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POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo/ Da/ Yr) ___________________________ Your Signature ___________________________

Print Your First Name ___________________________ MI ______ Print Your Last Name ___________________________

Print Your Residence Address ___________________________

Day Phone _______ -- _______ Eve. Phone _______ -- _______

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: ___________________________

I HAVE a car: _______ (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other: ___________________________

Assigned Precinct: _______ Home Precinct: _______

Affidavit Number: _______ Clerk: _______

E.O. Bk. _______ 6/2 _______ 6/6 _______ Code _______

Reg. Attach.: _______ Initials _______

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); ............... 15-27
2. the location of your polling place ........................................ (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; .................. back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; ................................................. 6
5. information for disabled voters; ................................. 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; ................................................................. 30-31
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; ........................... 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; ......................... 12
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. ................................................................. inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

**STEP 1**

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

第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

**STEP 2**

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

第二步
請確認將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

**STEP 3**

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

第三步
請把帶錘之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

**STEP 4**

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votación.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate.

Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:

- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or

- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don’t find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

POLLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportoinment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
NEW STATE SENATE DISTRICTS

3rd State Senate District

8th State Senate District

OLD STATE SENATE DISTRICTS

3rd State Senate District

8th State Senate District
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries (“The Way It Is Now,” “The Proposal,” “A ‘Yes’ Vote Means,” and “A ‘No’ Vote Means.”) of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee prepares: the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters’ basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

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

Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
( DOES NOT INCLUDE S.F. UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT OR S.F. COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT)

**1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE**
$2.4 BILLION

- **STATE & FEDERAL GRANTS FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (E.G., AIDS PREVENTION, AFDC PAYMENTS)** 30 % $720 MILLION
- **REVENUES GENERATED BY CITY DEPARTMENTS AND USED BY SAME DEPARTMENT (E.G., LANDING FEES PAID BY AIRLINES TO S.F. INT'L. AIRPORT)** 29 % $696 MILLION
- **BUSINESS, SALES & OTHER TAXES & OTHER INCOME** 21 % $504 MILLION
- **PROPERTY TAX** 20 % $480 MILLION

**1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET**
$2.4 BILLION

- **NON-GENERAL FUND REVENUE** 46% $1.1 BILLION
- **OTHER GENERAL FUND REVENUE** 11% $260 MILLION
- **GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUE** 43% $1.03 BILLION

**EXPENDITURES PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES** $1.03 BILLION

- **PUBLIC PROTECTION** 39 % $409 MILLION
- **HEALTH & WELFARE** 31 % $321 MILLION
- **UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION** 11 % $114 MILLION
- **GENERAL ADMINISTRATION** 14 % $146 MILLION
- **RECREATION & CULTURE** 5 % $53 MILLION

This includes only the General Fund subsidy to the Municipal Railway. The total budget for the Municipal Railway is $232 Million, including state and federal grants.

**NOTE:** These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- ADOPT
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- ALTER
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
© 1988 City and County of San Francisco

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m.
Daily
DEMOCRATIC PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
To vote for delegates pledged to a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred.
To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.
To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person’s name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.
To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite “YES” or “NO” for that measure.
All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.
If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

民主黨

選民須知

投票選舉代表擁護選票上所列的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。

投票選舉候選人所列的候選人，在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。如果要選舉超過兩名競選同一職位的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的所有候選人姓名旁邊打孔，但請勿選舉超過要選的候選人的數目。

投票選舉合資選票，請在選票卡的長方形票處的空白處寫上該候選人的姓名和職位。如有不明之處，請向助選員求助。

投票任何一項提案，請用藍色筆尖在提案旁邊的“YES”（贊成）或“NO”（反對）打孔。

如果選票有明顯污損或擦掉痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你投票錯了，或者選票撕廢了，應把選票交還選區的選舉委員，再拿一份新選票。

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO DEMOCRATA

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES
Para votar para los delegados correspondientes a un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido.
Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.
Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.
Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de “SI” o “NO” para dicha medida.
Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca y borrador; esto anularía la balota.
Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y daña la balota; devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請轉下頁。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.

TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>組圖</th>
<th>總統候選人</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>民主黨</td>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN, JR.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>民主黨</td>
<td>LYNDON H. LA ROCHE, JR.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>民主黨</td>
<td>PAUL TSONGAS</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>民主黨</td>
<td>LARRY AGRAN</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>民主黨</td>
<td>BILL CLINTON</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>民主黨</td>
<td>EUGENE J. MC CARTHY</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>民主黨</td>
<td>BOB KERREY</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Ballot**

Consolidated Primary Election, June 2, 1992, City and County of San Francisco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote #</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>MEL LEVINE</td>
<td>United States Congressman</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEO MCCARTHY</td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor, California</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHARLES GREENE</td>
<td>Member, Senior Legislature</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BARBARA BOXER</td>
<td>Congresswoman</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS — PERIODO COMPLETO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States Senator — Full Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS — PERIODO CORTO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States Senator — Short Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAVID KEARNS</td>
<td>Computer Software Designer</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIANNE FEINSTEIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOSEPH M. ALIOTO</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAY DAVIS</td>
<td>Controller of California</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>CANDIDATE</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTIDO DEMOCRATA</strong></td>
<td><strong>STATE SENATOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOM LANTOS</strong>&lt;br&gt;United States Congressman&lt;br&gt;Congresista de los Estados Unidos</td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMOCRATIC PARTY</strong></td>
<td><strong>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</strong></td>
<td><strong>CHARLES GRICE</strong>&lt;br&gt;Nonprofit Organization Director&lt;br&gt;Director de una organización no lucrativa</td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMOCRATIC PARTY</strong></td>
<td><strong>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</strong></td>
<td><strong>JOHN L. BURTON</strong>&lt;br&gt;Assemblyman&lt;br&gt;Asambleísta</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT**

No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito

沒有爭議選本區這一公職
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comité Central del Condado</th>
<th>Member, County Central Committee — 12th District</th>
<th>Vote for no more than 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN RIORDAN</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN FIGONE</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAREN FITZGERALD</td>
<td>State Central Committeewoman / Miembro del Comité Central del Estado</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JAICKS</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATLIN F. CURTIN</td>
<td>Small Businesswoman / Mujer de negocios</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM B. CLARKE</td>
<td>Executive Recruiter / Reclutador ejecutivo</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW DE LA ROSA</td>
<td>Environmental Advocate / Defensor por la protección del medio ambiente</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAINE COLLINS MC BRIDE</td>
<td>Housewife/RN / Ama de casa/Enfermera licenciada</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BYRON MC QUARTERS</td>
<td>Reform Advocate / Defensor por la reforma</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH MILLER</td>
<td>Director, County Committee / Director, Comité del Condado</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>State Committee Member / Miembro del Comité del Estado</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEEANN FRITI</td>
<td>Executive Assistant / Asistente ejecutivo</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIE A. PLAZEWESKI</td>
<td>Legal Assistant / Asistente legal</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAIRE ZVANSKI</td>
<td>Office Worker / Empleado de oficina</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REUBEN DAVID GOODMAN</td>
<td>City Property Appraiser / Tasador de la propiedad de la ciudad</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB GEARY</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WALL</td>
<td>Physics Professor / Profesor de física</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIVIAN WILEY</td>
<td>Business Woman / Mujer de negocios</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY TIMOTHY O'ROURKE</td>
<td>Union Warehouseman / Guardalmacen sindical</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNIE O'CONNOR</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL HARDMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEANNA TERLIN HANEY</td>
<td>Small Businessperson / Persona de negocios</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY ANNE BOUEY</td>
<td>Political Scientist / Científico Político</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRIAN BERMUDEZ, JR.</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXA SMITH</td>
<td>State Central Committeewoman / Miembro del Comité Central del Estado</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT
Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本區在本頁是空白
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</th>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 5</td>
<td>請選一人</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELLEN CHAITIN</strong>&lt;br&gt;Trial Attorney&lt;br&gt;Abogada Litigante 資訊律師</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANET W. FORSYTHE</strong>&lt;br&gt;Deputy Public Defender&lt;br&gt;Abogada de Oficio Delegada 助理公共辯護律師</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 6</td>
<td>請選一人</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BARRY MELTON</strong>&lt;br&gt;Attorney&lt;br&gt;Abogado 律師</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DONNA LITTLE</strong>&lt;br&gt;Judge of the Municipal Court&lt;br&gt;Juez del Tribunal Municipal 市法庭法官</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

152 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.  
YES 185  NO 186

153 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.  
YES 193  NO 194

154 PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.  
YES 203  NO 204
| BALOTA APARTIDARIA | ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas. | 1992年學校設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債十九億元（$ 1,900,000,000），提供資金作建設或改裝公立學校之用。 |
| 185 SI 贊成 | 186 NO 反對 | 152 |
| ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalezcan la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior público deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejorías de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas. | 1992年6月高等教育設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債九億元（$900,000,000），用於興建或改裝加州的公立學院和大學設施。 |
| 193 SI 贊成 | 194 NO 反對 | 153 |
| APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocuren del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas. | 延期徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估值所增實業稅可延期徵收。 |
| 203 SI 贊成 | 204 NO 反對 | 154 |
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A
GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

YES 212
NO 213

B
CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES 218
NO 219

C
CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

YES 222
NO 223

D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

YES 227
NO 228

E
Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

YES 232
NO 233

8E-0-ALL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**212 SI 贊成**
**213 NO 反對**
**217 CA 无派投票**

|  | BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas. | 1992年改良金門公園公債案。發行公債$76,300,000，用於支付金門公園的興建、重建、修復、再造林和整頓，包括供水系統和灌溉，湖和水的流向，公用事業包括街燈和保安照明，修復和整頓公園的面貌，自然美化，包括便利殘障人士使用的廁所。 |

**218 SI 贊成**
**219 NO 反對**

|  | BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma. | 1992年改市政中心公債案。發行公債$26,700,000，用於支付改市政中心廣場和富頓街林蔭人行道，自然美化和市政廳周圍及鄰近地區的街燈。 |

**221 SI 贊成**
**222 NO 反對**

|  | BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asbesto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas. | 1992年改市政中心停車場公債案。發行公債$24,000,000，用於支付改市政中心停車場或在鄰近建築停車場，包括減少石棉和為殘障人士提供方便。 |

**227 SI 贊成**
**228 NO 反對**

|  | BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente. | 1992年改市政中心保溫系統公債案。發行公債$21,200,000，用於支付興建或重建市政中心地區內的保溫系統，包括管道和熱水系統。 |

**232 SI 贊成**
**233 NO 反對**

|  | ¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública? | 應否規定市政府每年撥出一定比例的普通基金，連续十二年（1993—2005），只用於特定的基础工程，如興建、保養和購置市府大樓和其他公共物業？ |

---

**8F-0-ALL**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services,</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service rules?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>departments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
### SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>舊金山市、縣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td>聯合初選 一九九二年六月二日</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO</td>
<td>提交選民投票表決的市、縣提案</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|  |
|---|---|
| 237 SI 赞成 | 県幹事的職責和人事應否從高級法庭幹事調到政府服務部，並在市首席行政官的監督下任職？ |
| 238 NO 反对 |  |

|  |
|---|---|
| 241 SI 赞成 | 市動物園獸醫主醫師應否由康樂與公園管理局局長委任，但須經康樂與公園委員會批准，而不在公務條例管轄下任職？ |
| 242 NO 反对 |  |

|  |
|---|---|
| 245 SI 赞成 | 市採購官應否不必為市政府其他部門管理所有物資、補給和器材的存貨，而交由市各部門自行負責管理這些存貨？ |
| 246 NO 反对 |  |

|  |
|---|---|
| 248 SI 赞成 | 支持把加州劃分為北加州和南加州應否成為舊金山市縣人民的政策？ |
| 249 NO 反对 |  |

|  |
|---|---|
| 252 SI 赞成 | 如果加州劃分為北加州和南加州，舊金山則屬於北加州版圖，這應否成為舊金山市縣人民的政策？ |
| 253 NO 反对 |  |

---

**FIN DE LA BALOTA**

票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE, OFFICE #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
• 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
• Hastings Law School graduate
• Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
• Delinquency Prevention Commissioner (1985 – 1987)
• Volunteer Attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
• Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
• Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:

SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficey, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy von Beroldingen, Joseph Desmond

RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola

10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPeaker Willie Brown
Senator Milton Marks

ASSASSOR Richard Hongisto
SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebeim, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlotta del Portillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni
BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick
COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblentz, Louis Chan, Paul Womam, Sue Bierman

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
• Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
• In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.
• It’s time to make history!
• I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
• Honors graduate — George Washington University.
• Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
• Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s Office.
• “Barrister of the Year” — 1988.
• Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
• Coro Foundation Fellow.
• American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
• Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.

As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.

I will also be a role model for our young men and women.

My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoogasiun; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melcito Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brasington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe

Ellen Chaitin
DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are:
   As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair
   and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all
   citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the
   California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the
   California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim
   Services and Chairperson of the California Workers’ Compensation
   Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and
   Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts
   to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a
   forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of
   California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California
   Women’s History Month Cavalcade of Women.
My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assembly-
person Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor
Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley;
Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dear-
man; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge
David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge
Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge
Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District
Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local
38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul
Varacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years
My qualifications for office are:
   Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a
   musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our
   community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to demo-
   cratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my
   candidacy:
   • Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
   • Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive
     criminal trial experience.
   • Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
   • Named an “Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service” by Bar
     Association.
   • Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar
     Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
   • Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality.
As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now
you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennesey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan,
Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins,
Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom,
Alicia Wang

Barry Melton
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

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

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":

1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments", which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park’s electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park’s public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park’s irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $76,300,000
- Bond interest: $53,791,500
- Debt service requirement: $130,091,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of citylife for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park’s one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park’s infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park’s basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park’s infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park’s water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and resealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills!

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE “NO” ON “A,” “B,” “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member

Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!
STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that "San Francisco deserves better".
"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area’s open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space
Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dierauf, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco’s Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City’s neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it’s necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O’Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Ezquerro, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco’s most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park’s infrastructure, preserving the park’s safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

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

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

San Francisco’s elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carlota del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park’s forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schmel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Grego, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burkes, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let’s bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City's economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nothenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Cartier*
Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quaranta, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Kile Osier, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP’S, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lilienthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Bieman
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwenn Craig
Kelly Cullen
Susanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Rola Giford
Louis J. Giraudo
Richard Grossboll
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaicks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kalil
Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Reverend John and Donneter E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Otto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sululagi Palega
Lois Pavlov
Marine H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell- Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Saslafsky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomata N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Maillard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinkhon

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

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combating AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loveliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women’s Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco’s park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Millet, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park’s trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court’s decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park’s aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city’s infrastructure are supposed to come from the city’s general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city’s infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it’s free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you’ll see that these things aren’t free. It’s City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven’t been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It’s telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — “No New Taxes.” But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don’t tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you’ll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or how about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You’ll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you’ll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION B, PROPOSITION C AND PROPOSITION D

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REICTING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; DEFING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park facilities, landscaping, operations including disabled access thereof and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of elections for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting.

(Continued on next page)
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto."

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system."

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto."

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

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

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

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

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.
PROPOSITION B
CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City’s current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$26,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Interest</td>
<td>18,923,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$45,523,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.0044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPOSEكهرباء ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of. Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSEitates ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we're in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions "A," "B," "C," and "D"?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it's $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year's bills?

Remember, that's how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE "NO" ON "A," "B," "C" AND "D"!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.
To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!!
STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that "San Francisco deserves better".
"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maier.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Franciscan’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!

Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Pessell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.

Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

VOTE YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Siern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Song
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's Civic Center, which should symbolize our city's beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtle
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

Proposition B will make San Francisco's Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city's traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne
City Attorney

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

Milton Marks
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco’s heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings. Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood. Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city’s needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B. Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According to the Controller’s statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote No on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let’s get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.
A pretty picture is not a guarantee.
Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer’s Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children’s playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall’s delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush? Let’s see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSITION C

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $24,000,000
- Bond interest: 16,920,500
- Debt service requirement: 40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.0040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
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PROPOSITION'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square.

It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.

Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSITION'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT "cure parking headaches" in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City's bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City's Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What's more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can't, the garage shouldn't be built. We believe the City's General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn't be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area.

This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

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

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote Yes on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.
Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Song
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage - underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner
David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works
Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager
Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers' funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That's why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can't you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We're here asked to "incure a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage" to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C's high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $53,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that's just for the garage — it doesn't include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR'S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board's esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board's decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don't we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a "white elephant". Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board's budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco's Transi First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city's residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let's not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let's logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco’s revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.
Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
**TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD**

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where:</th>
<th>Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th &amp; Lawton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mar 7 Basic</th>
<th>June 13 Advanced</th>
<th>Sept 12 Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 28 Basic</td>
<td>June 27 Worm</td>
<td>Sept 26 Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11 Advanced</td>
<td>July 18 Basic</td>
<td>Oct 10 Worm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 25 Worm</td>
<td>July 25 Basic</td>
<td>Oct 24 Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9 Basic</td>
<td>Aug 1 Advanced</td>
<td>Nov 7 Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23 Basic</td>
<td>Aug 22 Worm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLUG Compost Hotline-468-0262 • Recycling Hotline-554-6193
Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

---

**Find Yourself a Best Friend**

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPOSITION D

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption $21,220,000
- Bond interest $14,360,100
- Debt service requirement $36,180,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
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PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than "a hot water system."

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.

Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system. Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!
The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.

ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!
Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D.
Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.

VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition D will replace the Civic Center's antiquated, wasteful steam heating plant with a modern, energy-efficient system.
By passing Proposition D, we will save an estimated $750,000 in energy costs every year.
Proposition D makes financial and environmental sense. Join us in voting YES on Proposition D.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Milton Marks
State Senator
Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assembly Speaker

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.
San Francisco's Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that's consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.
The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.
VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.
Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.
Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D
The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a "new" hot water heating system at Civic Center.
Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?
This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

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

PROPOSITION E
Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, "capital projects" includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current City services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.
NO: Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

PROPOSEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City's General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City's buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That's clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor's recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor's recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What's wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials' power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco's other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That's not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

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

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children's Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans' needs.

This time we're asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawn mowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing.

Do you believe that? We don't!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT'S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with “lawn mowers” as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 relating to annual mandated levels of funds for protection and maintenance of the City's infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county of adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each budget and annual appropriation ordinance, through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount (CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages specified below for the identified years of General Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:
Fiscal Year 1993/1994 1.5%
Fiscal Year 1994/1995 2.0%
Fiscal Years 1995/1996 through 2003/2004 2.5%
Fiscal Year 2004/2005 1.5%

For the purpose of this section the term "general fund revenue sources" shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereon belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1. In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

2. In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City's then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.

☐
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner’s Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and a deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner’s office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of scale inspectors and measurements as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county’s convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1992 four or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be and are hereby placed under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court, provided, however, that any person who holds civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption of the electorate of the amendment adding this paragraph to the charter shall continue to have civil service status in said position under the civil service provisions of the charter.
PROPOSITION F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk's office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller's Statement on "F"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator's Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION “F”
Proposition “F” makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder’s Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk’s and Recorder’s Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk’s Office to the County Recorder’s Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

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

No Opponent’s Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
Chief Zoo Veterinarian

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to chose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of "G" miss the point: This measure isn’t about health care for zoo animals, IT’S ABOUT PATRONAGE, HIRING!
In order to create "flexibility" in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to "exempt" that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That’s patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards.
If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians’ appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE "NO" ON "G"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"G" is "GREEDY"!

Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.

And that's what "G" is about: Political Patronage!

Every time a position is "exempted" from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.

Surprised?

You shouldn't be!

"G" was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!

Say "NO" to patronage hiring!
Say "No" To "G"!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!
Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the "friends" that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives
The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City's many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROponent's argument in favor of proposition H

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments' operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which "own" the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing's inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

Rebuttal to proponent's argument in favor of proposition H

Of course not! They're too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as "H".

Send City Hall a message that you're tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C", "D", "G", "H", "I" and "J"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"H" is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee "on the take."
"H" would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!
Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That's right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition "H".
VOTE "NO" ON "H"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Ario H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H's opponents want City government to be cumbersome.
In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.
If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller's Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.
The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors'

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in cases of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section.

The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

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

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California’s government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That’s the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn’t make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That’s not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your “YES” vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We’ll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won’t move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn’t get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state’s economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting).

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa
Dividing California into Two States

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese...

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California's ecological concerns are better addressed by our unified state policy. Northern California's voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state's beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON'T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren't interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don't they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California's counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn't San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn't our right to express our opinion worth that much?

Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher
Dividing California into Two States

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There’s no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn’t even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won’t solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It’s enough to make Jimmy Gonzales’ mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a “substantial, but presently indeterminable amount”.

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that state government should “interact” in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There’s no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It’s sad that some people feel the answer to California’s problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Save the spotted owl!
Don’t let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heroes Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn’t support California’s breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California’s problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don’t double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Kopp's Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors' proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless "advisory" trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn't even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than "hype" or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978. This measure supposedly creates "city policy". Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters opposed the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it's an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers' time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

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

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A
DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUAL-
IFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN
ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON
JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUES-
TION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALI-
FORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CAL-
IFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA
BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of
Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108,
sets forth the following declaration of policy to
be submitted to the qualified electors of the City
and County of San Francisco at an election to be
held on June 2, 1992:
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of
San Francisco to support dividing the State of
California into two states, consisting of a north-
ern California state and a southern California
state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A
DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUAL-
IFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN
ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON
JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUES-
TION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE
OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED
INTO TWO STATES.
BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of
Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108,
sets forth the following declaration of policy to
be submitted to the qualified electors of the City
and County of San Francisco at an election to be
held on June 2, 1992:
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of
San Francisco, in the event the State of California
were divided into a northern California state and
a southern California state, for San Francisco to
be part of the northern California state?
PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

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

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alito.
PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a “state-back” guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let’s keep San Francisco in northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote “YES” on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don’t let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don’t speak of “Northern California Girl” or “Hotel Southern California.”

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN’T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on 1 and J!

Committee Against The “State-Split” Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

"J" IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.
Proposition "J" asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.
Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of "Northern California" Those who want a "Northern California" state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!
To vote "YES" on Proposition "J" is to say you think this backwoods "state-splitting" scheme is o.k.
Tell City Hall you're tired of the jokes like Proposition "J" the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.
Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.
Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!
VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE "STATE-SPLIT" JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!

