service and educational promotional credits as herein set forth shall be added to credit obtained by the applicant in the examination and shall be taken into consideration by the civil service commission in determining the passing mark and the position of the member on the eligible list.

(d) ((9)) In promotional examinations in the police ((and fire)) department((s)), seniority of service and a clean record in ((the respective)) said department((s)) shall be added to the credit obtained by the applicant in the written portion of said examination, and shall be taken into consideration by the commission in determining ((his)) the passing mark and ((his place)) the position of the applicant upon the list of eligibles.

(e) ((10)) In computing the credits for service in ((both)) the police department ((and the fire department)), fractional parts of the year shall not be considered.

In the fire department, full months of service shall be considered in computing service credits. A full month of service shall be defined as being assigned by the chief of department to duties in the next higher rank for a cumulative total of eighteen watches, a "watch" being defined for purposes of this section as that period of time that would entitle a permanent member working in that rank to one day's pay. Such fractional credits may be considered only if received for service rendered prior to the closing date for applications for the promotive position as determined by the civil service commission.

(f) Vacancies occurring in the several ranks of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety; lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety; lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation; inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety; and investigator, bureau of fire investigation shall be subject to competitive examination, and the provisions of section 8.326 and ((subsection (a) and (b) of)) this section of the charter relating to the fire department shall apply except as otherwise provided herein. Personnel of the fire department eligible to participate in examinations for the rank of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, shall come from the ranks of lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation. Personnel of the fire department eligible to participate in examinations for the rank of lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, shall come from the ranks of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation. Personnel of the fire department eligible to participate in examinations for the rank of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, shall come from the ranks of hoseman, truckman and chief's operator. Officers and

members of the bureau of fire prevention and public safety and officers and members of the bureau of fire investigation are not eligible to participate in promotional examinations for the ranks other than those ranks provided for the bureau of fire prevention and public safety and bureau of fire investigation.

(g) ((Fifteen)) Eight per cent of the total credits allowed for any promotive examination shall be allowed for seniority of service, which credits shall be distributed as follows:

((a)) (1) For promotion to the rank of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation:

One per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the fire department until the maximum of ((fifteen)) eight per cent is reached;

((b)) (2) For promotion to the rank of lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation:

((Six-tenths of one)) One and six-tenths per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed ((for each year of service in the fire department until a total of nine per cent is reached; and in addition thereto there shall be allowed six-tenths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination)) for each year of service in the rank of inspector, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and investigator, bureau of fire investigation, until a total of ((six)) eight per cent of the credits of the entire examination is reached;

((c)) (3) For promotion to the rank of captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety:

((Six-tenths of one)) One and six-tenths per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed ((for each year of service in the fire department until a total of nine per cent is reached; and in addition thereto there shall be allowed six-tenths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination)) for each year of service in the ranks of lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety, and lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation, until a total of ((six)) eight per cent of the credits of the entire examination is reached.

(h) Credits for seniority of service in the fire department as set forth herein shall apply to all promotive examinations administered after the effective date of this section as amended; provided, however, that for the promotive examination for lieutenant in the fire department next administered after the effective date of this section as amended, seniority of service credits shall be distributed as follows:

One per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the fire department until a maximum of twelve per cent is reached.

(i) A member of the fire department upon completion of the required probationary period may claim educational promotional credits, which credits

(Continued on Next Page)

CONTINUATION OF TEXT OF PROPOSITION M

must have been attained prior to the closing date for applications for the promotive position as determined by the civil service commission.