What Proposition "J" really asks is, "If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?"
In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?
California will only continue to grow! It's a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.
San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don't let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

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

Don’t be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn’t even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it’s spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you’re elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members’ minds?

VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.

Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!

San Francisco Curbside Recycling
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

____________________________________
____________________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
**ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election**

Sign this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

---

**Check One:**
- [ ] Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
- [ ] I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

**P.O. Box or Street Address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Check Here If Appropriate:**
- [ ] I have moved since I last registered to vote.
  - My new address is printed below. (Residence Address ONLY.)

**Number and Street Name**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO, CA</th>
<th>Apt. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 4 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Check below all that apply, then sign your name:**
- [ ] I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- [ ] I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- [ ] All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish, Chinese.

You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

**Your signature - DO NOT PRINT**

**Date Signed**

**Day Time Phone**

**Evening Phone**
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet
and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q'Wong, Registrar of Voters
Lowell Workers Needed

Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9:10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

Registrar of Voters - Poll Worker Application

I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr)

Your Signature

Print Your First Name

Print Your Last Name

Print Your Residence Address

Zip Code

Day Phone -- Eve. Phone --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

Assigned Precinct:

Home Precinct:

Affidavit Number:

Clerk:

Inspector:

E.O. Bk. 6/2 6/6 Code

Reg. Attach. Init's

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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# PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); ........................................... 15-27
2. the location of your polling place ........................................... (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; ........................................... back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; ....................................................... 6
5. information for disabled voters; ............................................ 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; ....................................................... 30-31
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; ....................................................... 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; ....................................................... 12
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. ....................................................... inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

STEP 1

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

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

第一步
请双手持票向自动梭将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

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

第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合于二红点之上。

STEP 3

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

第三步
请把选票之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之后，把选票取出，沿虚线割起选票交还选举站监票员。

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votacion.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

________________________________________________________

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.

5
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate.

Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:

• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don’t find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

---

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
NEW BART DISTRICTS

8th Bart District

9th Bart District

7th Bart District

OLD BART DISTRICTS

9th Bart District

8th Bart District

7th Bart District
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries (“The Way It Is Now,” “The Proposal,” “A ‘Yes’ Vote Means,” and “A ‘No’ Vote Means.”) of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee prepares: the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters’ basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

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

Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
### 1991-92 Estimated Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Federal Grants for Specific Programs</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$720 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., AIDS Prevention, AFDC Payments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues generated by City Departments and</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$656 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used by Same Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., Landing Fees paid by Airlines to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.F. Int’l Airport)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Sales &amp; Other Taxes &amp; Other</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$504 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$480 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Revenue:** $2.4 Billion

### 1991-92 Estimated Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$1.1 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$260 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Regular Revenue</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$1.03 Billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Budget:** $2.4 Billion

### Expenditures

- **Portion of Property Tax:** (Approx. 8.45%) Used to Repay General Obligation Bonds

**Total Expenditures Paid from General Fund Regular Revenues:** $1.03 Billion

- **Public Protection:** 39%  
  - $409 Million
- **Health & Welfare:** 31%  
  - $321 Million
- **Utilities & Transportation:** 11%  
  - $114 Million
- **General Administration:** 14%  
  - $146 Million

**Recreation & Culture**

This includes only the General Fund subsidy to the Municipal Railway. The total budget for the Municipal Railway is $282 Million, including state and federal grants.

**Portion of General Fund Regular Revenue which would be allocated to the Infrastructure Fund if Prop E Passes (1.5% in first year).**

**NOTE:** These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- ADOPT
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- ALTER
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- ACCEPT
  RESPONSIBILITY
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
©1990 City and County of San Francisco

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m.
Daily
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DEMOCRATIC PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
To vote for delegates pledged to a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred.

To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person’s name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite “YES” or “NO” for that measure.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

民主黨

選民須知

投票選舉代表選舉票上所列的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。

投票選舉上所列的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。如果要選舉超過兩名候選同一官職的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的所有候選人姓名旁邊打孔，但請勿選舉超過要選的候選人的數目。

投票選舉合格寫入候選人，請在選票卡的長方形票尾的空白上寫上該候選人的姓名和官職。如有不明之處，請向助選員求助。

投票任何一項提案，請用藍色筆尖在提案旁邊的“YES”（贊成）或“NO”（反對）打孔。

如果選票有明顯污痕或擦掉痕迹，選票即作廢。

如果你投票錯了，或者選票撕破了，應把選票交回選區的選舉委員，再拿一份新選票。

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO DEMOCRATA

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES

Para votar para los delegados correspondientes a un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón ázul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido.

Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón ázul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón ázul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.

Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.

Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón ázul para perforar el orificio a lado de “SI” o “NO” para dicha medida.

Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca y borradora; esto anularía la balota.

Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請轉下頁。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.

TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>美國總統</th>
<th>總統優先選舉權</th>
<th>總統優先選舉權</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>總統優先選舉權</td>
<td>PREFERENCIA PRESIDENCIAL</td>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYNDON H. LAROCHE, JR.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL TSONGAS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY AGRAN</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL CLINTON</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE J. MC CARTHY</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB KERREY</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN, JR.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SAMPLE BALLOT

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

## UNITED STATES SENATOR

### SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS — PERIODO COMPLETO

**Leo M. Carthy**  
Lieutenant Governor, California  
Vicegobernador, California 加州副州長

**Charles Greene**  
Member, Senior Legislature  
Miembro, Legislatura Mayor 資深議員

**Barbara Boxer**  
Congresswoman  
Congresista 國會女議員

**Mel Levine**  
United States Congressman  
Congresista de los Estados Unidos 美國國會議員

### SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS — PERIODO CORTO

**Dianne Feinstein**

**Joseph M. Alioto**  
Attorney  
Abogado 律師

**Gray Davis**  
Controller of California  
Contralor de California 加州審計官

**David Kearns**  
Computer Software Designer  
Diseñador de software para computadoras 計算機軟件設計員
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress - 8th District</td>
<td>NANCY PELOSI</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator - 3rd District</td>
<td>MILTON MARKS</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Assembly - 13th District</td>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker, California Assembly</td>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 13
**Member, County Central Committee — 13th District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEW J. ROTHSCHILD</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney/City Commissioner / Abogado/Comisionado de la Ciudad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD ALLMAN</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Advocate / Defensor de Viviendas Economicas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY JOHNSON</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activist / Activista 活動家</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD COLTHIRST</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Aide / Activist / Asistente Legislativo / Activista 立法助理 / 活動家</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DINO DI DONATO</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Planner Advocate / Defensor de Planificacion Comunitaria 社区计划倡导者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIA MARTINEZ</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement Counselor / Consejero de Empleo 职业顾问</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIGDEN</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE MILLBURN</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed / Desocupado 失业者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE RACHEL KATZ</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent / Titular 现任者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER GABEL</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College President / Presidente de la Universidad 大学校长</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. BRUCE WINDREM</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Activist / Activista del Vecindario 街坊活动家</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELTON JOEL WILLIAMS</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Court Administrator / Administrador del Tribunal Jubilado 退休法庭行政员</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CONTEST CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE**

There are 27 candidates listed on pages 4 and 5. You may vote for no more than 12 of the candidates listed on the two pages.

**LA CONTIENDA CONTINUA EN LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE**

Hay 27 candidatos enumerados en las páginas 4 y 5. Puede votar por no más de 12 de los candidatos enumerados en estas páginas.

---

4-1-3
| JOHN HUNT | Musician | 131 |
| RICK HAUPTMAN | Commission Vice President / Vicepresidente de la comisión | 132 |
| KATHRYN (KAY) BURKE | Administrator / Administradora | 133 |
| ROBERT BARNES | Incumbent / Titular | 134 |
| ROBERT J. BOILEAU | Union Research Director / Director de investigaciones sindicales | 135 |
| NATALIE BERG | Incumbent / Titular | 136 |
| SUSAN J. BIERMAN | Incumbent / Titular | 137 |
| JESSE J. IVY | Deputy Sheriff, Bailiff / Sheriff delegado, Alguacil | 138 |
| JAMES STEVENS | | 139 |
| ORELIA LANGSTON | Urban Consultant / Consultora urbana | 140 |
| JAMES LEGARE | | 141 |
| IRIT LEVI | R.N. MFCC / Enfermera licenciada, MFCC | 142 |
| MATTHEW NOAH TUCHOW | Attorney-at-Law / Abogado | 143 |
# SAMPLE BALLOT

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

## NONPARTISAN BALLOT

### BALOTA APARTIDARIA

**JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 5**

**Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Attorney Abogada Litigante 律师</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET W. FORSYTHE</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Public Defender Abogada de Oficio Delegada 助理公共辯護律師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 6**

**Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARRY MELTON</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney Abogado 律師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA LITTLE</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court Juez del Tribunal Municipal 市法庭法官</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6-0-ALL**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>School Facilities Bond Act of 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>YES 185</td>
<td>NO 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of June 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well-trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.</td>
<td>YES 193</td>
<td>NO 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Property Tax Postponement Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.</td>
<td>YES 203</td>
<td>NO 204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</th>
<th>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185 SI 贊成</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186 NO 反对</td>
<td></td>
<td>1992年学校设施公债法案。本提案授权发行公债十九亿元（$1,900,000,000），提供资金作建设或改良公立学校之用。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193 SI 贊成</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALLACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalecerán la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejorías de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194 NO 反对</td>
<td></td>
<td>1992年6月高等教育设施公债法案。本提案授权发行公债九亿元（$900,000,000），用于新建或改良加州的公立学院和大学设施。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 SI 贊成</td>
<td></td>
<td>APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocuren del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204 NO 反对</td>
<td></td>
<td>延期征收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估值所增實業稅可延期徵收。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fiscal Impact:** This measure could result in costs of millions of dollars annually both for local governments and the state when the owners of homes postpay their taxes to the property. These costs will eventually be recouped, when the participating owners sell their homes.
GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

YES 212
NO 213

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES 218
NO 219

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

YES 222
NO 223

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

YES 227
NO 228

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

YES 232
NO 233
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforzamiento y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.

1992年改良金門公園公債法案。發行公債$76,300,000，用於支付金門公園的興建、重建、修復、再造林和整頓，包括供水系統和灌溉，湖和水的流向，公用事業包括街燈和保安照明，修復和整頓公園的面貌，自然美化，包括便利殘障人士使用的廁所。

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.

1992年改良市政中心公債法案。發行公債$26,700,000，用於支付改良市政中心廣場和富頓街林藝人行道，自然美化和市政總周圍及鄰近地區的街燈。

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asbesto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.

1992年改良市政中心停車場公債法案。發行公債$24,000,000，用於支付擴建市政中心停車場或在鄰近建築停車場，包括減少石棉和為殘障人士提供方便。

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de calderas de agua caliente.

1992年改良市政中心保暖系統公債法案。發行公債$21,200,000，用於支付興建或重建市政中心地區內的保暖系統，包括管道和熱水系統。

¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?

應否規定市政府每年撥出一定比例的普通基金，連織十二年（1993—2005），只用於特定的基礎工程，如興建、保養和購置市府大樓和其他公共物業？
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>無黨派選票</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td>聯合初選</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO</td>
<td>一九九二年六月二日</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 237 SÍ 贊成 | 縣幹事的職責和人事應否從高級法官席行政官的監督下任職？ |
| 238 NO 反對 | 庭幹事調到政府服務部，並在市首 |

| 241 SÍ 贊成 | 市動物園獸醫主醫師應否由市立動物園管理局局長委任，但須經市立 |
| 242 NO 反對 | 動物園委員會批准，而不作公務條 |

| 245 SÍ 贊成 | 市採購官應否不必為市政府其他部門管理所有物資、補給和器材的存 |
| 246 NO 反對 | 貨，而交由市各部門自行負責管理 |

| 248 SÍ 贊成 | 支持把加州劃分為北加州和南加州 |
| 249 NO 反對 | 應否改為舊金山市縣人民的政策？ |

| 252 SÍ 贊成 | 如果加州劃分為北加州和南加州， |
| 253 NO 反對 | 舊金山則屬於北加州版圖，這應否 |

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
- 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
- Hastings Law School graduate
- Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
- Volunteer Attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
- Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
- Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:

SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficy, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Eriola

10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPEAKER Willie Brown

SENATOR Milton Marks

ASSSESSOR Richard Hongisto
SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebeim, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlota delPortillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni

BART DIRECTOR Mike Bemick
COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblenz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Bierman

Ellen Chaitin

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
- Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
- In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.

It’s time to make history!
I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
- Honors graduate — George Washington University.
- Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
- Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s Office.
- Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
- Coro Foundation Fellow.
- American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
- Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.

As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.

I will also be a role model for our young men and women.

My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoogasan; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadle Redd; Melcicio Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brasington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe

Ellen Chaitin
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #6

DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are:
As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women’s History Month Cavalcade of Women.
My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varecalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years
My qualifications for office are:
Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:
• Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
• Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
• Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
• Named an “Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service” by Bar Association.
• Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
• Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality. As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Porillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Barry Melton

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

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

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or
   the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artifical lakes that are leaking. The Park’s electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park’s public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park’s irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption $76,300,000
- Bond interest $53,791,500
- Debt service requirement $130,091,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of city life for families, neighbors, and communities from all over the City. Within the Park’s one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park’s infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park’s basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park’s infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park’s water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and resealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to rebuild Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills?

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

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

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years.
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!
STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.
“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area’s open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space
Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Brayner, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society
Edward Dierauf, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco’s Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City’s neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it’s necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eckman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O’Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Esquerrro, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco’s most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park’s infrastructure, preserving the park’s safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

San Francisco's elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Senate
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carlota del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park's forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burke, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let's bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38

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

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City’s economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nothenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehrman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Cartier*
Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quarania, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Kile Oster, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP’S, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lilienthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Bierman
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwenn Craig
Kelty Cullen
Susanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Rotea Gifford
Louis J. Giraudo
Richard Grossboll
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaacks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kall
Tony Kihroy
Jean Kortum

Reverend John and Donneter E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Otto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sulalagi Palega
Lois Pavlov
Marianne H. Peterson
David Phipel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Saslafooky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomata R. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinkhon
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combatting AIDS.

**Isabel Wade**, AIDS Memorial Grove  
**John E. Yarling**, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors  
**Wayne April**, Dignity AIDS Support Group  
**David Jonson**, Coming Home Organization  
**Rick Salinas**, AIDS Emergency Fund  

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

**Art Agnos**  
**Dianne Feinstein**  
**Joseph L. Alioto**  
**George Christopher**  

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loneliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

**Impala Women’s Racing Team**

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco’s park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

**Jim Rhoads**  
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council  
**Carole Isaacs**, President  
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association  
**Carol Glossenger**  
Cole Valley Improvement Association  
**Jim Lazarus**  
Planning Association for the Richmond  
**Richard Millet**, President  
Potrero Hill Boosters Club  
**Midge Wilson**  
Tenderloin Network of Family Services  
**Kelly Cullen**  
Tenderloin Youth Advocates  
**Edward Spivak**  
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association  
**Carol Kocivar**, President  
West of Twin Peaks Central Council  

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park’s trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

**Donald D. Doyle**  
President  
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court’s decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park’s aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city’s infrastructure are supposed to come from the city’s general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city’s infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it’s free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you’ll see that these things aren’t free. It’s City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven’t been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It’s telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — “No New Taxes.” But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don’t tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you’ll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or how about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You’ll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you’ll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO-WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT, THE EX/emotion, THE CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION TO THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; STIPULATING THE DATE OF THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION;

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbesto abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water supply system and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of elections for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting.

(Continued on next page)"
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system."

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto."

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

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

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

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

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said City and County and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

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

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES ⇄ NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City’s current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $26,700,000
- Bond interest: $18,823,500
- Debt service requirement: $45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.0044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of. Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills?

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C" AND "D"

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!
STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.
“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Franciscan’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!

Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.
As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.

Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

San Francisco's Civic Center, which should symbolize our city's beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thecla Shelley
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bachtel
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

San Francisco's Civic Center, which should symbolize our city's beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

James Haas
Chair, Civic Pride

Carolyn Diamond
Executive Director, Greater Market Street Development Association

Robert Freese
President, San Francisco Beautiful

Proposition B will make San Francisco's Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city's traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne
City Attorney

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

Milton Marks
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco's heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vial for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city’s needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According the the Controller’s statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote No on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let’s get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer’s Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children’s playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall’s delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush? Let’s see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSITION C
CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "C"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $24,000,000
- Bond interest: $16,920,500
- Debt service requirement: $40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.0040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.
Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.

Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City’s Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help

Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area. This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote YES on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kilil
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night. Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center. Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner
David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works
Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager
Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center. Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers’ funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The City says about $65,000. That’s why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garages by 370 stalls.

Can’t you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We’re here asked to “incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garages” to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But City administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C’s high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $53,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that’s just for the garage — it doesn’t include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS’ BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDoggle!

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDoggle

At the last possible moment, the Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board’s esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board’s decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don’t we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a “white elephant”. Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board’s budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco’s Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city’s residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let’s not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let’s logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
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**TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD**

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

**Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)**

**Where:** Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)

**Cost:** Free

**Time:** Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Workshop Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Workshop Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 7</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Sept 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 28</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>June 27</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>Sept 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>July 18</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 25</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Oct 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Aug 1</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Nov 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Aug 22</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SLUG Compost Rollin—468-0262 • Recycling Hotline—554-6193**

Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

---

**Find Yourself a Best Friend**

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPOSITION D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $21,220,000
- Bond interest: 14,980,100
- Debt service requirement: $36,186,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPOSEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY
AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main

Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department,
City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.
Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and
maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.
Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez,
Hallinan, Hsieh, Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than "a hot water system."

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
Civic Center
Heating System Bonds

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall! You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

 Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.

Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system.

Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Civic Center
Heating System Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!
The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually. ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS! Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

...Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D. Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs. VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings. San Francisco’s Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that’s consistent with financial and ecological responsibility. The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.

VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently. Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.

Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D
The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a “new” hot water heating system at Civic Center. Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?
This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

YES ☐ ☐ NO ☐ ☐

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, "capital projects" includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current city services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.

NO: Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
PROPONEENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City’s General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City’s buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOINEENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That’s clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor’s recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor’s recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What’s wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straitjacketing of our elected officials’ power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco’s other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That’s not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

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

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children’s Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans’ needs.

This time we’re asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawn mowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don’t!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT’S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with “lawn mowers” as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
Infrastructure Fund

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition E

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President

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

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 relating to annual mandated levels of funds for protection and maintenance of the City's infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county of adding Section 6.209 to read as follows: NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each budget and annual appropriation ordinance, through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount (CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages specified below for the identified years of General Fund Regular Revenue sources:

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993/1994</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/1995</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/1996</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2005</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this section the term "general fund revenue sources" shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereon belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1. In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

2. In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City's then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services. Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner’s Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter by mutual agreement.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner’s office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county’s convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The power and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be and hereafter placed under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court. Provided however, that any person who holds civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption by the electorate of the amendment adding this paragraph to the charter shall continue to have civil service status in said position, under the civil service provisions of the charter.
PROPOSITION F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk's office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller's Statement on "F"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator's Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "F"
Proposition "F" makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder's Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.
The Proposition will place both the Clerk's and Recorder's Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk's Office to the County Recorder's Office.
The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor
This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent's Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:
Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not increase the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to choose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of “G” miss the point: This measure isn’t about health care for zoo animals, IT’S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create “flexibility” in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to “exempt” that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That’s patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards.

If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians’ appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified? VOTE “NO” ON “G”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"G" is "GREEDY"!

Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.

And that's what "G" is about: Political Patronage!

Every time a position is "exempted" from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.

Surprised?

You shouldn't be!

"G" was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!

Say "NO" to patronage hiring!

Say "No" To "G"!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember

Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!

Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the "friends" that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives
The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29c stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
PROPOSITION H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City’s many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments’ operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which “own” the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing’s inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of “H” is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect “savings” like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, “H” would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser’s office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out!

Of course not! They’re too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as “H”.

Send City Hall a message that you’re tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.


CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

“H” is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee “on the take.”

“H” would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!

Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That’s right!

But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition "H".
VOTE “NO” ON “H”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H’s opponents want City government to be cumbersome.

In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.

If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller’s Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.

The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section.

The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report the same to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

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

Controller’s Statement on “I”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts."

How Supervisors Voted on “I”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Dividing California into Two States

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California’s government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That’s the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn’t make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That’s not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians. Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your “YES” vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We’ll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won’t move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn’t get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state’s economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting).

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

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

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese... A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California’s ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California’s voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Puting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON’T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren’t interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don’t they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California’s counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn’t San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 30,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn’t our right to express our opinion worth that much?

Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DIVIDING CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Save the spotted owl!
Don't let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heroes Fremont, Stanford, and
General Sherman wouldn't support California's breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be
solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create
more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don't double the size of state government. Vote No on Propo-
sition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

There's no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot.
A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is
so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn't even
submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is
irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces
won't solve any problem facing California. Even if San Francisc-
cans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which
holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible
at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the
payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It's enough to
make Jimmy Gonzales' mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon
themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a
frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost
San Francisco taxpayers a "substantial, but presently indetermi-
nable amount".

The proponent of the measure argues that State government
should be more personalized, that State government should "in-
teract" in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators
represent more constituents than representatives in the US Con-
gress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board
of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives
and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If
supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they
mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Super-
visors.

There's no reason to believe that two governors and two more
Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It's sad that
some people feel the answer to California's problems lie in the
creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I
see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Kopp’s Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors’ proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless “advisory” trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn’t even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than “hype” or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates “city policy”. Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it’s an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers’ time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan
TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION I

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

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

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION J IS ON PAGE 82.
San Francisco in Northern California

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a “state-back” guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let's keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote “YES” on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don't let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don't speak of "Northern California Girl" or "Hotel Southern California."

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN'T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The "State-Split" Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"J" IS A JOKE!

A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.

Proposition "J" asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.

Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of "Northern California" Those who want a "Northern California" state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!

To vote "YES" on Proposition "J" is to say you think this backwoods "state-splitting" scheme is o.k.

Tell City Hall you're tired of the jokes like Proposition "J" the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.

Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.

Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE "STATE-SPLIT" JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!

What Proposition "J" really asks is, "If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?"

In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?

California will only continue to grow! It's a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.

San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don't let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Don't be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn't even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it’s spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you're elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members' minds?

VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.

Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
**POLLING PLACE CARD:** To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. **The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.**

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to **SIGN** your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

____________________________
____________________________
____________________________

Germaine Q Wong  
San Francisco Registrar of Voters  
Room 158 -- City Hall  
400 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554 - 4375

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot Type</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Precincts Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9213</td>
<td>13th Assembly District</td>
<td>3000's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Senate District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th Congressional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place. The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

Vote-By-Mail Voters --- Cut or Tear Along Perforated Line

Do Not Remove Label

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election

Sign this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

Check One:

☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address

City State Zip Code

Check Here If Appropriate:

☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote.
☐ My new address is printed below.

(Residence Address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 941

☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish ___. Chinese ___

Check below all that apply, then sign your name:

☐ You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

Your signature - DO NOT PRINT

Date Signed

Day Time Phone

Evening Phone
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION
I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr) Your Signature

Print Your First Name MI Print Your Last Name

Print Your Residence Address Zip Code

Day Phone -- Eve. Phone --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

---------------------------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ----------------------------

Assigned Precinct: Home Precinct:

Affidavit Number: Clerk: Inspector:

E.O. Bk. 6/2 6/6 Code Reg. Attach. Init's

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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### PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); ................................................. Page 15-27
2. the location of your polling place .................................................. Page
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; ........................................ Page back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; ....................................................... Page 6
5. information for disabled voters; .................................................. Page 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; .................................................. Page 30-31
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .................................................. Page 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; .................................................. Page 12
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting; .................................................. inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

STEP 1

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

第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

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

第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，應合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

第三步
請把帶錘之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。

STEP 4

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votacion.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4575 to let them know the polling place is not open.

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate.

Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:
• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don't find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party's candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as "independent" or "non-partisan" voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

---

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
NEW STATE SENATE DISTRICTS

8th State Senate District

3rd State Senate District

OLD STATE SENATE DISTRICTS

3rd State Senate District

8th State Senate District
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

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

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

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Bialock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, Jim Stevens and Molly Wood.
Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.
Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(Does not include S.F. Unified School District or
S.F. Community College District)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Federal Grants: For Specific Programs</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$720 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., AIDS Prevention, AFDC Payments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues Generated by City Departments and Used by Same Department</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$696 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., Landing Fees Paid by Airlines to S.F. Int'l. Airport)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Sales &amp; Other Taxes &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$504 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$480 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$1.1 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$260 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Regular Revenue</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$1.03 Billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures
Paid from General Fund Regular Revenues
$1.03 Billion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Protection</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$409 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$321 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Culture</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$53 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$114 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$146 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This includes only the General Fund subsidy to the Municipal Railway. The total budget for the Municipal Railway is $282 Million, including state and federal grants.

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- **ADOPT**
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- **ALTER**
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- **ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY**
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m. Daily
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

REPUBLICAN PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS

To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person's name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite "YES" or "NO" for that measure.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

共和黨

選民須知

投票選擇選票上所列的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。如果要選舉超過兩名競選同一官職的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的所有候選人姓名旁邊打孔，但請勿選舉超過要選的候選人的數目。

投票選擇合格寫入候選人，請在選票卡的長方形票尾的空位上寫上該候選人的姓名和官職。如有不明之處，請向助選員求助。

投票任何一項提案，請用藍色筆尖在提案旁邊的“YES”（贊成）或“NO”（反對）打孔。

如果你投票錯了，或者選票撕壞了，應把選票交回選區的選舉委員，再拿一份新選票。

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO REPUBLICANO

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES

Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.

Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el salón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.

Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de "Sí" o "No" para dicha medida.

Se prohibe todo tipo de marca y borrador; esto anularía la balota.

Si usted se equivoca al votar, o al rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請轉下頁。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.

TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>共和黨</th>
<th>聯合初選</th>
<th>美國總統</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>共和黨初選</td>
<td>九三零一年六月三日</td>
<td>美國總統</td>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO REPUBLICANO</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td>PRESIDENTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS</td>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICAN PARTY</td>
<td>CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 2, 1992</td>
<td>PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES</td>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAT BUCHANAN</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Vote Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN M. BROWN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Full Term</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONNY BONO</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Full Term</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN W. SPRING</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Full Term</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXANDER SWIFT EAGLE JUSTICE</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Full Term</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM CAMPBELL</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Full Term</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAAC PARK YONKER</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Full Term</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Full Term</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM TRINITY</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM B. “BILL” ALLEN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM E. “BILL” DANNEMEYER</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SEYMOUR</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

3
共和黨
PARTIDO REPUBLICANO

共同鉢囦
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS
2 DE JUNIO DE 1992

80

MARC WOLIN
Government Relations Consultant
Consultor de relaciones gubernamentales 政府關係顧問

STATE SENATOR

THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT
No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito

州参議員，第八區
SENADOR ESTATAL, DISTRITO 8
State Senator — 8th District

98

STORM JENKINS
Businessman
Hombre de negocios 商人

Member, State Assembly — 12th District

Republican Party
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION

3-2-1
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 12 縣中央委員會委員，第12區</th>
<th>線選不超過十三人 Vote for no more than 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee — 12th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARL W. RANDOLPH</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUEL ROSALES Incumbent / Titular 現任者</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER Incumbent / Titular 現任者</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES FANG Incumbent / Titular 現任者</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT C. CHANG Incumbent / Titular 現任者</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSA CHEUNG</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILDRED &quot;MILLE&quot; DANCH Flight Attendant-Lobbyist / Aeromoza-Cabildo 飛行服務員－說客</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS J. MARK State Central Committeeman / Miembro del Comité Central del Estado 美委員會委員</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL MAYER MARSHALL Incumbent / Titular 現任者</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRISTINA MACK Incumbent / Titular 現任者</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK MAN Entrepreneur / Empresario 企業家</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOANNE MC PHERSON</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM GILLERAN Former Chair-Incumbent / Presidente Anterior-Titular 前主席－現任者</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES R. WONG Attorney / Abogado 律師</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEARL H. WHITE Business Person / Persona de negocios 商人</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIP LOUIS WING Software Consultant / Consultor de software 軟件顧問</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUN RETSY HATYOYAMA Incumbent / Titular 現任者</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES L. HOWARD Incumbent / Titular 現任者</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAROLD HOOGASIAN Incumbent / Titular 現任者</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL S. SALERNO Owner TV Store / Propietario de una tienda de TV 電視店東主</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM SPINOZA Constitutional Law Specialist / Especialista en derecho constitucional 憲法專家</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI Incumbent / Titular 現任者</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</th>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT, OFFICE #5</strong></td>
<td><strong>JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada Litigante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET W. FORSYTHE</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada de Oficio Delegada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</th>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT, OFFICE #6</strong></td>
<td><strong>JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRY MELTON</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA LITTLE</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez del Tribunal Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 185
NO 186

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.

YES 193
NO 194

PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.

YES 203
NO 204
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td>Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalezcan la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejorías de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.</td>
<td>Esta enmienda autoriza un impuesto adicional sobre la propiedad que se aplicará a partir del 1 de enero de 1993. El objetivo es financiar proyectos de infraestructura y mejoramiento de viviendas en el condado de San Francisco. El impuesto se basará en el valor real de la propiedad y se aplicará a todas las parcelas de propiedad ubicadas dentro del condado. El monto razonable de los impuestos se calculará a razón de un porcentaje del valor real de la propiedad, que se determinará de acuerdo con los métodos de valoración establecidos por el condado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES</td>
<td>1992年學校設施公債法案。本提案授权發行公債十九億元（$1,900,000,000），提供資金作建設或改良公立學校之用。</td>
<td>1992年6月高等教育設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債九億元（$900,000,000），用於興建或改良加州的公立學院和大學設施。</td>
<td>延期徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估值所增實業稅可延期徵收。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185 SI 贊成</td>
<td>193 SI 贊成</td>
<td>203 SI 贊成</td>
<td>延期徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估值所增實業稅可延期徵收。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186 NO 反對</td>
<td>194 NO 反對</td>
<td>204 NO 反對</td>
<td>財政影響：這個提案將由於屋主延期徵收實業稅而導致州或地方政府損失數以百萬計。這些損失會在屋主賣出他們的房屋時最終獲得補償。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7F</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

A
YES 212 ➞
NO 213 ➞

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

B
YES 218 ➞
NO 219 ➞

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

C
YES 222 ➞
NO 223 ➞

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

D
YES 227 ➞
NO 228 ➞

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

E
YES 232 ➞
NO 233 ➞
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

212 SI 贊成
213 NO 反对

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反对

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.

222 SI 贊成
223 NO 反对

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asfalto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.

227 SI 贊成
228 NO 反对

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.

232 SI 贊成
233 NO 反对

¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993-2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?

8F-0-ALL

25
# SAMPLE BALLOT

## CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

## NONPARTISAN BALLOT

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

237 SI 贊成  
238 NO 反對  
237  Si  贊成  
238  NO  反對  
¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escrivano de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escrivano del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?

241 SI 贊成  
242 NO 反對  
241  Si  贊成  
242  NO  反對  
¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y éste ejecutará sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil?

245 SI 贊成  
246 NO 反對  
245  Si  贊成  
246  NO  反對  
¿Ya no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgando, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad?

248 SI 贊成  
249 NO 反對  
248  Si  贊成  
249  NO  反對  
¿Será la política de las personas del Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?

252 SI 贊成  
253 NO 反對  
252  Si  贊成  
253  NO  反對  
¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?

FIN DE LA BALOTA
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OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

---

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
• 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
• Hastings Law School graduate
• Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
• Delinquency Prevention Commissioner (1985 – 1987)
• Volunteer Attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
• Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
• Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:

SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire
Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficy, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond

RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola

10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENIATOR Milton Marks

ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto
SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebeim, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlota delPortillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni
BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick
COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblentz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Bierman

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.
Is it time to make history?
I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
• Honors graduate — George Washington University.
• Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
• Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s Office.
• “Barrister of the Year” — 1988.
• Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
• Coro Foundation Fellow.
• American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
• Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.

As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.

I will also be a role model for our young men and women.

My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoogasian; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melecio Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brassington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe

---

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #6

DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39

My qualifications for office are:

As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers' Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women's History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assembly-person Willie Brown; Supervisor Robert Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Deerman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years

My qualifications for office are:

Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

- Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
- Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
- Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
- Named an “Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service” by Bar Association.
- Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
- Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality.

As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta de Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Barry Melton

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

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

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park's electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park's public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park's irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $76,300,000
- Bond interest: 53,791,500
- Debt service requirement: $130,091,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGIN ON PAGE 41.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of city life for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park’s one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park’s infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park’s basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park’s infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park’s water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and resealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills?

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!
STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.
“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area’s open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dieruff, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco’s Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City’s neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it’s necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O’Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Ezquerra, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Truegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco’s most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park’s infrastructure, preserving the park’s safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

San Francisco’s elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carlota del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park’s forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burke, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let’s bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Bierman
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwenn Craig
Kelly Cullen
Susanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Roea Gilford
Louis J. Giraudo
Richard Grossboi
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaacks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kalil
Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Reverend John and
Donneer E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Maninak
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Otto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sutulagi Pala
Lois Pavlow
Marianne H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Sastafsky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomatra N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinklon
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combatting AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loveliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women’s Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco’s park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Millet, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park’s trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court's decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $2.22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park's aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city's infrastructure are supposed to come from the city's general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city's infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it's free, NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you'll see that these things aren't free. It's City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven't been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It's telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — "No New Taxes." But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don't tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you'll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or how about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You'll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you'll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION B, PROPOSITION C AND PROPOSITION D

(Special Election)

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL, TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,280,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM IN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA, TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO, SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK, AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECOMMENDING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENTS BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and offices of elections for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992."

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting.

(Continued on next page)
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto."

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system."

"CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto." Each voter to vote for any said propositions hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

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

Section 5. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein.

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

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

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

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

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City’s current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$26,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>18,823,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$45,523,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Allolio.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B
San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of.
Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!
Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!
Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”? Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!
Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills!
Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCITY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!
STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better.”
“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law.
The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.
The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Franciscans' civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!

Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.
As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.

Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Siong
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's Civic Center, which should symbolize our city's beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect.

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig  
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn  
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley  
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtle  
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffat  
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane  
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis  
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

Proposition B will make San Francisco's Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city's traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne  
City Attorney

Arlo Smith  
District Attorney

Millon Marks  
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.  
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco's heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein  
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According the Controller’s statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let's get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer's Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children's playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall's delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?
Let's see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSITION C

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption $24,000,000
- Bond interest 16,920,500
- Debt service requirement $40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.0040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
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PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.
Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City’s Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area.

This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Ennsman
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote Yes on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Sier
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner

David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works

Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager

Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers’ funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That’s why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can’t you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We’re here asked to “incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage” to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C’s high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $53,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that’s just for the garage — it doesn’t include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR’S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board’s esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board’s decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don’t we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a “white elephant”. Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board’s budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco’s Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city’s residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let’s not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let’s logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Apr 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Apr 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>May 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>May 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>June 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>July 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>July 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>Aug 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Aug 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept 12</td>
<td>Sept 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>Oct 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLUG Compost Hotline—468-0262 • Recycling Hotline—554-6193

Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

---

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Civic Center
Heating System Bonds

PROPOSITION D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $21,220,000
- Bond interest: 14,860,100
- Debt service requirement: 36,180,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than “a hot water system.”

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

58
Civic Center
Heating System Bonds

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding!
This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.

Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system.

Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.

Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!
The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.

ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!
Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D. Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.

VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition D will replace the Civic Center's antiquated, wasteful steam heating plant with a modern, energy-efficient system.

By passing Proposition D, we will save an estimated $750,000 in energy costs every year.

Proposition D makes financial and environmental sense. Join us in voting YES on Proposition D.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Milton Marks
State Senator
Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assembly Speaker

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.

San Francisco's Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that's consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.

The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.

VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.

Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.

Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D

The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21,22 million bond measure for a "new" hot water heating system at Civic Center.

Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?

This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION E
Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, “capital projects” includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “E”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current city services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.
NO: Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Infrastructure Fund

PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City’s General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City’s buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
Absent: Supervisor Mahler.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That’s clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor’s recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor’s recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What’s wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials’ power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco’s other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That’s not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee

By Cheryl Arenson
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children’s Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans’ needs. This time we’re asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawn mowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don’t!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT’S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with “lawn mowers” as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City's General Fund. Inflexibility doesn't matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the "Children's Fund" which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its "best".) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City's general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City's objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City's other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President

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

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 relating to annual mandated levels of funds for protection and maintenance of the City's infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation
Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each budget and annual appropriation ordinance, through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount (CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages specified below for the identified years of General Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:
   - Fiscal Year 1993/1994: 1.5%
   - Fiscal Year 1994/1995: 2.0%
   - Fiscal Years 1995/1996 through 2003/2004: 2.5%
   - Fiscal Year 2004/2005: 1.5%

For the purpose of this section the term "general fund revenue sources" shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereon belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1) In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

2) In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City's then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner’s Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central storages and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the tele-
PROPOSITION F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk’s office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:
Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator’s Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "F"

Proposition "F" makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder's Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk's and Recorder's Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk's Office to the County Recorder's Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent's Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

Chief Zoo Veterinarian

PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor and evaluate, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to choose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of "G" miss the point: This measure isn't about health care for zoo animals, IT'S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create "flexibility" in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to "exempt" that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That's patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reut and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards.

If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians' appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE "NO" ON "G"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember

Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"G" is "GREEDY"!

Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.

And that's what "G" is about: Political Patronage! Every time a position is "exempted" from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.

Surprised?

You shouldn't be!

"G" was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!

Say "NO" to patronage hiring!
Say "No" To "G"!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care! Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the "friends" that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid ArgumentsWere Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives
The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
Inventory Control

PROPOSITION H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City's many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments' operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which "own" the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing's inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16,1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of "H" is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect "savings" like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, "H" would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser's office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out!

Of course not! They're too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as "H".

Send City Hall a message that you're tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C", "D", "G", "H", "I" and "J"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

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

"H" is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee "on the take."
"H" would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!
Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That's right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition "H”.
VOTE "NO" ON "H"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H’s opponents want City government to be cumbersome.
In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer—Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.
If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller’s Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.
The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character, as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchasing department. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section.

The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department purchasing same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

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

Controller's Statement on "I"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:
Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "I"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Dividing California into Two States

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California's government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That's the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn't make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That's not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your "YES" vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We'll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won't move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn't get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs.

The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state's economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting)!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

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

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese...

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California’s ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California’s voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON’T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren’t interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don’t they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California’s counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn’t San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn’t our right to express our opinion worth that much?

Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher
DIVIDING CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES

NO PAID ARGUMENTS WERE SUBMITTED IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There's no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn't even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won't solve any problem facing California. Even if Californians voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It's enough to make Jimmy Gonzales' mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a "substantial, but presently indeterminable amount".

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should "interact" in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There's no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It's sad that some people feel the answer to California's problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Save the spotted owl!
Don't let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heroes Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn't support California's breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.
Don't double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Kopp's Good Government Committee opposes the Board of
Supervisors' proposal to divide California and is indignant that
irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot
with a meaningless "advisory" trick. So pathetic is the Board of
Supervisors that it didn't even have the nerve to submit a ballot
argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the
foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs
should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of
Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco
taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our ex-
 pense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as
the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than
"hype" or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case
with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Nor-
thern California and Southern California. Similar measures have

This measure supposedly creates "city policy". Even however,
if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only
the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore,
it's an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers' time and money.
There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco,
but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will
our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up
and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan
TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION I

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

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

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a "state-back" guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let's keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote "YES" on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don't let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don't speak of "Northern California Girl" or "Hotel Southern California."

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN'T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The "State-Split" Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

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

"J" IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.

Proposition "J" asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.

Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of "Northern California" Those who want a "Northern California" state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!

To vote "YES" on Proposition "J" is to say you think this backwoods "state-splitting" scheme is o.k.

Tell City Hall you're tired of the jokes like Proposition "J" the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.

Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.

Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE "STATE-SPLIT" JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!
What Proposition "J" really asks is, "If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?"

In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?

California will only continue to grow! It's a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to ask at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.

San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don't let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
San Francisco in Northern California

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition J

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Don't be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn't even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it's spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you're elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members' minds?

VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.

Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may "fax" your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

"Cleaning" your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
INDEX

GENERAL INFORMATION

Absentee Ballot Application ................................ Back Cover
Access for the Disabled Voter ........................................ 5
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures .................. .32
How to use Poll Star Vote Recorder ............................... 4
Important Facts About Absentee Voting ......................... .88
Important Notice .......................................................... 7
Legislative and BART Districts .................................... 8
Local Offices to Be Voted on This Election .................... .29
Location of Your Polling Place .................................. Back Cover
Permanent Absentee Voter Application ......................... Back Cover
Permanent Absentee Voter (Vote-by-Mail) 
Qualifications ............................................................ 5
Poll Worker Application .............................................. Inside Front Cover
Polling Place Card ....................................................... Inside Back Cover
Polling Place Changes .............................................. 7
Purpose of the Voter Information Pamphlet ................... 3
Sample Ballot .............................................................. 15-27
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters ........................... .89
Words You Need to Know ........................................... .12
Your Rights as a Voter ................................................... 6

CANDIDATES

Ellen Chaitin .......................................................... .30
Janet W. Forsythe ....................................................... .30
Donna Little ............................................................. .31
Barry Melton .............................................................. .31

PROPOSITIONS

Chief Zoo Veterinarian ................................................. 69
Civic Center Bonds ..................................................... 43
Civic Center Garage Bonds ......................................... 49
Civic Center Heating System Bonds ............................ 57
County Clerk ............................................................. 67
Dividing California into Two States .......................... 77
Golden Gate Park Bonds ............................................. 33
Infrastructure Fund ..................................................... 61
Inventory Control ....................................................... 73
Proposition A ............................................................. 33
Proposition B ............................................................. 43
Proposition C ............................................................. 49
Proposition D ............................................................. 57
Proposition E ............................................................. 61
Proposition F ............................................................. 67
Proposition G ............................................................. 69
Proposition H ............................................................. 73
Proposition I ............................................................. 77
Proposition J ............................................................. 83
San Francisco in Northern California ......................... 83

SAN FRANCISCO VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION 1992

Published by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
City and County of San Francisco
400 Van Ness Avenue, Room 158
San Francisco, CA 94102
Gregory P. Ridenour, Administrative Manager

Typesetting by Ink
Andrew Fox, Graphic Production Artist
Printing by Alonzo Printing, Co.
Translations by La Raza Translation Service and Chinese Journal Corp.
Cover Design by Keilani Tom Design Associates

The Consolidated Primary Election 1992 San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet was printed on recycled paper.
**POLLING PLACE CARD:** To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to **SIGN** your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
**OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS**  
*City and County of San Francisco*  
Room 158 - City Hall  
400 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691  
(415) 554 - 4375

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot Type</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Precincts Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9221</td>
<td>12th Assembly District</td>
<td>2000's, 2100's, 2200's, 2700's, 2900's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th Senate District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th Congressional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place.  
The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION** - June 2, 1992 Primary Election  
*Sign* this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

### Check One:
- [ ] Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
- [ ] I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

#### P.O. Box or Street Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Check Here If Appropriate:
- [ ] I have moved since I last registered to vote.  
  My new address is printed below.  
  (Residence Address ONLY.)

#### Number and Street Name

**SAN FRANCISCO, CA**

|----------|----------|

### Check below all that apply, then sign your name:
- [ ] I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- [ ] I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- [ ] All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish______ Chinese______

You **MUST SIGN** here, to receive a ballot.