Educational promotional credits for purposes of this section shall consist of units of college or university credit awarded in courses relevant to the San Francisco fire service. The relevancy of units of credit and the number of such units applicable to the respective promotive ranks of the fire department shall be initially determined from time to time by a committee which shall be chosen by and serve at the pleasure of the chief of department. The committee shall report its determinations to the fire commission. The fire commission must establish such educational promotional credits as it deems appropriate, subject to the approval of the civil service commission. Said committee shall consist of five members determined as follows:

(1) No less than three of the members of said committee shall be members of a paid fire department of the rank of battalion chief or higher, with no less than two of the three being members of the San Francisco Fire Department;

(2) One committee member shall possess an advanced degree in education and be a member of the faculty of an accredited college or university;

(3) One member of the committee shall be a member of the recognized employee organization for the uniformed firefighters of the fire department nominated by said organization and confirmed by the chief of department;

(j) Educational promotional credits shall be distributed as follows:

For Promotion to All Ranks Below the Rank of Assistant Chief:

Seven per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for possession of an associate of science degree in fire science technology, provided that a majority of the college or university units required for the degree are relevant to the San Francisco fire service to be determined as provided herein, and further that the member also successfully completes all the fire service-related credits for the promotional rank. No member may claim educational promotional credit for such a degree after once having made a claim therefor in a promotional examination in which appointment from the resulting eligible list is secured.

In lieu of the credit allowed for possession of an associate of science degree, five per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for successful completion of all of the fire service-related credits for the rank examined for as determined herein.

In the event less than all the fire service-related credits for the promotive rank are successfully completed by the member, the fire commission, subject to the approval of the civil service commission, shall from time to time provide for proration of educational promotional credits for each fire service-related credit successfully completed to a maximum of two

and one-half per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination.

For Promotion to the Rank of Assistant Chief:

Seven per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for possession of a bachelor of science or arts degree, provided that: (1) a majority of the college or university credits required for the degree are relevant to the fire service as determined herein; and (2) the member also successfully completes all the fire service-related credits for assistant chief as determined herein.

In lieu of the credit allowed for possession of a bachelor of science or arts degree, five per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for successful completion of all of the fire service-related credits for assistant chief as determined herein;

In the event less than all the fire service-related credits for the rank of assistant chief are successfully completed by the member, the fire commission, subject to the approval of the civil service commission, shall from time to time provide for proration of educational promotional credits for each fire service-related credit successfully completed to a maximum of two and one-half per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination.

(k) The maximum per cent of educational promotional credits that may be distributed to a member for any one promotive examination shall not exceed seven per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination. No member may claim educational promotional credit for college, university or fire service-related credits after once having made a claim therefor in a promotive examination in which appointment from the resulting eligible list is secured, except when such credits are included in the curriculum for a degree entitling a member to credit as provided herein.

(l) Educational promotional credits as provided herein shall be allowed on all promotive examinations in the fire department administered after the effective date of this section, as amended; provided, however, that educational promotional credits shall not be allowed for that promotive examination next administered after the effective date of this section, as amended, for promotion to the following ranks or positions: lieutenant; captain; battalion chief; assistant chief; lieutenant, bureau of fire prevention and public safety; lieutenant, bureau of fire investigation; and captain, bureau of fire prevention and public safety.

(m) The committee established herein shall upon formation promptly adopt appropriate rules and procedures for the conduct of its business. The civil service commission may by rule administer the provisions of this section pursuant to the authority granted in Section 3.661.

The effective date of this section as amended herein shall be the first day of the month following ((ratification)) filing of the amendment with the Secretary of State as provided by law.



and LEAGUE of WOMEN VOTERS of SAN FRANCISCO
BLACK WOMEN ORGANIZED for ACTION & PUBLIC MEDIA CENTER

**BRING YOU THE
BEGINNING OF A SAN FRANCISCO TRADITION...**
"Campaign Countdown"

**A SERIES of "LIVE RADIO BROADCASTS" to EDUCATE & INFORM the
SAN FRANCISCO ELECTORATE !!!**

Sun. Oct. 23 6-7 pm District 10 Candidate

Sun. Oct. 23 7-8 pm **ROUND TABLE: "THE ROLE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
IN CITY GOVERNMENT"**

INVITED PARTICIPANTS: PRESIDENT THE BOARD, CLERK OF THE
BOARD, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF S. F., THE BUDGET
ANALYST, CHAIR PEOPLE OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES;
FINANCE; FIRE, SAFETY & POLICE; GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES;
AND URBAN & CONSUMER AFFAIRS COMMITTEES.