**Your signature - DO NOT PRINT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Signed</th>
<th>Day Time Phone</th>
<th>Evening Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr) Your Signature
[Blank]
Print Your First Name MI Print Your Last Name
[Blank][Blank]
Print Your Residence Address Zip Code
[Blank]
Day Phone -- Eve. Phone --
[Blank][Blank]
Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: [ ] (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

------------------------------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS -------------------------------

Assigned Precinct: Home Precinct: Clerk: Inspector:
[Blank][Blank]
Affidavit Number: Code Reg. Attach. Init's
[Blank][Blank][Blank]
E.O. Bk. 6/2 6/6

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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## PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a **Sample Ballot** (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .......................................................... 15-27
2. the **location of your polling place** .................................................. (see the label on the back cover)
3. an **application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot** and for permanent absentee voter status; ......................................................... back cover
4. Your **rights as a voter**; .................................................................... 6
5. **information for disabled voters**; .................................................... 5
6. **statements from candidates** who are running for local office; .......... 30-31
7. **information about each local ballot measure**, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .................................................. 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; ............................................ inside back cover
9. a **Polling Place Card** to mark your choices before voting.
**HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER**

**SPECIAL NOTE:**
*If you make a mistake, return your card and get another.*

**STEP 1**

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

**USING BOTH HANDS**

*INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.*

*Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."*

**STEP 2**

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

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

**STEP 3**

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

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

**STEP 4**

*After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.*

*Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la boleta a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votación.*
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:

• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or

• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don’t find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

---

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-draw congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries (“The Way It Is Now,” “The Proposal,” “A ‘Yes’ Vote Means,” and “A ‘No’ Vote Means.”) of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee prepares: the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters’ basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, Jim Stevens and Molly Wood.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(Does not include S.F. Unified School District or
S.F. Community College District)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

STATE & FEDERAL GRANTS
FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS
(E.G., AIDS PREVENTION,
AFDC PAYMENTS)
30% $720 MILLION

REVENUES GENERATED BY CITY
DEPARTMENTS AND USED BY SAME
DEPARTMENT
(E.G., LANDING FEES PAID BY AIRLINES TO
S.F. INT'L. AIRPORT)
29% $696 MILLION

BUSINESS, SALES & OTHER TAXES
& OTHER INCOME
21% $504 MILLION

PROPERTY TAX
20% $480 MILLION

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

NON-GENERAL FUND REVENUE
46% $1.1 BILLION

OTHER GENERAL FUND REVENUE
11% $260 MILLION

GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUE
43% $1.03 BILLION

EXPENDITURES
PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES
$1.03 BILLION

PUBLIC PROTECTION
39% $409 MILLION

HEALTH & WELFARE
31% $321 MILLION

RECREATION
& CULTURE
5% $53 MILLION

UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION
11% $114 MILLION

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
14% $146 MILLION

This includes only the General Fund
subsidy to the Municipal Railway. The
total budget for the Municipal Railway
is $282 million, including state and
federal grants.

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

■ ADOPT
Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

■ ALTER
Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

■ ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY
Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
© 1984 City and County of San Francisco

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m. Daily

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

REPUBLICAN PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.
To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person’s name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.
To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite “YES” or “NO” for that measure.
All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.
If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO REPUBLICANO

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES
Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.
Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.
Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de “Sí” o “No” para dicha medida.
Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca o borrador; esto anularía la balota.
Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

Para comenzar a votar, pase a la página siguiente.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>ELECTION</th>
<th>CANDIDATE</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republicano</td>
<td>Consolidated Primary Election, June 2, 1992</td>
<td>George Bush</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicano</td>
<td>Consolidated Primary Election, June 2, 1992</td>
<td>Pat Buchanan</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

### UNITED STATES SENATOR

#### Full Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN M. BROWN Salesman Vendedor</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONNY BONO Mayor/Businessman Alcalde/Hombre de negocios</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN W. SPRING Consultant/College Instructor Consultor/Instructor universitario</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXANDER SWIFT EAGLE JUSTICE Educator/Gem Cutter Educador/Cortador de piedras preciosas</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM CAMPBELL Congressman, Educator, Economist Congressista, Educador, Economista</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAAC PARK YONKER Farmer/Rancher Campesino/Ranchero</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN Television Commentator/Educator Comentarista de televisión/Educador</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Short Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JIM TRINITY Dentist/Businessman Dentista/Hombre de negocios</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM B. “BILL” ALLEN Civil Rights Commissioner Comisionado de derechos civiles</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM E. “BILL” DANNEMEYER Member of Congress, 39th District Miembro del Congreso, Distrito 39</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SEYMOUR Appointed United States Senator Senador de los Estados Unidos nombrado</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Position                              | Candidate                                      | Vote
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------|
| U.S. Representative in Congress — 12th District | **JIM TOMLIN**  
Independent Businessman  
Hombre de negocios independiente  
獨立商人 | **80**
| State Senator — 8th District        | **THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT**  
No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito  
沒有人競選本區這一公職 |      |
| Member, State Assembly — 12th District | **STORM JENKINS**  
Businessman  
Hombre de negocios  商人 | **98**

**PARTIDO REPUBLICANO**  
**ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS**  
2 DE JUNIO DE 1992  
**MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY**  
JUNE 2, 1992
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karl W. Randolph</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Rosales</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence Faulkner</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Fang</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert C. Chang</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa Cheung</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred &quot;Millie&quot; Danch</td>
<td>Flight Attendant-Lobbyist</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis J. Mark</td>
<td>State Central Committeeman</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Mayer Marshall</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Mack</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Man</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne McPherson</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Gilleran</td>
<td>Former Chair-Incumbent</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles R. Wong</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl H. White</td>
<td>Business Person</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Louis Wing</td>
<td>Software Consultant</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun Retsy Hatoyma</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James L. Howard</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Hoogasian</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael S. Salerno</td>
<td>Owner TV Store</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Spinoza</td>
<td>Constitutional Law Specialist</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Silvestri</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
BALOTA APARTIDARIA

JUDGE DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 5
Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5

ELLEN CHAITIN
Trial Attorney
Abogada Litigante

JANET W. FORSYTHE
Deputy Public Defender
Abogada de Oficio Delegada

BARRY MELTON
Attorney
Abogado

DONNA LITTLE
Judge of the Municipal Court
Juez del Tribunal Municipal

Vote for One
Parecer por Uno

161 
163 

169 
171 

21
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**7E**

**NONPARTISAN BALLOT**

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**152** SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

| YES 185 | NO 186 |

**153** HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.

| YES 193 | NO 194 |

**154** PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.

<p>| YES 203 | NO 204 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 185 SI 贏成
186 NO 反对

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992**
- Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.

### 193 SI 贏成
194 NO 反对

**ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992**
- Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalecerán la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejorías de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.

### 203 SI 贏成
204 NO 反对

**APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA**
- Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocurran del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.

---

**7F-0-ALL**

**SAMPLE BALLOT**

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**無黨派選票**

1992年學校設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債十九億元（$1,900,000,000），提供資金作建設或改良公立學校之用。

1992年6月高等教育設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債九億元（$900,000,000），用於興建或改良加州的公立學院和大學設施。

這些建設工程創造就業，確保加州學生獲得高等教育，並使各公立學院和大學培訓出一批訓練有素的、競爭力強的勞動大軍，充實加州的經濟。授權興建的138公立校園計劃，包括，但並不等於限制於防震和其他衛生安全的改良、實驗室的現代化，以便跟上科學的發展和建築課室、圖書館等等。

延期徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估價所增加實業稅可延期徵收。

財政影響：這個提案將由於支出延期徵收實業稅而導致州或地方政府損失數以百萬元計。這些損失會在徵稅出售他們的房屋時最終獲得補償。
# SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.</td>
<td>YES 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.</td>
<td>YES 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.</td>
<td>YES 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.</td>
<td>YES 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?</td>
<td>YES 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</td>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212 SI 贠成</td>
<td>213 NO 反对</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 SI 贠成</td>
<td>219 NO 反对</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222 SI 贠成</td>
<td>223 NO 反对</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asbesto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 SI 贠成</td>
<td>228 NO 反对</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 SI 贠成</td>
<td>233 NO 反对</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer? YES 237
NO 238

G
Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules? YES 241
NO 242

H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments? YES 245
NO 246

I
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state? YES 248
NO 249

J
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state? YES 252
NO 253

END OF BALLOT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA PARTIDARIA</th>
<th>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>9F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td>無黨派選票</td>
<td>9F-0-ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO</td>
<td>提交選民投票表決的市、縣提案</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>237 SI 贊成</th>
<th>¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escritano de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escritano del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?</th>
<th>縣幹事的職責和人事應否由高級法庭幹事事調到政府服務部，並在市首席行政官的監督下任職?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>238 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>241 SI 贊成</th>
<th>¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y este ejecutará sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil?</th>
<th>市動物園獸醫主任應否由康樂與公園管理局局長委任，但須經康樂與公園委員會批准，而不在公務條例管轄下任職?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>242 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>245 SI 贊成</th>
<th>¿Ya no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgando, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad?</th>
<th>市採購官應否不必為市政府其他部門管理所有物資、補給和器材的存貨，而交由市各部門自行負責管理這些存貨?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>246 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>248 SI 贊成</th>
<th>¿Será la política de las personas del Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</th>
<th>支持把加州劃分為北加州和南加州應否成為舊金山市縣人民的政策?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>249 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>252 SI 贊成</th>
<th>¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</th>
<th>如果加州劃分為北加州和南加州，舊金山則屬於北加州版圖，這應否成為舊金山市縣人民的政策?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>253 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

__________________________________________________________

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
- 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
- Hastings Law School graduate
- Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
- Volunteer Attorney, Women's Health Clinic
- Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
- Married, two children

A judgesship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I'm honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned me the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:

SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficy, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola
10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENATOR Milton Marks
ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto
SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebeim, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlota delPortillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni
BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick
COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblentz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Bierman

Ellen Chaitin

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
- Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
- In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.
- Its time to make history!
- I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
  - Honors graduate — George Washington University.
  - Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
  - Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender's Office.
  - "Barrister of the Year" — 1988.
  - Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
  - Coro Foundation Fellow.
  - American Fellow — American Association for University Women.
  - Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.
  - As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.
  - I will also be a role model for our young men and women.
  - My supporters include:
  - Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoagian; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melecio Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brasington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #6

DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are:

As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women’s History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louis; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge PhilipMoscone; Judge Ronald Quinones; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality. As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years
My qualifications for office are:

Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

- Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar,
- Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience,
- Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator,
- Named an “Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service” by Bar Association,
- Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law,
- Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality. As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Barry Melton

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

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

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (“Proponent’s Argument”) and one argument against the measure (“Opponent’s Argument”) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument” indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument”:
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

“Opponent’s Argument”:
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument.”

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park’s electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park’s public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park’s irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on "A"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $76,300,000
- Bond interest: 53,791,500
- Debt service requirement: 130,091,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of city life for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park’s one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park’s infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park’s basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park’s infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park’s water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and resealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REButtal To Proponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”? Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills!

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMmittee To PREvent MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember

Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!

But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!

San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that "San Francisco deserves better".

"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area’s open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dierauf, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco’s Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City’s neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it’s necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenheimer, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O’Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Esquerro, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco’s most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park’s infrastructure, preserving the park’s safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

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

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park’s forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burke, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

San Francisco’s elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carloita del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebein, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rode Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let’s bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38
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Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City’s economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horn, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nahtenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehrman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Cartier*
Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quaranta, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Kile Ozie, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP’s, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lillienhal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Bierman
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwenn Craig
Kely Cullen
Suzanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Roeia Gilford
Louis J. Giraud
Richard Grossboll
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaicks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kallil
Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum

Reverend John and
Donnie E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Otto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sulalagi Palega
Lois Pavlow
Marionne H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Sastaksay
Gail Schlesinger
Thomata N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turmhull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinkhorn
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Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community battling AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loveliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women’s Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco’s park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Millet, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park’s trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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**Golden Gate Park Bonds**

**PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A**

*Vote NO on Proposition A*

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court’s decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $.22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park’s aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city’s infrastructure are supposed to come from the city’s general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

---

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It’s telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — “No New Taxes.” But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don’t tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you’ll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You’ll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you’ll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

*James Slaughter*  
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

---

Of course everyone wants our city’s infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it’s free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you’ll see that these things aren’t free. It’s City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven’t been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

*Thomas Garber*  
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.
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TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION B, PROPOSITION C AND PROPOSITION D

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election to be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of elections for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting (Continued on next page)"
surrounding the City Hall and areas ad-

djacent the...system within the Civic Center area

including pipelines and hot water boiler

system.

"CIVIC CENTER PARKING GA-


To incur a bonded indebtedness of

$24,400,000 to pay for the enlargement of

the Civic Center Parking Garage or

construction of a parking garage adja-
cent thereto, including asbestos abate-
ment and providing access for the

disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPRO-


To incur a bonded indebtedness of

$76,300,000 to pay the cost of the con-

struction or reconstruction of repair, re-

orestation and rehabilitation of Golden

Gate Park including water system supply

and irrigation, lakes and water courses,
utilities including street and se-

curity lighting, repair and rehabilitation

of park features, landscaping, restrooms

including disabled access thereto."

Each voter to vote for any said propositions

hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of

the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank

space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to

the right of said proposition, and to vote against

said proposition and against the issuance of the

Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space

opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right

of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the

cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards

are used at said special election, each voter to

to vote for any said proposition shall punch the

ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to

the right of said proposition, and to vote against

said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the

hole after the word "NO" to the right of said

proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall

appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on

the proposition voted in favor of and authorized

the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the

purposes set forth in said proposition, then such

proposition shall have been accepted by the elec-
tors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost

of the municipal improvements described herein.

Such bonds shall be of the form and character

known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a

rate not to exceed 12 per cent per annum,

payable semiannually, provided, that interest for

the first year after the date of any of said bonds

may be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective

propositions shall be counted separately and

when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting

on such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such

proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the prin-
cipal and interest on said bonds, the Board of

Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general

tax levy and in the manner for such general tax

levy provided, levy and collect annually each

year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a

sum in the Treasury of said City and County set

apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due

for the principal and interest on said bonds, a
tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such

bonds as the same becomes due and also such

part of the principal thereof as shall become due

before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for

making the next general tax levy can be made

available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published

once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San

Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published
daily in the City and County of San Francisco,

being the official newspaper of said city and

county and such publication shall constitute no-
tice of said election and no other notice of the
election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employ-
ees, representatives and agents of the City and

County of San Francisco are hereby authorized

and directed to do everything necessary or desir-
able to the calling and holding of said special

election, and to otherwise carry out the provi-
sions of this ordinance.

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be

Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City’s current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $26,700,000
- Bond interest: $18,823,500
- Debt service requirement: $45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.0044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of.

Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top if off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills?

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE “NO” ON “A,” “B,” “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that "San Francisco deserves better".

"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.

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

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.
As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.
Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.
Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Francisco’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!

Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Your vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtie
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

James Haas
Chair, Civic Pride

Carolyn Diamond
Executive Director, Greater Market Street Development Association

Robert Friese
President, San Francisco Beautiful

Proposition B will make San Francisco’s Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city’s traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne
City Attorney

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

Milton Marks
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco’s heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)

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

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city’s needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According to the Controller’s statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote No on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let’s get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer’s Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children’s playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall’s delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?
Let’s see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "C"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $24,000,000
- Bond interest: $16,920,500
- Debt service requirement: $40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($.0040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.

Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City’s Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds
Civic Center Garage Bonds

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C
The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco's Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City's general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent's statement that the Civic Center area "has excess parking". Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as "excess parking". Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way "risk the City's General Fund". There is no "risk" because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area.

This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote YES on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Strong
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kail
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night. Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner

David Hard
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works

Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager

Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers’ funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C. Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That's why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can't you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We're here asked to "incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage" to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are besieged to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C's high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $33,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that's just for the garage - it doesn't include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR'S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board's esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board's decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don't we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a "white elephant". Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board's budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco's Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city's residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let's not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let's logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

San Francisco’s revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by SF League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

Mar 7 Basic  June 13 Advanced  Sept 12 Basic
Mar 28 Basic  June 27 Worm  Sept 26 Basic
Apr 11 Advanced  July 18 Basic  Oct 10 Worm
Apr 25 Worm  July 25 Basic  Oct 24 Basic
May 9 Basic  Aug 1 Advanced  Nov 7 Advanced
May 23 Basic  Aug 22 Worm

SLUG Compost Hotline—468-0262 • Recycling Hotline—554-6193
Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

---

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364
PROPOSITION D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "D"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $21,220,000
- Bond interest: $14,960,100
- Debt service requirement: $36,180,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Civic Center
Heating System Bonds

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.
Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than “a hot water system.”

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.
Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system.
Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City's budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!**

The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.

**ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!**

Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

**SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)**

**James Fussell, Executive Director**

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D.

Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.

**VOTE YES on Proposition D.**

*Mayor Frank Jordan*

---

**PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D**

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.

San Francisco’s Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that’s consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.

The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.

**VOTE NO ON D.**

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.

Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.

Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

*San Francisco Taxpayers Association*

*State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President*

---

**Vote NO on Proposition D**

The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a "new" hot water heating system at Civic Center.

Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?

This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. **Vote NO on Proposition D.**

*San Francisco Home Owners Council*
Infrastructure Fund

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, “capital projects” includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current City services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.

NO: Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City’s General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City’s buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That’s clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor’s recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor’s recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What’s wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials’ power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco’s other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That’s not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee

By Cheryl Arenson
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children’s Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans’ needs.

This time we’re asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawnmowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don’t!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT’S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with “lawnmowers” as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
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PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 relating to annual mandated levels of funds for protection and maintenance of the City's infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County of adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each budget and annual appropriation ordinance, through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount (CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages specified below for the identified years of General Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:

- Fiscal Year 1993/1994: 1.5%
- Fiscal Year 1994/1995: 2.0%
- Fiscal Years 1995/1996 through 2003/2004: 2.5%
- Fiscal Year 2004/2005: 1.5%

For the purpose of this section the term "general fund revenue sources" shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereon belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1. In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

2. In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City's then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 as follows: 3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management.

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent and personnel of County Clerk.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employees shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984, two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be administered by the county clerk as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.
PROPOSITION F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk’s office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator’s Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION F IS ON PAGE 66.
PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "F"

Proposition "F" makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder's Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk's and Recorder's Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk's Office to the County Recorder's Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent's Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

YES ➡
NO ➡

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:
Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not increase the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempt from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to chose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of “G” miss the point: This measure isn’t about health care for zoo animals, IT’S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create “flexibility” in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to “exempt” that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That’s patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards. If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians’ appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE “NO” ON “G”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"G" is "GREEDY"

Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.

And that's what "G" is about: Political Patronage! Every time a position is "exempted" from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.

Surprised?

You shouldn't be!

"G" was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!

Say "NO" to patronage hiring!
Say "No" To "G"!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arla H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!

Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the "friends" that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives

The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
Inventory Control

PROPOSITION H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City’s many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:
Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

PROPONEHT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments’ operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which “own” the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing’s inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONEHT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of “H” is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect “savings” like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, “H” would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser’s office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out?

Of course not! They’re too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as “H”.

Send City Hall a message that you’re tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.


CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

“H” is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee “on the take.”
“H” would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory! Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That’s right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition “H”.
VOTE “NO” ON “H”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H’s opponents want City government to be cumbersome.

In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.

If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller’s Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.

The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section.

The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require such department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops here-tofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report the same to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES ☐ NO ☐

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.
PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California's government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That's the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn't make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 50 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That's not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue their separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your "YES" vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We'll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won't move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn't get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capital and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state's economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting!)

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlt H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese . . .

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California’s ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California’s voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON’T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren’t interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don’t they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California’s counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn’t San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn’t our right to express our opinion worth that much?

Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted in Favor Of Proposition I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There's no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolishness, that it wouldn't even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won't solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It's enough to make Jimmy'Gonzales' mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a "substantial, but presently indeterminable amount".

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should "interact" in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There's no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It's sad that some people feel the answer to California's problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Save the spotted owl!
Don't let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heroes Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn't support California's breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don't double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Kopp's Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors' proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless "advisory" trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn't even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than "hype" or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates "city policy". Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it's an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers' time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan
TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION I

DEscribing and setting forth a declaration of policy to the qualified electors of the city and county of San Francisco at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, relating to the question of dividing the State of California into two states, North California and South California:

Be it moved, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION J

DEscribing and setting forth a declaration of policy to the qualified electors of the city and county of San Francisco at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, relating to the question of the city and county of San Francisco being a part of the state of North California, in the event the State of California is divided into two states:

Be it moved, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

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

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION J IS ON PAGE 82.
PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than the debates over creeping Los Angeles. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfuly, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a “stateback” guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let’s keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote “YES” on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don’t let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don’t speak of “Northern California Girl” or “Hotel Southern California.”

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN’T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The “State-Split” Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"J" IS A JOKE!

A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.

Proposition “J” asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.

Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of “Northern California” Those who want a “Northern California” state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!

To vote “YES” on Proposition “J” is to say you think this backwoods “state-splitting” scheme is o.k.

Tell City Hall you’re tired of the jokes like Proposition “J” the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.

Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.

Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE “STATE-SPLIT” JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!

What Proposition “J” really asks is, “If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?”

In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?

California will only continue to grow! It’s a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.

San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don’t let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

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

Don't be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn't even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it's spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you're elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members' minds?
VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President

Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.
Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to **SIGN** your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554 - 4375

Ballot Type
9222

Republican
12th Assembly District
8th Senate District
12th Congressional

Precincts Applicable
2300's, 2400's,
2500's, 2600's,
2800's

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place. The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

Vote-By-Mail Voters — Cut or Tear Along Perforated Line

Do Not Remove Label

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election
Sign this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

Check One:
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address

City State Zip Code

Check Here If Appropriate:
☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote.
☐ My new address is printed below.
(Residence Address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name

SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Apt. No.

☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish _____ Chinese _____

Check below all that apply, then sign your name:
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.

You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

Your signature - DO NOT PRINT

Date Signed
Day Time Phone
Evening Phone
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION
I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr)  Your Signature
Print Your First Name
Print Your Residence Address
Day Phone  --  Eve. Phone  --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

Assigned Precinct:  Home Precinct:  Clerk:  Inspector:
Affidavit Number:  Code  Reg. Attach.  Init'ls

E.O. Bk.  6/2  6/6

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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## Purpose of the Voter Information Pamphlet

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .......................................................... 15-27
2. the location of your polling place ........................................... (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; .................................................. Back Cover
4. Your rights as a voter; .......................................................... 6
5. information for disabled voters; ............................................. 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; ........... 30-31
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .................................................. 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; ................................... 12
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. .......................................................... Inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando los dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
請雙手將票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

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

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

第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

第三步
请把带銃之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔插票。

STEP 4

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entregue la en el lugar oficial de votacion.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，
沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate.

Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:
  • Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
  • Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don’t find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

---

POLLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries (“The Way It Is Now,” “The Proposal,” “A ‘Yes’ Vote Means,” and “A ‘No’ Vote Means,”) of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee prepares: the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters’ basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, Jim Stevens and Molly Wood.
Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.
Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(Does not include S.F. Unified School District or
S.F. Community College District)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

STATE & FEDERAL GRANTS
FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS
(E.G., AIDS PREVENTION,
AFDC PAYMENTS)
30%
$720 MILLION

REVENUES GENERATED BY CITY
DEPARTMENTS AND USED BY SAME
DEPARTMENT
(E.G., LANDING FEES PAID BY AIRLINES TO
S.F. INT'L AIRPORT)
29%
$696 MILLION

BUSINESS, SALES & OTHER TAXES
& OTHER INCOME
21%
$504 MILLION

PROPERTY TAX
20%
$480 MILLION

PORTION OF
PROPERTY TAX
(APPROX. 8.45%)
USED TO REPAY
GENERAL
OBLIGATION
BONDS

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

NON-GENERAL FUND REVENUE
46%
$1.1 BILLION

OTHER GENERAL FUND REVENUE
11%
$260 MILLION

GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUE
43%
$1.03 BILLION

EXPENDITURES
PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES
$1.03 BILLION

PUBLIC PROTECTION
39%
$409 MILLION

HEALTH & WELFARE
31%
$321 MILLION

RECREATION & CULTURE
5%
$53 MILLION

UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION
11%
$114 MILLION

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
14%
$148 MILLION

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- ADOPT
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- ALTER
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
©1991 City and County of San Francisco

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m. Daily
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

REPUBLICAN PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.
To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person's name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.
To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite "YES" or "NO" for that measure.
All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.
If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

共和黨

選民須知

投票選擇選票上所列的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。如果要選舉勝出兩名競選同一官職的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的所有候選人姓名旁邊打孔，但請勿選舉超過所選候選人的數目。

投票選舉合格寫入候選人，請在選票卡的長方形票尾的空白上寫上該候選人的姓名和官職。如有不明之處，請向助選員求助。

投票任何一項提案，請用藍色筆尖在提案旁邊的“YES”(贊成)或“NO”(反對)打孔。

如果選票有明顯污跡或撕掉痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你投票錯了，或者選票撕裂了，應把選票交回選區的選舉委員，再拿一份新選票。

BALOTA DEL Partido Republicano

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES
Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.
Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.
Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de “SÍ” o “NO” para dicha medida.
Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca y borradura; esto anularía la balota.
Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y daña la balota, devuélvála al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請轉下頁。
PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.

TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>共和黨</th>
<th>總統優先選舉權</th>
<th>PREFERENCIA PRESIDENCIAL</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARTIDO REPUBLICANO</td>
<td>PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE</td>
<td>PRESIDENTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELECTORALS PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>JUNE 2, 1992</td>
<td>PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAT BUCHANAN</td>
<td>PAT BUCHANAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td>GEORGE BUSH</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Race</td>
<td>Full Term</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONNY BONO</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN W. SPRING</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXANDER SWIFT EAGLE JUSTICE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM CAMPBELL</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAAC PARK YONKER</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN M. BROWN</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Race</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM B. &quot;BILL&quot; ALLEN</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM E. &quot;BILL&quot; DANNEMEYER</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN SEYMOUR</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM TRINITY</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTY</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>CANDIDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICAN</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>Marc Wolin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICAN</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>Bill Boerum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICAN</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>Max Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICAN</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>John Sidline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Position Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>DONALD CASPER</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>ROSE CHUNG</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>LEE S. DOLSON</td>
<td>College Professor / Professor Universitario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>GARY T. MACINNES</td>
<td>Attorney / Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>STEPHEN D. MAYER</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>L. KIRK MILLER</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>ANNA M. GUTH</td>
<td>Volunteer / Voluntaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>MAX WOODS</td>
<td>Cable Car Operator / Operador de Tranvías</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>SAM T. HARPER</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MARK HILL</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent / Titular nombrado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>ARTHUR BRUZZONE</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>CHRISTOPHER BOWMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>ROBERTA BOOMER</td>
<td>Incumbent / Titular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>JOANNE &quot;JODY&quot; STEVENS</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent / Titular nombrada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE BALLOT

### CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BALOTA APRTIDARIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 東庭法官，第五庭          | 議選一人      |
| JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 5 | Vote por Uno  |
| Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5       | Vote for One  |
| ELLEN CHAITIN                                     | 161  →         |
| Trial Attorney                                   |
| Abogada Litigante 審議律師                        |
| JANET W. FORSYTHE                                  | 163  →         |
| Deputy Public Defender                            |
| Abogada de Oficio Delegada 助理公共辯護律師         |

| 東庭法官，第六庭          | 議選一人      |
| JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 6 | Vote por Uno  |
| Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6       | Vote for One  |
| BARRY MELTON                                     | 169  →         |
| Attorney                                         |
| Abogado 律師                                       |
| DONNA LITTLE                                      | 171  →         |
| Judge of the Municipal Court                     |
| Juez del Tribunal Municipal 市法庭法官               |
SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

**152**

YES 185  NO 186

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California's public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state's economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.

**153**

YES 193  NO 194

PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.

**154**

YES 203  NO 204
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALLACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.

186 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALLACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalecerán la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejorías de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.

193 SI 贊成
194 NO 反對

APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocurran del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.

203 SI 贊成
204 NO 反對

延期征收營業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住宅購買主要住所時增加營業税，可延期競付。影響：這提案將由於屋主延期競付營業稅而導致州或地方政府損失數百萬元。這些損失將在屋主賣出他們的房屋時最終獲得補電。
GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

A YES 212
NO 213

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

B YES 218
NO 219

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

C YES 222
NO 223

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

D YES 227
NO 228

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

E YES 232
NO 233
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disposición del asfalto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.

¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

237 SI 贊成
238 NO 反對
¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escrivano de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escrivano del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對
¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y éste ejecutará sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil?

245 SI 贊成
246 NO 反對
¿Ya no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgando, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad?

248 SI 贊成
249 NO 反對
¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對
¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
• 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
• Hastings Law School graduate
• Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
• Delinquency Prevention Commissioner (1985 – 1987)
• Volunteer Attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
• Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
• Married, two children
A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I am honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:
SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficy, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Eriola
10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENATOR Milton Marks
ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto
SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebim, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlota dell’Portillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni
BART DIRECTOR Mike Berneck
COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblentz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Bierman

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
• Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
• In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.
• “Barrister of the Year” — 1988.
• Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
• Coro Foundation Fellow.
• American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
• Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.
As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.
I will also be a role model for our young men and women.
My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoogasian; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melicio Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brassington.
Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Ellen Chaitin

Janet W. Forsythe

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #6

DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39

My qualifications for office are:

As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women’s History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Derman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years

My qualifications for office are:

Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

- Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
- Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
- Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
- Named an "Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service" by Bar Association.
- Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff in Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
- Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality.

As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Etona Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Barry Melton
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

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

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or
   the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four
   members of the Board, if the measure was
   submitted by same.

2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or
   members designated by the Board.

3. The Mayor.

4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has
   filed as a campaign committee in support of the
   measure.

5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combina-
   tion of voters and association of citizens.

6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":

1. For a referendum, the person who files the refer-
   endum petition with the Board of Supervisors.

2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or
   members designated by the Board.

3. The Mayor.

4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has
   filed as a campaign committee opposing the
   measure.

5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combi-
   nation of voters and association of citizens.

6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent’s Arguments" and "Opponent’s Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park’s electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park’s public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park’s irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $76,300,000
- Bond interest: $53,791,500
- Debt service requirement: $130,091,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
金门公园债券

支持提案 A 的论点

投票支持提案 A

金门公园是所有旧金山人的宝藏。公园提供了对城市生活的缓解，为家庭和邻里提供避难所。公园内有一千多英亩的湖泊、溪流、瀑布、越野小径、游乐场、野餐地点、博物馆、草地和森林。对普通观察者来说，公园看起来很健康。然而，公园的基础设施正在老化和倒塌。水井给许多灌溉系统带来了问题。供水线路正在老化和干燥。瀑布正在干涸。电气线路在地面腐烂。森林正在枯萎。在许多公园的基本设施中，如公共洗手间，对残疾人不友好。有些厕所无法使用。如果这些问题得不到解决，这座城市将面临公园的衰退和衰败。

提案 A 将为公园带来必要的修复，以保持金门公园的健康，为未来的旧金山人提供服务。修复包括更换公园的基础设施，如重新铺设供水线路，重建水井，修复湖泊，重新种植瀑布，加快老树和森林的重新覆盖。

提交人：监事会成员和市长

此论点于 1992 年 3 月 16 日由监事会通过。

赞成：监事会成员 Achenberg、Alioto、Britt、Gonzalez、Hallinan、Hsieh、Migden、Shelley 和 Ward。

缺席：监事会成员 Kennedy 和 Maher。

反驳支持提案 A 的论点

当然，改善金门公园和重建 Civic Center 是我们目前的计划，这是一件好事。但我们也应该考虑一下我们自己的生活。例如，如果一个人有能力购买一辆新的 BMW，一个新游泳池，一艘新游艇，一个新立体声音响系统，新的珠宝，新的衣服...

但是，我们应该考虑城市的未来。这不仅包括我们自己，还包括我们下一代。

目前，这座城市正面临财政赤字超过 15 亿美元。自 1986 年以来，这座城市批准了一些 15 亿美元的债券。我们正处于经济衰退的中间。

现在是时候批准这些 10 亿美元的债券来支持提案 A、B、C 和 D 了。

让我们换一个角度来看这个问题：如果你有超过 15,000 美元的存款，你会买一辆新车，建造一个游泳池，或者购买一件珠宝吗？当然不会！

那么，为什么城市应该借入 10 亿美元来翻新公园，当它只需要 15 亿美元的债券来支付一年的费用呢？

记住，这就是为什么纽约市自己造成了破产。

投票反对这 10 亿美元的债券！

投票反对 A、B、C 和 D！

委员会阻止市政破产

Arlo H. Smith，民主县委员会成员
Alexa Smith，民主党州委员会成员
Robert Silvestri，共和县委员会成员

注：本页中的论点是作者的意见，未经任何官方机构检查。
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years.

But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!

San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.

“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

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

Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area's open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land *
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society *
Edward Dier afs, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party *

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco's Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City's neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it's necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are drying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O'Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Esquerra, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco's most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park's infrastructure, preserving the park's safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park’s forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burkes, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Styberg Arboreum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

San Francisco’s elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carlota del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denehein, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammannio, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let’s bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
# Golden Gate Park Bonds

## PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City's economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudolf Nothenberg, Chief Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Lehrman, Nob Hill Gazette*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Carrier*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Suro*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S &amp; C Motors*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Quaranta, Restaurant Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Berman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kille Osier, The Names Project*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard H. Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Dishman, GUMP<em>S, Group Vice President</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce W. Lilienthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning &amp; Urban Research Association (SPUR)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

| Sherry Agnos |
| Louis J. Amoroso |
| Ruth Asawa |
| Barbara Bagot |
| Vikki Bay |
| Hilda Bernstein |
| Susan Bierman |
| Shirley Black |
| Jamie Nicol Bowles |
| Sharon Bretz |
| Thad Brown |
| Linda Cannon |
| Gwenn Craig |
| Kelly Cullen |
| Susanne L. Danielson |
| Ina Dearman |
| Henry Der |
| Dino Di Donato |
| Steven J. Doi |
| Mrs. Morris Doyle |
| Doug Engmann |
| Rotea Gilford |
| Louis J. Giraudo |
| Richard Grossboll |
| Anne Halsted |
| Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany |
| Ricardo Hernandez |
| Roberto Hernandez |
| Claudine Huey |
| Agar Jaicks |
| Maurice James |
| Cameo F. Jones |
| Shirley Jones |
| Jean Kalil |
| Tony Ktroy |
| Jean Kortum |

Reverend John and Donneter E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Otto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sululagi Palega
Lois Pavlow
Marianne H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Antia Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Saslawsky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomatra N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel V. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Tee
Robert W. Zinkhon

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

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell's drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combating AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco's former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loveliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park's delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women's Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco's park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco's neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Issacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Millet, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park's trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court’s decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $2.22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park’s aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city’s infrastructure are supposed to come from the city’s general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city’s infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it’s free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you’ll see that these things aren’t free. It’s City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven’t been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.
There is no free lunch.
Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It’s telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — “No New Taxes.” But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don’t tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you’ll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or how about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You’ll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you’ll pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT:

TWO MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($2,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL;
TWO MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-FOUR THOUSAND DOLLARS ($2,240,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA;
TWO MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-FOUR THOUSAND DOLLARS ($2,240,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO;
SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK;
THIRTY MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($30,300,000) TO IMPROVE THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS.

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

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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $2,700,000, for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000, to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000, to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, rereforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting (Continued on next page)
surrounding the City Hall and areas ad-
jacent thereto."

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYS-
TEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of
$21,220,000 to pay the cost of construc-
tion or reconstruction of a heating sys-
tem within the Civic Center area
including pipelines and hot water boiler
system."

"CIVIC CENTER PARKING GA-
RAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS,
To incur a bonded indebtedness of
$24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of
the Civic Center Parking Garage or
construction of a parking garage adja-
cent thereto, including asbestos abate-
ment and providing access for the
disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPRO-
To incur a bonded indebtedness of
$76,300,000 to pay the cost of the con-
struction or reconstruction of repair,
reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden
Gate Park including water system sup-
ply and irrigation, lakes and water
courses, utilities including street and se-
curity lighting, repair and rehabilitation
of park features, landscaping, restrooms
including disabled access thereto."

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employ-
es, representatives and agents of the City and
County of San Francisco are hereby authorized
and directed to do everything necessary or desir-
able to the calling and holding of said special
election, and to otherwise carry out the provi-
sions of this ordinance.

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be
Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City's current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $26,700,000
- Bond interest: 16,823,500
- Debt service requirement: 45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.0044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B
San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of.
Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.
Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.
Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.
Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .
And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .
But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!
Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!
Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!
To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!
Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C” and “D”?
Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?
Of course not!
Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills!
Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!
VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!

This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years! But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!

San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.

“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children's play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer's Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers' trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer's Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women's Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B. As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.

Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Song
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

Jean Kail
Library Commissioner

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Proposition B will revitalize the "heart of the City", increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Francisco's civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO'S FUTURE!

Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)

James Fussell, Executive Director
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig  
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn  
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley  
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtle  
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt  
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane  
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis  
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

Proposition B will make San Francisco’s Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city’s traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne  
City Attorney

Arlo Smith  
District Attorney

Milton Marks  
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.  
Assembly Speaker

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

James Haas  
Chair, Civic Pride

Carolyn Diamond  
Executive Director, Greater Market Street Development Association

Robert Priese  
President, San Francisco Beautiful

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco’s heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein  
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city's needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

*Genevieve Spiegel*, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
*Alice Lowe*, Chair, Asian Art Commission
*Rand Castle*, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
*Walter Johnson*, Secretary-Treasurer

---

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According the Controller's statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for.

It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

*James Slaughter*
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let's get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer's Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children's playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces, asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall's delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?

Let's see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSITION C

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $24,000,000
- Bond interest: $16,920,500
- Debt service requirement: $40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.0040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.

Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City’s Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area. This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)

James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote YES on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Siong
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night. Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center. Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner

David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works

Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager

Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C. Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers’ funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new Library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.
Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That’s why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can’t you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We’re here asked to “incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage” to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C’s high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $33,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that’s just for the garage — it doesn’t include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR’S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board’s esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board’s decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don’t we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a “white elephant”. Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board’s budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco’s Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city’s residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let’s not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let’s logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Phipel
Norman Roffe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
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TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)

Cost: Free

Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mar 7</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>June 13</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Sept 12</th>
<th>Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 28</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>June 27</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>Sept 26</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>July 18</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>Worm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 25</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Oct 24</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Aug 1</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Aug 22</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLUG Compost Rotline-468-0262 • Recycling Hotline-554-6193

Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364
PROPOSITION D

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $21,220,000
- Bond interest: $14,960,100
- Debt service requirement: $36,180,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center
Heating System Bonds

PROponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition D

Please Vote Yes on Proposition D
A Yes on D Vote is a Vote for Economy
And for Energy Efficiency.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.
Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than “a hot water system.”

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City's great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don't raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.

Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system. Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City's budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the "right" time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is "dumb" is not Proposition D. What's dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don't fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!
The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.
ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!
Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D.
Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.
VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.
San Francisco’s Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that’s consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.
The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.
VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.
Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.
Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quenin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D

The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a “new” hot water heating system at Civic Center. Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?
This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council
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PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, "capital projects" includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current City services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.
NO: Achenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
ABSENT: Supervisor Aloto.
PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City’s General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City’s buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That’s clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor’s recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor’s recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What’s wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials’ power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco’s other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That’s not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children's Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans' needs.

This time we're asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawnmowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don't!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT'S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition "E" requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer's assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition "E" deals not with "lawnmowers" as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition "E" would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition "E" is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition E

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President

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

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the
qualified electors of the City and County of San
Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and
county by adding Section 6.209 relating to an-
annual mandated levels of funds for protection and
maintenance of the City’s infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco hereby submits to the
qualified electors of said city and county at an
election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a
proposal to amend the Charter of said city and
county by adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the
Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and
the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each
budget and annual appropriation ordinance,
through Fiscal Year 2004/2005 only, an amount
(CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages
specified below for the identified years of Gen-
eral Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993/1994</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/1995</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/1996 through 2003/2004</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2005</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this section the term “gen-
eral fund revenue sources” shall be defined to
include all revenues, however they may subse-
quently be identified or classified, of the type that
are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordin-
nance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Rev-
eneu appropriations of the general fund. Not later
than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter,
the controller shall make available for public
distribution a list of all general fund revenue
sources and the amounts derived from those
sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this sec-
tion shall be expended solely for the acquisition,
maintenance, and construction of real property
and improvements thereon belonging to the City
and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PRO-
JECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1. In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the
capital funds must be used for mainte-
nance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41%
of the capital funds must be used for
maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used
for maintenance. The allocation percent-
ages specified in this paragraph (A) may
be changed in any given year by the
Board of Supervisors if such change is
approved by resolution of the board ap-
proved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the
question of the change in allocation per-
centage.

2. In subsequent years, capital funds
may be expended for any capital project
selected by the Mayor and the Board of
Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary
and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit
the authority of the City to appropriate additional
funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this
section and not expended during the fiscal year
shall be carried forward and expended in subse-
quient fiscal years in accordance with the alloca-
tion criteria specified in this section for the year
in which the appropriation of the unexpended
funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds
will not meet any of the City’s then current
annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropri-
ated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or
replace the maintenance components of existing
departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.
The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner’s Office and Convention Facilities Management
The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:
Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.
The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.
Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.
Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.
Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.
The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors. All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.
The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.
Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.
Coroner’s office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.
County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.
Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.
Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county’s convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.
The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.
It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.
4.103 Superior Court Appointments
The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.
Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be and are hereby placed under the direction of the superior court.
The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court, provided however that any person who holds civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption by the electorate of the amendment adding this paragraph to the charter shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.
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PROPOSITION F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk’s office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator’s Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "F"
Proposition "F" makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder's Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk's and Recorder's Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk's Office to the County Recorder's Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent's Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to choose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of “G” miss the point: This measure isn’t about health care for zoo animals, IT’S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create “flexibility” in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to “exempt” that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That’s patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards.

If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians’ appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE “NO” ON “G”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
“G” is “GREEDY”!
Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.

And that’s what “G” is about: Political Patronage! Every time a position is “exempted” from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends. Surprised? You shouldn’t be!

“G” was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!

Say “NO” to patronage hiring!
Say “No” to “G”!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care! Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the “friends” that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

---

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives

The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
Inventory Control

PROPOSITION H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City’s many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:
Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments’ operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which “own” the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing’s inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSPR'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of “H” is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect “savings” like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, “H” would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser’s office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out!

Of course not! They’re too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!
Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as “H”.
Send City Hall a message that you’re tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"H" is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee "on the take."
"H" would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!
Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That's right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergages in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition "H".
VOTE "NO" ON "H"

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H's opponents want City government to be cumbersome.
In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.
If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments would have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller's Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.
The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be directly purchased by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the person assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments, and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
PROPOSITION I.
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?  

YES  
NO  

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California’s government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That’s the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn’t make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That’s not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians. Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue their separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your “YES” vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We’ll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won’t move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn’t get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state’s economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting)!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa
Oponent's Argument Against Proposition I

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese...

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California's ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California's voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON'T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

Rebuttal to Oponent's Argument Against Proposition I

All that the passage of Proposition I would do is to allow San Franciscans the right to explore the concept of a separate Northern California State.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren't interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don't they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California's counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn't San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn't our right to express our opinion worth that much? Vote YES on Proposition I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There's no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn't even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won't solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It's enough to make Jimmy Gonzales' mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a "substantial, but presently indeterminable amount".

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should "interact" in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There's no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It's sad that some people feel the answer to California's problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Save the spotted owl!
Don't let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heroes Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn't support California's breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don't double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

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

Kopp’s Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors’ proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless “advisory” trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn’t even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than “hype” or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates “city policy”. Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it’s an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers’ time and money. There are endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan
TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION I

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES ➪ NO ➪

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

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

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Ahnoko.
PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a “state-back” guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let’s keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote “YES” on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don’t let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don’t speak of “Northern California Girl” or “Hotel Southern California.”

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN’T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The “State-Split” Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

“J” IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.
Proposition “J” asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.
Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of “Northern California” Those who want a “Northern California” state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!
To vote “YES” on Proposition “J” is to say you think this backwoods “state-splitting” scheme is o.k.
Tell City Hall you’re tired of the jokes like Proposition “J” the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.
Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.
Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!
VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE “STATE-SPLIT” JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!
What Proposition “J” really asks is, “If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?”

In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?
California will only continue to grow! It’s a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.
San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don’t let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition J

PAID Arguments Against Proposition J

Don't be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn't even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it's spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you're elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with caved ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members' minds? VOTE NO ON J.

Kopp's Good Government Committee
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President

Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.

Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page. After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?

Your Return Address


Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place. The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

**Vote-By-Mail Voters — Cut or Tear Along Perforated Line**

Do Not Remove Label

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

**ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election**

**Sign** this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

Check One:

- [ ] Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
- [ ] I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address

City  State  Zip Code

Check Here If Appropriate:

- [ ] I have moved since I last registered to vote.
  My new address is printed below. (Residence Address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name

Apt. No.

SAN FRANCISCO, CA  941

Check below all that apply, then sign your name:

- [ ] I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- [ ] I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- [ ] All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish _____, Chinese _____.

**You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.**

Your signature - **DO NOT PRINT**

Date Signed  Day Time Phone  Evening Phone
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q. Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLLED WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr)</th>
<th>Your Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Your First Name</th>
<th>Print Your Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Your Residence Address</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day Phone</th>
<th>Eve. Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:

I HAVE a car: [Please Check]

--- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned Precinct:</th>
<th>Home Precinct:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affidavit Number:</th>
<th>Clerk:</th>
<th>Inspector:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.O. Bk.</th>
<th>6/2</th>
<th>6/6</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Reg. Attach.</th>
<th>Init's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .......................... 15-27
2. the location of your polling place ................................ (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; ....................... back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; .......................................... 6
5. information for disabled voters; ............................... 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; ................................................................. 30-31
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; ................................................................. 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; ................. 12
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting; ................................................................. inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

STEP 1

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

第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

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

第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

第三步
請把帶釘之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監票員。

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 138 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Reublican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:
   • Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
   • Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don’t find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City's constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

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

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

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

Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gilham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(DOES NOT INCLUDE S.F. UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT OR
S.F. COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

STATE & FEDERAL GRANTS
FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS
(E.G., AIDS PREVENTION,
AFDC PAYMENTS)
30 %
$720 MILLION

REVENUES GENERATED BY CITY
DEPARTMENTS AND USED BY SAME
DEPARTMENT
(E.G., LANDING FEES PAID BY AIRLINES TO
S.F. INT'L. AIRPORT)
29 %
$696 MILLION

BUSINESS, SALES & OTHER TAXES
& OTHER INCOME
21 %
$504 MILLION

PROPERTY TAX
20 %
$480 MILLION

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

NON-GENERAL FUND REVENUE
46%
$1.1 BILLION

OTHER GENERAL FUND REVENUE
11%
$260 MILLION

GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUE
43%
$1.03 BILLION

EXPENDITURES
PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES
$1.03 BILLION

PUBLIC PROTECTION
39 %
$409 MILLION

HEALTH & WELFARE
31 %
$321 MILLION

RECREATION & CULTURE
5 %
$53 MILLION

UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION
11 %
$114 MILLION

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
14 %
$146 MILLION

This includes only the General Fund subsidy to the Municipal Railway. The total budget for the Municipal Railway is $282 Million, including state and federal grants.

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- ADOPT
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- ALTER
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m. Daily

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS

To express your preference for a candidate for nomination for President, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Your vote in this portion of the ballot is advisory only. Delegates to the national convention will be elected in the delegate selection portion of the ballot.

To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person's name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite "YES" or "NO" for that measure.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES

Para expresar su preferencia por un candidato que será nombrado Presidente, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Su voto en esta porción de la balota sirve sólo como guía. Los delegados a la convención nacional serán elegidos en la porción de la balota de selección de delegados.

Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.

Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pídale que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.

Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de "SI" o "NO" para dicha medida.

Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca o borrador; esto anularía la balota.
Si usted se equivoca al votar, a la rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.
### SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>總統優先選舉權</th>
<th>PREFERENCIA PRESIDENCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>美國獨立黨</td>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>參加全國大會的代表</td>
<td>Delegates to the National Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUNA DELEGACION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOWARD PHILLIPS</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO</th>
<th>2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS</td>
<td>PRESIDENTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY</td>
<td>PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-3-ALL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Senator — Full Term</td>
<td>JEROME “JERRY” MC CREDY</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Senator — Short Term</td>
<td>PAUL MEEUWENBERG</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**American Independent Party**

**Consolidated Primary Election**

**June 2, 1992, City and County of San Francisco**
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th><strong>U.S. Representative in Congress — 8th District</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>affiliate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2 | **State Senator — 8th District** |
| **there is no contest for this office in this district** | **No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito** |
| **affiliate** | **Vote por Uno** |

| 1 | **Member, State Assembly — 12th District** |
| **NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED** | **NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO** |
| **affiliate** | **Vote por Uno** |
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT
Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本區在本頁是空白
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本区在本頁是空白
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
BALOTA APARTIDARIA

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT, OFFICE #5
JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 5

ELLEN CHAITIN
Trial Attorney
Abogada Litigante
Vote for One
161

JANET W. FORSYTHE
Deputy Public Defender
Abogada de Oficio Delegada
Vote for One
163

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT, OFFICE #6
JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 6

BARRY MELTON
Attorney
Abogado
Vote for One
169

DONNA LITTLE
Judge of the Municipal Court
Juez del Tribunal Municipal
Vote for One
171
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

7E
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

152
YES 185
NO 186

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.

153
YES 193
NO 194

PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.

154
YES 203
NO 204
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.

1992年學校設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債十九億元（$1,900,000,000），提供資金作建設或改良學校之用。

152

193 SI 贊成
194 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalezcan la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejorías de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.

1992年6月高等教育設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債九億元（$900,000,000），用於興建或改良加州的公立學校和大學設施。

153

203 SI 贊成
204 NO 反對

APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocuren del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.

延期徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估值所増實業稅可延期償付。

財政影響：這個提案將由於屋主延期繳付實業稅而導致州或地方政府損失數以百萬元計。這些損失會在屋主賣出他們的房屋時最終獲得補償。

154
GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.  

YES 212  NO 213

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.  

YES 218  NO 219

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.  

YES 222  NO 223

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.  

YES 227  NO 228

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?  

YES 232  NO 233
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

8F

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.

212 SI 贊成
213 NO 反對

1992年改良金門公園公債法案。發行公債 $76,300,000，用於支付金門公園的興建、重建、修復、再造林和整頓，包括供水系統和灌溉、湖和水的流向，公用事業包括街燈和保安照明，修復和整頓公園的面貌，自然美化，包括便利殘障人士使用的廁所。

B

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反對

1992年改良市政中心公債法案。發行公債 $26,700,000，用於支付改良市政中心廣場和富頓街林蔭人行道，自然美化和市政廳周圍及鄰近地區的街燈。

C

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asfalto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.

222 SI 贊成
223 NO 反對

1992年改良市政中心停車場公債法案。發行公債 $24,000,000，用於支付擴建市政中心停車場或在鄰近建築停車場，包括減少石板和魚骨縫人士提供方便。

D

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCION DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.

227 SI 贊成
228 NO 反對

1992年改良市政中心供熱系統公債法案。發行公債 $21,200,000，用於支付興建或重建市政中心地區內的保暖系統，包括管道和熱水系統。

E

¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993-2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?

232 SI 贊成
233 NO 反對

應否規定市政府每年撥出一定比例的普通基金，連續十二年（1993—2005），只用於特定的基礎工程，如興建、保養和購買市府大樓和其他公共物業？

8F-0-ALL
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

9E

F Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer? YES 237 ➔ NO 238 ➔

G Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules? YES 241 ➔ NO 242 ➔

H Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments? YES 245 ➔ NO 246 ➔

I Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state? YES 248 ➔ NO 249 ➔

J Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state? YES 252 ➔ NO 253 ➔

9E-0-ALL

END OF BALLOT
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APRITIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPÓSITOS DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

237 SI 贊成
238 NO 反對
¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escrivano de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escrivano del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對
¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y éste ejecutará sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil?

245 SI 贊成
246 NO 反對
¿Ya no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgando, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad?

248 SI 贊成
249 NO 反對
¿Será la política de las personas del Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對
¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

______________________________________________________

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
• 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
• Hastings Law School graduate
• Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
• Delinquency Prevention Commissioner (1985 – 1987)
• Volunteer Attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
• Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
• Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:

SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire,
Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael
Duffie, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone,
Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich,
Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola

10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENATOR Milton Marks
SUPERVISORS: Kevin Shelley, Willie Kennedy, Carole
Migden, Bill Maher, Roberta Achtenberg, Jim Gonzalez, Tom
Hsieh, Terence Hallinan, Harry Britt, Angela Alioto.
ASSSESSOR Richard Hongisto
SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebeim, JoAnne Miller, Fred
Rodriquez, Carlota delPortillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred,
Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni
BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick
COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy
Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William
Coblentz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Biernar

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
• Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San
Francisco.
• In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black
women.
• It’s time to make history!
• I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
  • Honors graduate — George Washington University.
  • Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
  • Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s
    Office.
  • "Barrister of the Year" — 1988.
  • Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
  • Coro Foundation Fellow.
  • American Fellow — American Association of University
    Women.
  • Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.

As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial
courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good
judgment to the court.

I will also be a role model for our young men and women.
My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor
Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges:
Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty
Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine
Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Po-
lice Commissioner; Harold Hoogasian; Pat Norman; William
Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melecio Santos; Charles
Birenbaum; Michael Brasington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American
woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe

Ellen Chaitin
DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are:
As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers' Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women's History Month Cavalcade of Women.
My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varcaelli, Vice-President, SEIU.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years
My qualifications for office are:
Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:
• Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
• Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
• Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
• Named an "Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service" by Bar Association.
• Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
• Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality.
As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Barry Melton

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

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

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To Incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park’s electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park’s public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park’s irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $76,300,000
- Bond interest: $53,791,500
- Debt service requirement: $130,091,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of city life for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park's one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park's infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park's basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park's infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park's water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and resealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we're in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions "A", "B", "C", and "D"?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it's $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year's bills?

Remember, that's how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that "San Francisco deserves better".
"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law.
The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area’s open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space
Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dierauf, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco’s Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City’s neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it’s necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loo, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O’Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Esquerro, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco’s most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park’s infrastructure, preserving the park’s safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting YES on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

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

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park’s forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burkes, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

San Francisco’s elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carlota del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let’s bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park Bond

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City's economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nathenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehrman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Carter*
Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quaranta, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Kite Oster, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson*
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP'S, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lilienthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Bierman
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwenn Craig
Kelly Cullen
Susanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Roea Gilford
Louis J. Giraudo
Richard Grossbold
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heaney
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaacks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kalil
Tony Kilroy
Jean Korium
Reverend John and
Donneter E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Otto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sulalagi Palega
Lois Pavlov
Marianne H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Sasafsky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomata N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Maillard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinkhon

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

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combatting AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yurling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loveliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women’s Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco’s park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urges you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Miller, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park’s trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court's decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $.22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park's aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city's infrastructure are supposed to come from the city's general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors on property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It's telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — "No New Taxes." But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don't tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you'll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You'll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you'll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Of course everyone wants our city's infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it's free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you'll see that these things aren't free. It's City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven't been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION B, PROPOSITION C AND PROPOSITION D

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, for the purpose of submitting to the voters 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall and local lands for the improved properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and abatement for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting (Continued on next page)
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto."

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system."

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto."

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

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

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

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

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

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

PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City's current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $26,700,000
- Bond interest: $18,823,500
- Debt service requirement: $45,623,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Ailoto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
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PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B
San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of.

Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills?

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a
crises, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of
Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years.
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite
the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are
asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions
of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New
York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top
of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate
staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government
before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might
be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage
the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.
To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the
equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to
borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure
ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession,
the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them
will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the
bottom falls out of the barrel!
STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL
BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B",
"C" AND "D"!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPOENST'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions
A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that
"San Francisco deserves better".
"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further
deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open
spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be
preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can
continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center
Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget
deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is
balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law.
The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with
balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what
they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New
York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing
bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future,
investments which will not increase annual operating costs but
may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals
which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their con-
tinued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsich,
Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.
The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.
The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.
Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
Proposition B will revitalized the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Francisco’s civic pride!
VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!
Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.
As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.
Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.
VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.
Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.
Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Stang
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.
Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.
Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig  
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn  
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelty  
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechle  
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt  
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane  
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis  
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

James Haas  
Chair, Civic Pride

Carolyn Diamond  
Executive Director, Greater Market Street Development Association

Robert Friese  
President, San Francisco Beautiful

Proposition B will make San Francisco’s Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city’s traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne  
City Attorney

Arlo Smith  
District Attorney

Milton Marks  
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.  
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco’s heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein  
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city’s needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote NO on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According the the Controller’s statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote No on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let’s get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer’s Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children’s playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall’s delivery trucks,

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?

Let’s see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSITION C
CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “C”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $24,000,000
- Bond interest: $16,920,500
- Debt service requirement: $40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.0040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.
Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

Rebuttal to PropoNent's Argument in Favor of Proposition C

Proposition C will NOT "cure parking headaches" in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City's bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City's Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What's more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs; and if they can't, the garage shouldn't be built. We believe the City's General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn't be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds
Civic Center Garage Bonds

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues. If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area.

This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn't be at the expense of the Farmer's Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer's trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People do drive to evening activities. Farmer's trucks need parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer's Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers' trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the "Heart of the City".

Please vote Yes on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer's Market

The Civic Center Farmer's Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers' trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coutcher
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

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

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner

David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works

Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager

Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers' funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That's why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can't you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We're here asked to "incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage" to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C's high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $53,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that's just for the garage — it doesn't include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR'S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board's esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board's decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don't we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a "white elephant"? Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board's budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco's Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city's residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let's not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let's logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco’s revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
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TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

Mar 7 Basic  June 13 Advanced  Sept 12 Basic
Mar 28 Basic  June 27 Worm  Sept 26 Basic
Apr 11 Advanced  July 18 Basic  Oct 10 Worm
Apr 25 Worm  July 25 Basic  Oct 24 Basic
May 9 Basic  Aug 1 Advanced  Nov 7 Advanced
May 23 Basic  Aug 22 Worm

SLUG Compost Rolline--468-0262 • Recycling Hotline--554-6193

Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

---

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $21,220,000
- Bond interest: 14,960,100
- Debt service requirement: $36,180,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPOSED ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY
AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center
heating system with a new, energy efficient system. The
old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years.
Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out
and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This
old system requires constant oversight when in operation and
requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy
than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and
inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main
Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department,
City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and
maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Brit, Gonzalez,
Hallinan, Hsieh, Migden, Shelley and Ward.

Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSED ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you
believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an ex-
pected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system
for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving
this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in
operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook
does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down
the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No
descriptive language other than “a hot water system.”

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work
on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond
salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36
million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors
have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from
taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every
dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the
way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real
cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting
way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guiness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.

Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system. Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!
The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.

ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!
Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D.
Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.

VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition D will replace the Civic Center's antiquated, wasteful steam heating plant with a modern, energy-efficient system.
By passing Proposition D, we will save an estimated $750,000 in energy costs every year.
Proposition D makes financial and environmental sense. Join us in voting YES on Proposition D.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Milton Marks
State Senator
Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assembly Speaker

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.
San Francisco's Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that's consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.
The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.

VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.
Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.
Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D
The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a "new" hot water heating system at Civic Center. Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?
This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council
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Infrastructure Fund

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

Yes  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, "capital projects" includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current City services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.

NO: Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
PROPOSAL'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City's General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than letting them deteriorate and have to be replaced later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City's buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSAL'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That's clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor's recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor's recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What's wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials' power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco's other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That's not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children's Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans' needs.

This time we’re asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawn mowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don't!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E—IT'S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with "lawnmowers" as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
For the purpose of this section the term "general fund revenue sources" shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereon belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1. In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996 through 2003/2004, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

2. In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City’s then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner’s Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plans and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county supervisors, and his official acts and all plans, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county supervisors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefore shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner’s office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county’s convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be and are hereby placed under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court, provided, however, that any person who holds civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption of the ordinance amending this paragraph to the charter shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of the charter.
PROPOSITION F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk’s office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator’s Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION F IS ON PAGE 66.
PROPOSAL'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "F"
Proposition "F" makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder's Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk's and Recorder's Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk's Office to the County Recorder's Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

---

No Opponent's Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F
Chief Zoo Veterinarian

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the
pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Depart-
ment, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission,
rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Man-
ger to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of
the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employ-
ees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo
Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the
Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service sys-
tem. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the Gen-
eral Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to con-
tinue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0
to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alloto, Britt, Gonzalez,
Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher, Migden, Shelley
and Ward.
Chief Zoo Veterinarian

PROPONEHT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 5 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to chose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONEHT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of "G" miss the point: This measure isn't about health care for zoo animals, IT'S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create "flexibility" in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to "exempt" that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That's patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards.

If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians' appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE "NO" ON "G"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

"G" is "GREEDY"!
Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the
grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot
with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get
their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil
service.
And that’s what "G" is about: Political Patronage!
Every time a position is "exempted" from civil service the
politicians get a chance to hire their friends.
Surprised?
You shouldn’t be!
"G" was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried
to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount
of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from
wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9
million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same
Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and
a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign
policy!
Say "NO" to patronage hiring!
Say "No" To "G"!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!
Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary
medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated
with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from
Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to
conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate
in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical
program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this
specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary
school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.
This is no giveaway of public funds and the "friends" that will
benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh,
Kennedy, Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives
The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
PROPOSITION H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City's many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments' operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which "own" the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing’s inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSITION'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of "H" is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy. It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect "savings" like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, "H" would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser's office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out?

Of course not! They're too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as "H".

Send City Hall a message that you're tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C", "D", "G", "H", "I" and "J"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

"H" is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee "on the take."
"H" would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!

Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That's right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergages in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition "H".

VOTE "NO" ON "H"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H's opponents want City government to be cumbersome.

In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.

If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller's Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.
The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section.

The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report the same to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSITION

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES

NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Dividing California into Two States

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California’s government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That’s the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn’t make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That’s not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your “YES” vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We’ll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won’t move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn’t get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state’s economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting)!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

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

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belie an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese . .

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California's ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California's voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state's beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON'T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren't interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don't they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California's counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn't San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn't our right to express our opinion worth that much? Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

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

There's no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn't even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won't solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect of the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It's enough to make Jimmy Gonzales' mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a "substantial, but presently indeterminable amount".

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should "interact" in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There's no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It's sad that some people feel the answer to California's problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

Save the spotted owl!
Don't let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heros Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn't support California's breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don't double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Kopp’s Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors’ proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless “advisory” trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn’t even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than “hype” or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates “city policy”. Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it’s an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers’ time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

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

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

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

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "J"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
San Francisco in Northern California

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California. The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a “state-back” guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let’s keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote “YES” on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California. The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don’t let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don’t speak of “Northern California Girl” or “Hotel Southern California.”

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself? Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN’T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The “State-Split” Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

“J” IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.
Proposition “J” asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.
Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of “Northern California” Those who want a “Northern California” state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!
To vote “YES” on Proposition “J” is to say you think this backwoods “state-splitting” scheme is o.k.
Tell City Hall you’re tired of the jokes like Proposition “J” the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.
Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.
Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!
VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE “STATE-SPLIT” JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!
What Proposition “J” really asks is, “If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?”
In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?
California will only continue to grow! It’s a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.
San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don’t let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Don't be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn't even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it's spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you're elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members' minds?
VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President

Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.

Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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### PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Zoo Veterinarian</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Bonds</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Garage Bonds</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Heating System Bonds</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Clerk</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividing California into Two States</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Park Bonds</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Fund</td>
<td>61</td>
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<tr>
<td>Inventory Control</td>
<td>73</td>
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<tr>
<td>Proposition A</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition B</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition C</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition D</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition E</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition F</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition G</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition H</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition I</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition J</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco in Northern California</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CANDIDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Chaitin</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet W. Forsythe</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Little</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Melton</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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POLLING PLACE CARD: To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to **SIGN** your application on the other side?

Your Return Address
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot Type</th>
<th>American Independent</th>
<th>Precincts Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9231</td>
<td>12th Assembly District, 8th Senate District, 8th Congressional</td>
<td>2000's, 2100's, 2200's, 2700's, 2900's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place. The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

Vote-By-Mail Voters --- Cut or Tear Along Perforated Line

Do Not Remove Label

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

### ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election

Sign this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

Check One:
- [ ] Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
- [ ] I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Check Here If Appropriate:
- [ ] I have moved since I last registered to vote. My new address is printed below. (Residence Address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 941

Check below all that apply, then sign your name:
- [ ] I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- [ ] I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- [ ] All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish_____, Chinese_____.

You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

Your signature - DO NOT PRINT

Date Signed

Day Time Phone

Evening Phone

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED

YES OR NO
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet
and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q. Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility..

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION
I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr) Your Signature

Print Your First Name MI Print Your Last Name

Print Your Residence Address Zip Code

Day Phone -- Eve. Phone --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other: 

-------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS --------

Assigned Precinct: Home Precinct: 

Affidavit Number: Clerk: Inspector: 

E.O. Bk. 6/2 6/6 Code Reg. Attach. Init'ls

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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### PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. **a Sample Ballot** (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); ............................................. 15-27
2. the location of your polling place ............................................. (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an **Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot** and for permanent absentee voter status; ............................................. .back cover
4. **Your rights as a voter** ...................................................... 6
5. information for disabled voters ............................................. 5
6. **statements from candidates** who are running for local office; ...................................................... 30-31
7. **information about each local ballot measure**, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; ............................................. 33-86
8. **definitions of words** you need to know; ............................................. 12
9. **a Polling Place Card** to mark your choices before voting. ............................................. inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

**STEP 1**

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del “Votomatic.”

第一步
请双手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

**STEP 2**

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

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

第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

**STEP 3**

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

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

第三步
請把帶錐之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

**STEP 4**

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

Depois de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votación.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監票員。
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P”, then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help.
You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate.
Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:
• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don't find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party's candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as "independent" or "non-partisan" voters. People who checked "American Independent" on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with "2." Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with "3."

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

---

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

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

---

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, Jim Stevens and Molly Wood.
Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.
Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Federal Grants for Specific Programs</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$720 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E.g., AIDS Prevention, AFDC Payments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues Generated by City Departments and Used by Same Department (E.g., Landing Fees Paid by Airlines to S.F. Intl. Airport)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$666 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Sales &amp; Other Taxes &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$504 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$480 MILLION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$1.1 BILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$260 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Regular Revenue</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$1.03 BILLION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES
$1.03 BILLION

- Public Protection: 39% ($409 MILLION)
- Health & Welfare: 31% ($321 MILLION)
- Recreation & Culture: 5% ($53 MILLION)
- Utilities & Transportation: 11% ($114 MILLION)
- General Administration: 14% ($146 MILLION)

This includes only the General Fund subsidy to the Municipal Railway. The total budget for the Municipal Railway is $282 Million, including state and federal grants.