Mon. Oct. 24	6-8 pm	Ballot Issues Panel
Tue. Oct. 25	6-8 pm	District 11 Candidates
Wed. Oct. 26	6-8 pm	District 9 Candidates
Thu. Oct. 27	6-8 pm	Ballot Issues Panel
Fri. Oct. 28	6-8 pm	District 8 Candidates
Sat. Oct. 29	6-8 pm	City Attorney Candidates
Sun. Oct. 30	6-8 pm	District 7 Candidates
Mon. Oct. 31	6-8 pm	City Treasurer Candidates
Tue. Nov. 1	6-8 pm	District 6 Candidates
Wed. Nov. 2	6-8 pm	District 5 Candidates
Thu. Nov. 3	6-8 pm	District 4 Candidates
Fri. Nov. 4	6-8 pm	District 3 Candidates
Sat. Nov. 5	6-8 pm	District 2 Candidates
Sun. Nov. 6	6-8 pm	District 1 Candidates
Mon. Nov. 7	6-8 pm	Campaign Recap Panel
Tue. Nov. 8	6 pm until	ELECTION RETURNS

You Can Hear It on 'KPOO RADIO' 89.5 FM

Phone in questions for the Candidates 864-7474 ☆ 864-5766



THE AGONY AND THE ECSTASY

WANTED!

**BY THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OF
SAN FRANCISCO**

**MEN AND WOMEN TO PARTICIPATE IN
GRASS ROOTS DEMOCRACY BY WORKING
ON ELECTION DAY, TUESDAY:**

NOVEMBER 8, 1977

IN NEIGHBORHOOD POLLING PLACES.

 **REWARD:** \$32.50 TO \$42.50
FOR THE DAY.

**HERE IS A CHANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE
WORK OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT.**

**Qualifications: You Must Be A Registered
Voter of San Francisco.**

APPLY ROOM 155, CITY HALL

APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION PARA PAPELETA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

NAME: _____

PRINTED NAME

CON LETRAS DE IMPRENTA

I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election **November 8, 1977**
I expect to be absent from my election precinct on the day of election or unable to vote therein by reason of physical disability or other reason provided by law.

Por la presente solicito una Papeleta de Votante Ausente para la elección señalada en el lado reverso de esta forma.

Espero estar ausente de mi precinto electoral en el día de la elección o no poder votar allí por incapacidad física u otra razón prevista por la ley.

請寄一份缺席選票給本人，以參加此表格後面 所列之選舉。
本人在選舉之日，因故缺席，不能親自參加投票，此乃依法所容者。

BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT: _____

ENVIEME LA PAPELETA A: _____

請將選票寄給本人下址：

Zip Code

Area postal

郵區號碼

Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant

Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco

申請人在舊金山登記選舉之住址：

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE

申請人簽名

Application must be received in the office of the Registrar of Voters no later than the seventh day preceding the day of election.

La solicitud debe recibirse en la oficina del Registrador de Voteros no después del séptimo día antes de la elección.

申請表必須在選舉月七天前寄到選民註冊官辦事處。

12 ☐ I prefer election materials in English
☐ Prefiero materiales electorales en español
☐ 我欲索取中文選舉資料

(DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE) (NO ESCRIBA DEBAJO DE ESTA LINEA) (請勿在此綫下填寫)

Signature and registration verified as correct.

Date _____

Deputy Registrar of Voters

MAIL TO: REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ENVIAR A: ABSENT VOTING SECTION
郵寄至: CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CAL. 94102

This application
must be received
by 5 P.M., November 1, 1977

THOMAS P. KEARNEY
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
155 CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
558-3061
558-3417

DISTRICT NO. 1

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
San Francisco
Calif.
Permit No. 4

Third Class

POSTMASTER: IF UNDELIVERABLE AS ADDRESSED
DO NOT TRANSFER OR FORWARD.

MAILING
ADDRESS



LOCATION OF YOUR
POLLING PLACE

你投票的地方

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 941__

**Aplicacion para papeleta de votante
ausente aparece en la Pagina 95.**

缺席選票申請表刊在第九十五頁

**Application for absentee ballot
appears on Page 95.**