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- ADOPT
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- ALTER
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Open for Adoptions 11 a.m. to 6 p.m. Daily
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS

To express your preference for a candidate for nomination for President, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Your vote in this portion of the ballot is advisory only. Delegates to the national convention will be elected in the delegate selection portion of the ballot.

To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person's name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite "YES" or "NO" for that measure. All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

美國獨立黨

選民須知

如要表達你對提名總統候選人的優先選擇，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。你投票這一部分僅屬表達意見性質，出席全國大會的代表將在選票的選舉代表部分選出。

投票選舉選票上所列的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。如果要選舉超過兩名競選同一官職的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的所有候選人姓名旁邊打孔，但請勿選舉超過所選候選人的數目。

投票選舉合格的候選人，請在選票卡的長方體部分的空位上寫上該候選人的姓名和官職。如有不明之處，請向助選員求助。

投票任何一項提案，請用藍色筆尖在提案旁邊的“YES”（贊成）或“NO”（反對）打孔。

如果選票有明顯污損或擦掉痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你投票錯了，或者選票撕破了，應把選票交回選區的選舉委員，再拿一份新選票。

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES

Para expresar su preferencia por un candidato que será nombrado Presidente, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Su voto en esta porción de la balota sirve sólo como guía. Los delegados a la convención nacional serán elegidos en la porción de la balota de selección de delegados.

Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.

Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.

Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de “Sí” o “No” para dicha medida.

Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca y borradoras; esto anularía la balota.

Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請轉下頁。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.

TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
**SAMPLE BALLOT**  
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>總統優先選舉權</th>
<th>PREFERENCIA PRESIDENCIAL</th>
<th>Presidential Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOWARD PHILLIPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>參加全國大會的代表</th>
<th>DELEGADOS PARA LA CONVENCION NACIONAL</th>
<th>Delegates to the National Convention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
<td>NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUNA DELEGACION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY**  
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION  
JUNE 2, 1992

**PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO**  
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS  
2 DE JUNIO DE 1992

**PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**  
PRESIDENTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 2, 1992

UNITED STATES SENATOR

SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS — PERIODO COMPLETO

United States Senator — Full Term

JEROME "JERRY" MC CREDAY
Businessman
Hombre de negocios

54

PAUL MEEUWENBERG
Marketing Consultant
Consultor de mercadotecnia

69
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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República de México

3. Representante de los Estados Unidos, Distrito 12
Representante de los Estados Unidos en el Congreso — 12th District
NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED
NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO

4. Senador Estatal, Distrito 8
State Senator — 8th District

THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT
No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito

5. Miembro de la Asamblea Estatal, Distrito 12
Member, State Assembly — 12th District
NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED
NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO

American Independent Party
Consolidated Primary Election
June 2, 1992
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT
Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本區在本頁是空白
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-3-ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 2, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT**

Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本區在本頁是空白
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</th>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA 無黨派選票</th>
<th></th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT, OFFICE #5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELLEN CHAITIN</strong></td>
<td>Trial Attorney</td>
<td>Abogada Litigante 奏訴律師</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANET W. FORSYTHE</strong></td>
<td>Deputy Public Defender</td>
<td>Abogada de Oficio Delegada 助理公共辯護律師</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT, OFFICE #6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BARRY MELTON</strong></td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Abogado 律師</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DONNA LITTLE</strong></td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court</td>
<td>Juez del Tribunal Municipal 市法庭法官</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

152

SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 185
NO 186

153

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California's public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California's students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state's economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.

YES 193
NO 194

154

PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.

YES 203
NO 204
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反对
ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.

193 SI 贊成
194 NO 反对
ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalezcan la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejorías de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.

203 SI 贊成
204 NO 反对
APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocuren del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.

192年学校设施公债法案。本提案授权发行公债十九亿元（$1,900,000,000），提供资金作建设或改良公立学校之用。

192年6月高等教育设施公债法案。本提案授权发行公债九亿元（$900,000,000），用于兴建或改良加州的公立学院和大学设施。

這些建設工程可以創造就業，確保加州學生獲得高等教育，並使各公立學院和大學培訓出一批訓練有素的、競爭力強的勞動大軍，充實加州的經濟。授權興建的138公立校園計 划，包括，但並不等於限制於防震和其他衛生安全的改良、實驗室的現代化，以跟上科學的發展和建築 課室、圖書館等等。

延時徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估值所增實業稅可延 期繳付。

財政影響：這個提案將由於房屋延 期應付實業稅而導致州或地方政府 損失數以百萬元計。這些損失會在 屋主賣出他們的房屋時最終獲得補 償。
GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

YES 212
NO 213

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES 218
NO 219

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

YES 222
NO 223

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

YES 227
NO 228

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

YES 232
NO 233
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balota</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Año</th>
<th>Detalles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212 SÍ</td>
<td>Bonos para Mejorar el Parque Golden Gate, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajística, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Requisitos similares como el descrito para el Parque Golden Gate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 SÍ</td>
<td>Bonos para Mejorar el Centro Cívico, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajística e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222 SÍ</td>
<td>Bonos para Mejorar la Playa de Estacionamiento del Centro Cívico, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asfalto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Mejorar la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 SÍ</td>
<td>Bonos para Mejorar el Sistema de Calafacción del Centro Cívico, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calafacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Mejorar el sistema de calafacción del Centro Cívico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 SÍ</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A** 8F 8F-0-ALL
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9E</th>
<th>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY &amp; COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F**

Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?  

| YES 237 | NO 238 |

**G**

Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?  

| YES 241 | NO 242 |

**H**

Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?  

| YES 245 | NO 246 |

**I**

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?  

| YES 248 | NO 249 |

**J**

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?  

| YES 252 | NO 253 |

9E-0-ALL

END OF BALLOT
## SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

### BALOTA APARTIDARIA

#### CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

**ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992**

**MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>237 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>238 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>9F</strong></td>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>無黨派選票</td>
<td>當事的職責任和人事應否從高等法院事務後轉職到政府部門，並在首席行政官的監督下任職？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escritorio de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escritorio del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>241 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>242 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td>市動物園獸醫主醫師應否由康樂與公園管理局局長委任，但須經康樂與公園委員會批准，而不應在公務條例管轄下任職？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y éste ejecutará sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>245 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>246 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td>市採購官應否不必為市政府其他部門管理所有物資、補給和器材的存貨，而由各部門自行負責管理這些存貨？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Ya no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgando, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>248 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>249 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td>支持把加州劃分為北加州和南加州，應否成為舊金山市縣人民的政策？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas del Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>252 SI</strong></td>
<td><strong>253 NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
<td>如果加州劃分為北加州和南加州，舊金山則屬於北加州範圍，這樣應否成為舊金山市縣人民的政策？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FIN DE LA BALOTA**

票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE, OFFICE #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
- 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
- Hastings Law School graduate
- Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
- Volunteer Attorney, Women's Health Clinic
- Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
- Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I'm honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:

SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficy, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Petasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola

10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENATOR Milton Marks

ASSessor Richard Hongisto

SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebeim, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlota delPorillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni
BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick
COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblenz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Bieman

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
- Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
- In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.
- Its time to make history!
- I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
  • Honors graduate — George Washington University.
  • Dean's Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
  • Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender's Office.
  • "Barrister of the Year" — 1988.
  • Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
  • Coro Foundation Fellow.
  • American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
  • Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.
  • As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.
  • I will also be a role model for our young men and women.

My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoogasian; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melecio Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brassington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe

Ellen Chaitin

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

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are:

As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women’s History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hichens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazolla, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years
My qualifications for office are:

Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

• Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
• Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
• Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
• Named an “Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service” by Bar Association.
• Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
• Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality.

As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechtler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Ectorrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Donna Little

Barry Melton

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

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

"Proponent’s" and "Opponent’s" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent’s Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent’s Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent’s Argument" and "Opponent’s Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent’s Argument" and the "Opponent’s Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent’s Argument":

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent’s Argument":

1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent’s Argument" or an "Opponent’s Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent’s Argument" and "Opponent’s Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent’s Arguments" and "Opponent’s Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park’s electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park’s public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park’s irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $76,300,000
- Bond interest: $53,791,500
- Debt service requirement: $130,091,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of citylife for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park’s one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park’s infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park’s basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park’s infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park’s water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and resealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills?

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!
STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.
“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law.
The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Ahu, Kennedy and Maher.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area's open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

*Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space
Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dierauf, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco's Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City's neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it's necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O'Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Ezquerro, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco's most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park's infrastructure, preserving the park's safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achenberg

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

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

San Francisco's elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carlista del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park's forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betsy Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burkes, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let's bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38

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

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City’s economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nathenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehrman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Carrier*
Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quaranta, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Kile Osier, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP’S, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lilienthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Bierman
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwen Craig
Kelly Cullen
Susanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Rotea Gilford
Louise J. Giraud
Richard Grossboll
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaicks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kalil
Tony Kilroy
Jean Korniut

Reverend John and Donneter E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Otto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sululagi Palega
Lois Pavlov
Marianne H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Sasafsky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomatra N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinkhan
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combatting AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loveliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women’s Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco’s park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Miller, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park’s trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court’s decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park’s aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city’s infrastructure are supposed to come from the city’s general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city’s infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it’s free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you’ll see that these things aren’t free. It’s City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven’t been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It’s telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — “No New Taxes.” But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don’t tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you’ll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or how about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You’ll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you’ll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION B, PROPOSITION C AND PROPOSITION D

(Special Election) CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO-WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RE-CONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANAGER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, restoration and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and lagoons, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of elections for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting (Continued on next page)
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto."

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system."

"CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto."

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

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

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

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

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

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City's current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption $26,700,000
- Bond interest 18,823,500
- Debt service requirement $45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.0044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of. Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills?

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

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

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.
“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Brit, Kennedy and Maher.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Franciscan’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!

Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.
As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.

Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Strong
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will complement construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig  
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn  
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley  
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtle  
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt  
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane  
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis  
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

Proposition B will make San Francisco’s Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city’s traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne  
City Attorney

Arlo Smith  
District Attorney

Milton Marks  
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.  
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco’s heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Proposals B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein  
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city’s needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According to the Controller’s statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs, GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene. Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let’s get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer’s Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children’s playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall’s delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?

Let’s see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow
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PROPOSITION C
CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "C"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $24,000,000
- Bond interest: $18,920,500
- Debt service requirement: $40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.0040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area. Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.

Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City’s Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area. This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People do drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)

James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote YES on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Jean Kallil
Library Commissioner

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner
David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works
Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager
Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.
Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.
Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers’ funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milion Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Ario Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.
Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That’s why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can’t you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We’re here asked to “incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage” to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are besieged to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C’s high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $53,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that’s just for the garage — it doesn’t include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR’S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board’s esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board’s decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don’t we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a “white elephant”? Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board’s budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco’s Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city’s residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let’s not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let’s logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco’s revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
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TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLUG Compost Hotline—468-0262 • Recycling Hotline—554-6193

Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

---

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPOSITION D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "D"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $21,220,000
- Bond interest: $14,960,100
- Debt service requirement: $36,180,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than “a hot water system.”

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding!
This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the
ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate
enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with
no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the
approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in
bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of
$36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the
most expensive heating system in the world which could join
sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes
or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want
to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a
$150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.

Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating
costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old,
energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain
heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings
with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system.

Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy,
not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right”
time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one
needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the
long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing
business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government

is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be
penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Brit, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh,
Migden, Shelley and Ward.

Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!

The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.

ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!

Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D. Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.

VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition D will replace the Civic Center's antiquated, wasteful steam heating plant with a modern, energy-efficient system.
By passing Proposition D, we will save an estimated $750,000 in energy costs every year.

Proposition D makes financial and environmental sense. Join us in voting YES on Proposition D.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

Louise Renne
City Attorney

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

Milton Marks
State Senator

Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assembly Speaker

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.
San Francisco's Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that's consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.
The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.

VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.
Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.

Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D

The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a "new" hot water heating system at Civic Center.
Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?

This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, “capital projects” includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current city services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.

NO: Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City’s General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City’s buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That’s clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor’s recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor’s recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What’s wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials’ power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco’s other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That’s not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

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

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children's Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans' needs.

This time we're asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawn mowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don't!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT'S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition "E" requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer's assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition "E" deals not with "lawnmowers" as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition "E" would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition "E" is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Ayes: Supervisors Alito, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.
Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Brit, Migden and Ward.

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

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President

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

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the
qualified electors of the City and County of San
Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and
county by adding Section 6.209 relating to an-
nual mandated levels of funds for protection and
maintenance of the City's infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco hereby submits to the
qualified electors of said city and county an
election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a
proposal to amend the Charter of said city and
county by adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:
NOTE: This entire section is new.
6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the
Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and
the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each
budget and annual appropriation ordinance,
through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount
(CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages
specified below for the identified years of Gen-
eral Fund Regular Revenue sources.
A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:
   Fiscal Year 1993/1994 1.5%
   Fiscal Year 1994/1995 2.0%
   Fiscal Years 1995/1996 through
       2003/2004 2.5%
   Fiscal Year 2004/2005 1.5%

For the purpose of this section the term "gen-
eral fund revenue sources" shall be defined to
include all revenues, however they may subse-
sequently be identified or classified, of the type that
are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordin-
ance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Re-
venue appropriations of the general fund. Not later
than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter,
the controller shall make available for public
distribution a list of all general fund revenue
sources and the amounts derived from those
sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this sec-
tion shall be expended solely for the acquisition,
maintenance, and construction of real property
and improvements thereon belonging to the City
and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PRO-
JECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:
   (1) In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the
capital funds must be used for main-
tenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the
capital funds must be used for main-
tenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for
maintenance. The allocation percent-
ages specified in this paragraph (A) may
be changed in any given year by the
Board of Supervisors if such change is
approved by resolution of the board ap-
proved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the
question of the change in allocation per-
centage.

(2) In subsequent years, capital funds
may be expended for any capital project
selected by the Mayor and the Board of
Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary
and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit
the authority of the City to appropriate additional
funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this
section and not expended during the fiscal year
shall be carried forward and expended in subse-
quent fiscal years in accordance with the alloca-
tion criteria specified in this section for the year
in which the appropriation of the unexpended
funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds
will not meet any of the City's then current
annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropri-
atied pursuant to this section shall not supplant or
replace the maintenance components of existing
departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held herein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be and are hereby placed under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court; provided, however, that any person who holds civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption by the electorate of the amendment adding this paragraph to the charter shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of the charter.
PROPOSITION F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer? YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk's office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller's Statement on "F"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator's Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
County Clerk

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "F"

Proposition "F" makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder's Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk's and Recorder's Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk's Office to the County Recorder's Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent's Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

PROPOSITION G

Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to choose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of "G" miss the point: This measure isn't about health care for zoo animals. IT'S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create "flexibility" in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to "exempt" that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That's patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards. If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians' appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified? VOTE "NO" ON "G"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

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

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

“G” is “GREEDY”!
Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.

And that’s what “G” is about: Political Patronage! Every time a position is “exempted” from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.

Surprised?
You shouldn’t be!
“G” was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!

Say “NO” to patronage hiring!
Say “No” To “G”!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!
Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.
This is no giveaway of public funds and the “friends” that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G
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Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.
3.551 General Manager; Other Executives
The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

YES      NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City’s many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

Inventory Control

PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments' operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which "own" the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing's inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of “H” is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect “savings” like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, “H” would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser’s office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out?

Of course not! They’re too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as “H”.

Send City Hall a message that you’re tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.


CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"H" is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee "on the take."
"H" would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!
Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That's right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition "H".
VOTE "NO" ON "H"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H's opponents want City government to be cumbersome.

In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.

If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller's Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.
The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H
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Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or brands are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops herebefore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “I”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “I”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Ailoto.
Dividing California into Two States

PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California's government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That's the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn't make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That's not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your "YES" vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We'll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won't move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn't get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state's economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting)!

Committee Against Splitting the State

Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

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

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, gypies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese...

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California’s ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California’s voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON’T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren’t interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don’t they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California’s counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn’t San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn’t our right to express our opinion worth that much?

Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There’s no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn’t even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won’t solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It’s enough to make Jimmy Gonzales’ mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a “substantial, but presently indeterminable amount”.

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should “interact” in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There’s no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It’s sad that some people feel the answer to California’s problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Save the spotted owl!
Don’t let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heros Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn’t support California’s breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California’s problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don’t double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

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

Kopp's Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors' proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless "advisory" trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn't even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than "hype" or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates "city policy". Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it's an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers' time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

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

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOSITION J
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION J IS ON PAGE 82.
SAN FRANCISCO IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

PROponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a "state-back" guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let's keep San Francisco in northern California and allow the two new states to pursue their own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote "YES" on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don't let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don't speak of "Northern California Girl" or "Hotel Southern California."

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state where there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN'T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The "State-Split" Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"J" IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.

Proposition "J" asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.

Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of "Northern California" Those who want a "Northern California" state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!

To vote "YES" on Proposition "J" is to say you think this backwoods "state-splitting" scheme is o.k.

Tell City Hall you're tired of the jokes like Proposition "J" the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.

Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.

Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE "STATE-SPLIT" JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!
What Proposition "J" really asks is, "If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?"

In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?

California will only continue to grow! It's a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.

San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don't let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition J

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Don’t be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn’t even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it’s spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you’re elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members’ minds? VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

*Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.*

Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!

[Image of recycling bin and recycling symbol]
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

- Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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**POLLING PLACE CARD:** To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

### CANDIDATES - Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STATE PROPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOCAL PROPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Did you remember to **SIGN** your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

____________________________

____________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554 - 4375

Ballot Type

9232

American Independent
12th Assembly District
8th Senate District
12th Congressional

Precincts Applicable
2300's, 2400's,
2500's, 2600's,
2800's

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place.
The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

Vote-By-Mail Voters — Cut or Tear Along Perforated Line

Do Not Remove Label

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

ABSSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election
Sign this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

Check One:

☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address:

City:

State:

Zip Code:

Check Here If Appropriate:

☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote.
☐ My new address is printed below.
(Residence Address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name:

Apartment No.:

SAN FRANCISCO, CA

☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish ☐, Chinese ☐.

You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

Your signature - DO NOT PRINT

Date Signed

Day Time Phone

Evening Phone
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q. Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION
I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Mo</th>
<th>Da</th>
<th>Yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Your First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Your Residence Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day Phone</th>
<th>--</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eve. Phone</th>
<th>--</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

----------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS -----------

Assigned Precinct:  
Affidavit Number:  
Clerk:  
Inspector:  

E.O. Bk.  6/2  6/6  Code  Reg. Attach.  Init's

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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# PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a **Sample Ballot** (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); ........................................... 15-27
2. the **location of your polling place** ............................................................ (see the label on the back cover)
3. an **application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot** and for permanent absentee voter status; ................................................. back cover
4. **Your rights as a voter**; ........................................................................... 6
5. **information for disabled voters**; ............................................................. 5
6. **statements from candidates who are running for local office**; ............... 30-31
7. **information about each local ballot measure**, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .................................................. 33-86
8. **definitions of words you need to know**; ............................................. 12
9. a **Polling Place Card** to mark your choices before voting. ...................... inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando los dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del “Votomatic.”

第一步
请双手持票向自动機牌整張選票插入。

STEP 2

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

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

第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

第三步
請把帶鋸之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entérguela en el lugar oficial de votación.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線提起選票交給選舉站監選員。
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party's nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate.

Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don't know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:
- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don't use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don’t find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

POLLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
NEW ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS

12th Assembly District

13th Assembly District

OLD ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS

17th Assembly District

16th Assembly District

19th Assembly District
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposal is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

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

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

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, Jim Stevens and Molly Wood.
Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.
Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(Does not include S.F. Unified School District or
S.F. Community College District)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

STATE & FEDERAL GRANTS
FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS
(E.G., AIDS PREVENTION,
AFDC PAYMENTS)
30% $720 MILLION

REVENUES GENERATED BY CITY
DEPARTMENTS AND USED BY SAME
DEPARTMENT
(E.G., LANDING FEES PAID BY AIRLINES TO
S.F. INTL. AIRPORT)
29% $696 MILLION

BUSINESS, SALES & OTHER TAXES
& OTHER INCOME
21% $504 MILLION

PROPERTY TAX
20% $480 MILLION

PORTION OF
PROPERTY TAX
(APPROX. 8-45%)
USED TO REPAY
GENERAL
OBLIGATION
BONDS

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

NON-GENERAL FUND REVENUE
46% $1.1 BILLION

OTHER GENERAL FUND REVENUE
11% $260 MILLION

GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUE
43% $1.03 BILLION

EXPENDITURES
PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES
$1.03 BILLION

PUBLIC PROTECTION
39% $409 MILLION

HEALTH & WELFARE
31% $321 MILLION

RECREATION
& CULTURE
5% $53 MILLION

UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION
11% $114 MILLION

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
14% $146 MILLION

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- **ADOPT**
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- **ALTER**
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- **ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY**
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m. Daily

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
© 1983 City and County of San Francisco
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY BALLOT
INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
To express your preference for a candidate for nomination for President, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Your vote in this portion of the ballot is advisory only. Delegates to the national convention will be elected in the delegate selection portion of the ballot.

To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person’s name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite “YES” or “NO” for that measure. All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

選民須知
如要表達你對提名總統候選人的優先選擇，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。你投票這一部分僅屬表達意見性質。出席全國大會的代表將在選票的選舉代表部分選出。

投票選舉候選人所列的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。如果要選舉超過兩名競選同一官職的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的所有候選人姓名旁邊打孔，但請勿選舉超過所選的候選人的數目。

投票選舉合格寫入候選人，請在選票卡的長方形票寫空位上寫上該候選人的姓名和官職。如有不明之處，請向助選員求助。

投票任何一項提案，請用藍色筆尖在提案旁邊的“YES”(贊成)或“NO”(反對)打孔。

如果你投票錯了，或者選票撕破了，應把選票交回選區的選舉委員，再拿一份新選票。

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO
INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES
Para expresar su preferencia por un candidato que será nombrado Presidente, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Su voto en esta porción de la balota sirve sólo como guía. Los delegados a la convención nacional serán elegidos en la porción de la balota de selección de delegados.

Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.

Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.

Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de “Sí” o “No” para dicha medida.

Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca y borradura; esto anularía la balota.

Si usted se equivoca al voto, o si rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請轉下頁。
PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.

TO START VOTING,
GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>總統優先選舉權</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PREFERENCIA PRESIDENCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOWARD PHILLIPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>請選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>參加全國大會的代表</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DELEGADOS PARA LA CONVENCION NACIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegates to the National Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUNA DELEGACION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>沒有候選人參選</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>美國獨立黨</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESIDENTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>總統立委會</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 2, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|  | 1-3-ALL |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Primary Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator — Full Term</td>
<td>Jerome &quot;Jerry&quot; M. Cready</td>
<td>American Ind.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator — Short Term</td>
<td>Paul Meeuwenberg</td>
<td>American Ind.</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

U.S. Representative in Congress — 8th District
NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED
NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO
Vote for One

State Senator — 3rd District
NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED
NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO
Vote for One

Member, State Assembly — 13th District
NO CANDIDATE HAS FILED
NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUN CANDIDATO
Vote for One
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

4

PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 2, 1992

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT
Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本区在本页是空白
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

5

PARTIDO INDEPENDIENTE AMERICANO

ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS
2 DE JUNIO DE 1992

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 2, 1992

5-3-ALL

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT
Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本區在本頁是空白
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</th>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELLEN CHAITIN</strong></td>
<td><strong>DONNA LITTLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Attorney</td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada Litigante</td>
<td>Juez del Tribunal Municipal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANET W. FORSYTHE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada de Oficio Delegada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Ballot**

Consolidated Primary Election, June 2, 1992, City and County of San Francisco
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

7E

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

152
SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 185
NO 186

153
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.

YES 193
NO 194

154
PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.

YES 203
NO 204
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATELES

185 SI 赞成
186 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.

193 SI 赞成
194 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Esta acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalezcan la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejorías de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.

203 SI 赞成
204 NO 反对

APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocurran del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.

7F-0-ALL
GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

YES 212 →
NO 213 →

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES 218 →
NO 219 →

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

YES 222 →
NO 223 →

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

YES 227 →
NO 228 →

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

YES 232 →
NO 233 →
2012 SI 贊成
2013 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.

1992年改良金門公園公債法案。發行公債$76,300,000，用於支付金門公園的興建、重建、修復、再造林和整修，包括供水系統和灌溉、湖泊和水的流向，公用事業包括街燈和保安照明，修復和整修公園的面貌，自然美化，包括便利殘障人士使用的廁所。

2018 SI 贊成
2019 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.

1992年改良市政中心公債法案。發行公債$26,700,000，用於支付改良市政中心廣場和富頓街市政人行道，自然美化和市政廳周圍及附近地區的街燈。

2022 SI 贊成
2023 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asbesto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.

1992年改良市政中心停車場公債法案。發行公債$24,000,000，用於支付改良市政中心停車場或在鄰近建築停車場，包括減少石棉和為殘障人士提供方便。

2027 SI 贊成
2028 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACION DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.

1992年改良市政中心保養系統公債法案。發行公債$21,200,000，用於支付興建或重建市政中心地區內的保養系統，包括管道和熱水系統。

2032 SI 贊成
2033 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?

應否規定市政府每年撥出一定比例的普通基金，連續十二年（1993-2005），只用於特定的基礎工程，如興建、保養和購置市政大廈和其他公共物業？
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

**9E**

**NONPARTISAN BALLOT**

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>YES 237</td>
<td>NO 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?</td>
<td>YES 241</td>
<td>NO 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?</td>
<td>YES 245</td>
<td>NO 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>YES 248</td>
<td>NO 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>YES 252</td>
<td>NO 253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**END OF BALLOT**
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

237 SI 贊成 ¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escritorio de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escritorio del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?

238 NO 反對

241 SI 贊成 ¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y éste ejecutará sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil?

242 NO 反對

245 SI 贊成 ¿Ya no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgado, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad?

246 NO 反對

248 SI 贊成 ¿Será la política de las personas del Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?

249 NO 反對

252 SI 贊成 ¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?

253 NO 反對

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
- 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
- Hastings Law School graduate
- Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
- Volunteer Attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
- Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
- Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:

SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficey, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola

10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENATOR Milton Marks
ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto
SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebeim, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlota delPortillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni
BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick
COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblentz, Louis Chan, Paul Wortman, Sue Bierman

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
- Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
- In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.
- Its time to make history!
I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
- Honors graduate — George Washington University.
- Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
- Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s Office.
- “Barristor of the Year” — 1988.
- Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
- Coro Foundation Fellow.
- American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
- Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.

As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.

I will also be a role model for our young men and women.

My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoogasian; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melecio Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brasington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe

Ellen Chaitin

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #6

DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39

My qualifications for office are:

As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women’s History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years

My qualifications for office are:

Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

- Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
- Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
- Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
- Named an "Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service" by Bar Association.
- Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association's referral service in landlord-tenant law.
- Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality.

As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Barry Melton

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

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

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent’s Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent’s Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent’s Argument" and "Opponent’s Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent’s Argument" and the "Opponent’s Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent’s Argument" or an "Opponent’s Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent’s Argument" and "Opponent’s Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent’s Arguments" and "Opponent’s Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park's electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park's public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park's irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money would also be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$76,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>$53,791,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$130,091,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPOSEN'TS ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of city life for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park's one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park's infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park's basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park's infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park's water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and resealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Brit, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Migden, Shelley and Ward
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSEN'TS ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we're in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions "A," "B," "C," and "D"?
Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!
Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it's $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year's bills?
Remember, that's how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE "NO" ON "A," "B," "C" AND "D"

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!

This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!

But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!

San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that "San Francisco deserves better".

"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area's open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land
Jacob Stiglitz, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society
Edward Dierait, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners
Donna Gouge, Green Party

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco's Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City's neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it's necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommers Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O'Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Ezquerra, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco's most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park's infrastructure, preserving the park's safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting YES on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merritt
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

San Francisco’s elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carlota del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park’s forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burke, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let’s bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38
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Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City's economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert P. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nothenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Cartier*
Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quaranta, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Kile Ozier, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP®S, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lilienthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Bierman
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Breitz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwenn Craig
Kelly Cullen
Susanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Rotea Gilford
Louis J. Giraud
Richard Grossboll
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaicks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kallil
Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Rev. John and Donneter E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esber Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Otto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sulalagi Palega
Lois Pavlow
Marianne H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Salsafsky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomatra N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinkhon
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combatting AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loneliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women’s Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco's park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Millet, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your YES vote on Proposition A will insure that the park's trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote YES on Proposition A.

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

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court’s decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park’s aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city’s infrastructure are supposed to come from the city’s general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city’s infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it’s free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you’ll see that these things aren’t free. It’s City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven’t been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It’s telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — “No New Taxes.” But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don’t tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you’ll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or how about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You’ll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you’ll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION B, PROPOSITION C AND PROPOSITION D

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO THE GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREBY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; COUNTERSIGNED THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reconstruction, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

That said resolutions were passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy. The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts not to exceed the principal amounts specified.

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of elections for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting.

(Continued on next page)"
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto."

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system."

"CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto."

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

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

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

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

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

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

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City's current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption $26,700,000
- Bond interest 18,823,500
- Debt service requirement 45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Ahmoto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of.

Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it all off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills!

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C" AND "D"

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Ario H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.

“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law.

The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall would add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Franciscan’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!

Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.

Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Sarno
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Strong
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect.

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig  
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn  
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley  
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtle  
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt  
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane  
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis  
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

Proposition B will make San Francisco’s Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city’s traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne  
City Attorney

Arlo Smith  
District Attorney

Milton Marks  
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.  
Assembly Speaker

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect.

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

James Haas  
Chair, Civic Pride

Carolyn Diamond  
Executive Director, Greater Market Street Development Association

Robert Freese  
President, San Francisco Beautiful

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco’s heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein  
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
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Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city's needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According to the Controller's statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote No on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let's get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer's Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children's playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall's delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?
Let's see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSITION C
CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “C”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $24,000,000
- Bond interest: $16,920,500
- Debt service requirement: $40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,048,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.0040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage is now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.

Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City’s Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

Argumente printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPOONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area.

This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achenberg, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Migden, Shelley and Ward.

Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote Yes on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kaill
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
   Hotel Owner
David Hurd
   General Manager, George Coates Performance Works
Gary Cooke
   Restaurant Manager
Larry Broughton
   Hotel Director of Operations

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers’ funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
   State Senator
Louise Renne
   City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
   Sheriff
Arlo Smith
   District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
   Assembly Speaker
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That's why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can't you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board's esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board's decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don't we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a "white elephant"? Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board's budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco's Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city's residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let's not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let's logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Kopp's Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
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TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLUG Compost Hotline—468-0262 • Recycling Hotline—554-6193
Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PROPOSITION D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To
incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of con-
struction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center
area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam
heating system for City Hall and six other
buildings in the Civic Center area was built
in 1915. This system often breaks down
and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would
allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by
issuing general obligation bonds. The
money would be used to replace the
steam heating system with a hot water
system. The new system would be more
efficient and less costly to operate. Under
the current plans, the new system would
provide heat to three more buildings.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes,
you want to allow the City to borrow
$21,220,000 by issuing general obligation
bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center
heating system.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you
do not want the City to issue general
obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following state-
ment on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:
In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and
bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate
costs to be:

| Bond redemption | $21,220,000 |
| Bond interest   | 14,960,100  |
| Debt service requirement | $36,180,100 |

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the
average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be
approximately $1,809,000 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five
hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in
annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of
$250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be
noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized
bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years,
the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the
maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0
to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan,
Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher, Migden, Shelley and Ward.
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Civic Center
Heating System Bonds

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY
AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years.

Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than “a hot water system.”

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.

Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system. Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What's dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.

Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!
The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.

ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!
Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D.
Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.

VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition D will replace the Civic Center’s antiquated, wasteful steam heating plant with a modern, energy-efficient system.

By passing Proposition D, we will save an estimated $750,000 in energy costs every year.

Proposition D makes financial and environmental sense. Join us in voting YES on Proposition D.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Milton Marks
State Senator
Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assembly Speaker

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.

San Francisco’s Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that’s consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.

The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.

VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.

Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.

Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D

The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a “new” hot water heating system at Civic Center.

Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?

This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

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

PROPOSITION E
Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, "capital projects" includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "E"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current city services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.
NO: Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
ABSENT: Supervisor Aioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City's General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City's buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That’s clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor’s recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor’s recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What's wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials' power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco’s other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That's not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children’s Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans’ needs.

This time we’re asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawnmowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don’t!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT’S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with “lawnmowers” as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achenberg, Brit, Migden and Ward.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition E

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City's General Fund. Inflexibility doesn't matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the "Children's Fund" which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its "best"). Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City's general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City's objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City's other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the
qualified electors of the City and County of San
Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and
county by adding Section 6.209 relating to an-
nual mandated levels of funds for protection and
maintenance of the City's infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco hereby submits to the
qualified electors of said city and county an
election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a
proposal to amend the Charter of said city and
county by adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the
Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and
the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each
budget and annual appropriation ordinance,
through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount
(CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages
specified below for the identified years of Gen-
eral Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993/1994</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/1995</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/1996</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/2004</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2005</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this section the term "gen-
eral fund revenue sources" shall be defined to
include all revenues, however they may subse-
quently be identified or classified, of the type that
are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordi-
nance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Re-
v-enue appropriations of the general fund. Not later
than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter,
the controller shall make available for public
distribution a list of all general fund revenue
sources and the amounts derived from those
sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this sec-
tion shall be expended solely for the acquisition,
maintenance, and construction of real property
and improvements thereon belonging to the City
and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PRO-
JECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1. In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the
capital funds must be used for mainte-
nance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41%
of the capital funds must be used for
maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996,
31% of capital funds must be used for
maintenance. The allocation percent-
ages specified in this paragraph (A) may
be changed in any given year by the
Board of Supervisors if such change is
approved by resolution of the board ap-
proved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the
question of the change in allocation per-
centage.

2. In subsequent years, capital funds
may be expended for any capital project
selected by the Mayor and the Board of
Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary
and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit
the authority of the City to appropriate addi-
tional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this
section and not expended during the fiscal year
shall be carried forward and expended in subse-
quently fiscal years in accordance with the alloca-
tion criteria specified in this section for the year
in which the appropriation of the unexpended
funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds
will not meet any of the City’s then current
annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropri-
ated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or
replace the maintenance components of existing
departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities, and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this chart, the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officials and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the tele-

phone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, prints and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commission and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of scale of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management.

Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be and are hereby placed under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court, provided, however, that any person who holds a civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption of the ordinance amending this paragraphs of the charter shall continue to have civil service status in said position under the civil service provisions of the charter.
PROPOSITION F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk’s office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator’s Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION “F”

Proposition “F” makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder’s Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk’s and Recorder’s Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk’s Office to the County Recorder’s Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent’s Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

tem. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:
Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not increase the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
Chief Zoo Veterinarian

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to chose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of “G” miss the point: This measure isn’t about health care for zoo animals, IT’S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create “flexibility” in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to “exempt” that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That’s patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards. If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians’ appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE “NO” ON “G”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember

Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

“G” is “GREEDY”!
Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.

And that’s what “G” is about: Political Patronage!
Every time a position is “exempted” from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.

Surprised?
You shouldn’t be!

“G” was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!

Say “NO” to patronage hiring!
Say “No” To “G”!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!
Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the “friends” that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives

The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
Inventory Control

PROPOSITION H

Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

YES

NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City's many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments' operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which "own" the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing's inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of "H" is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect "savings" like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, "H" would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser's office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out!

Of course not! They're too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as "H".

Send City Hall a message that you're tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C", "D", "G", "H", "I" and "J"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"H" is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee "on the take."
"H" would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!
Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That's right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?
What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition "H".
VOTE "NO" ON "H"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H’s opponents want City government to be cumbersome.
In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.
If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.
The Controller’s Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.
The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article, requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops hereof are maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES

NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

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

Controller's Statement on "I"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:
Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "I"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
DIVIDING CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES

PROponent's argument in favor of proposition I

California's government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That's the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn't make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That's not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your "YES" vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We'll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUttAL TO PROponent's argument in favor of proposition I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won't move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population - maybe 15 million. We still couldn't get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative - but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state's economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting).

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, gypies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese . . .

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California’s ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California’s voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON’T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren’t interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don’t they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California’s counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn’t San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway. Isn’t our right to express our opinion worth that much?

Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher
DIVIDING CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There's no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn't even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won't solve any problem facing California. Even if Californians voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It's enough to make Jimmy Gonzales' mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco tax payers a "substantial, but presently indeterminable amount".

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should "interact" in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There's no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It's sad that some people feel the answer to California's problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Save the spotted owl!
Don't let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heroes Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn't support California's breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don't double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Kopp's Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors' proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless "advisory" trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn't even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than "hype" or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates "city policy". Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it's an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers' time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan
TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION I

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

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

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a “state-back” guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let’s keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote “YES” on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don’t let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don’t speak of “Northern California Girl” or “Hotel Southern California.”

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN’T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The “State-Split” Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

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

"J" IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.

Proposition "J" asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.

Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of "Northern California" Those who want a "Northern California" state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!

To vote "YES" on Proposition "J" is to say you think this backwoods "state-splitting" scheme is o.k.

Tell City Hall you're tired of the jokes like Proposition "J" the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.

Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.

Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE "STATE-SPLIT" JOKE

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!
What Proposition "J" really asks is, "If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?"

In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?

California will only continue to grow! It's a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.

San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don't let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition J

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Don't be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn't even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it's spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you're elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members' minds?

VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.

Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
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</table>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

________________________
________________________
________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554 - 4375

Ballot Type
9233

American Independent
13th Assembly District
3rd Senate District
8th Congressional

Precincts Applicable
3000's

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place.
The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

Vote-By-Mail Voters --- Cut or Tear Along Perforated Line

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

ABSSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election

Sign this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

Check One:
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address:

City State Zip Code

Check Here If Appropriate:

☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote.
☐ My new address is printed below.
(Residence Address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name:

Apt. No.

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 941__

Check below all that apply, then sign your name:

☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
 ☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
 ☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish______, Chinese______

You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

Your signature - DO NOT PRINT

Date Signed Day Time Phone Evening Phone
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet
and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLLED WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION
I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr)          Your Signature

Print Your First Name                 

Print Your Residence Address          Zip Code

Day Phone [---]                        Eve. Phone [---]

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:
Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

I HAVE a car: [ ] (Please Check)

---------------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ----------------
Assigned Precinct: [ ] Home Precinct: [ ]
Affidavit Number: [ ] Clerk: [ ] Inspector: [ ]

[ ] E.O. Bk.  [ ] 6/2  [ ] 6/6  [ ] Code  [ ] Reg. Attach. [ ] Initials

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .......................... 15-27
2. the location of your polling place .......................... (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; .......................... back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; ................................ 6
5. information for disabled voters; .......................... 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; .................................. 30-31
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .................................. 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; .......................... 12
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting.
**STEP 1**

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

**USING BOTH HANDS**

INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步

请双手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

**STEP 2**

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THEStub of your card fit down over the two red pins.

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

第二步

請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

**STEP 3**

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

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

第三步

請把票緩之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

**STEP 4**

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步

投票之後，把選票取出，

沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:
ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:
ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the city between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominee for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate.

Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:
- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don’t find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

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

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

The Committee:

- Preparing summaries of measures
- Preparing an index of candidates and measures
- Providing a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet
- Defining terms in the pamphlet
- Summarizing voters' basic rights
- Explaining the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office

Citizens Advisory Committee on Elections:

- Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(DOES NOT INCLUDE S.F. UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT OR S.F. COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Federal Grants for Specific Programs</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$720 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues Generated by City Departments and Used by Same Department (e.g., LANDING FEES PAID BY AIRLINES TO S.F. INT'L. AIRPORT)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$696 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Sales &amp; Other Taxes &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$504 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$480 MILLION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$1.1 BILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$260 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Regular Revenue</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$1.03 BILLION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES
$1.03 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Protection</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$409 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$321 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Culture</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$53 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$114 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$146 MILLION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This includes only the General Fund subsidy to the Municipal Railway. The total budget for the Municipal Railway is $282 Million, including state and federal grants.

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- **ADOPT**
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- **ALTER**
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- **ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY**
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m.
Daily
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
To express your preference for a candidate for nomination for President, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Your vote in this portion of the ballot is advisory only.

To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for which you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person’s name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite “YES” or “NO” for that measure.
All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

和平自由黨

選民須知

如要表達你對提名總統候選人的優先選擇，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。
你投票這一部分僅屬表達意見性質。

投票選擇選票上所列的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。如果要選
舉超過兩名競選同一官職的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的所有候選人姓名旁邊打孔，但
請勿選擇超過所選的候選人的數目。

投票選擇合符合候選人，請在選票卡的長方形票尾的空位上寫上該候選人的姓名和官職。如
有不明之處，請向助選員求助。

投票任何一項提案，請用藍色筆尖在提案旁邊的“YES”（贊成）或“NO”（反對）打孔。

如果選票有明顯污損或撕破痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你投票錯了，或者選票撕破了，應把選票交回選區的選舉委員，再拿一份新選票。

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO POR LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES
Para expresar su preferencia por un candidato que será nombrado Presidente, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Su voto en esta porción de la balota sirve sólo como guía.

Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para las cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.

Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la vistita de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.

Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de “SI” o “NO” para dicha medida.
Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca y borrados; esto anularía la balota.
Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請翻下頁。
PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.

TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
## SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>頭選優先選挙権</td>
<td>przegląd priorytetu głosowania prezesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFERENCE PRESIDENCIAL</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. ALISON STAR-MARTINEZ</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENORA B. FULANI</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON DANIELS</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARTICIPATION IN THE CONVENTION

- **DELEGADOS PARA LA CONVENCION NACIONAL**  
  Delegates to the National Convention  
  NO DELEGATION HAS FILED  
  NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUNA DELEGACION  沒有候選人參選
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party/Region</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENEVIEVE TORRES</td>
<td>United States Senator — Full Term</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHIRLEY LEE</td>
<td>United States Senator — Full Term</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GERALD HORNE</td>
<td>United States Senator — Short Term</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAIME “JIM” MANGIA</td>
<td>United States Senator — Short Term</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTY NAME</td>
<td>CANDIDATE INFORMATION</td>
<td>VOTE CODE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO DE LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD</td>
<td>CESAR G. CADABES, AIDS Project Director</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CESAR G. CADABES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director de un Proyecto por el SIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS, DISTRITO 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Representative in Congress — 8th District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SENGADAR ESTATAL, DISTRITO 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STATE SENATOR — 8th District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>没有人竞选本区这一公職</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY</td>
<td>KITTY REESE, Recreation Director</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member, State Assembly — 12th District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KITTY REESE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directora de recreación — 娱乐活动主任</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee — 12th District</td>
<td>Vote for no more than 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JEFF JACOBY</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student / Estudiante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELIZABETH PENDRY</strong></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist / Terapeuta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J.R. ODYCKE</strong></td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraiser / Recaudador de fondos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WILLIAM HARRIS</strong></td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker / Trabajador de mantenimiento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUNICE STRONGER</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary / Secretaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WARREN LIEBESMAN</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor / Editor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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## SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 市法庭法官，第五庭 |
| Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5 |

| ELLEN CHAITIN |
| Trial Attorney |
| Abogada Litigante |

| JANET W. FORSYTHE |
| Deputy Public Defender |
| Abogada de Oficio Delegada |

| JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 6 |
| Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6 |
| **NONPARTISAN BALLOT** |

| 市法庭法官，第六庭 |
| Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6 |

| BARRY MELTON |
| Attorney |
| Abogado |

| DONNA LITTLE |
| Judge of the Municipal Court |
| Juez del Tribunal Municipal |

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote for One
SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 185
NO 186

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.

YES 193
NO 194

PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.

YES 203
NO 204
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>聯合初選</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
<th>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>新金山市、縣</th>
<th>一九九二年六月二日提交選民投票表決的州提案</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Votos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>185 SI</td>
<td>186 NO</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td>1992年學校設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債十九億元（$1,900,000,000），提供資金作建設或改良公立學校之用。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>193 SI</td>
<td>194 NO</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalecerán la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejorías de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.</td>
<td>1992年6月高等教育設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債九十億元（$900,000,000），用於興建或改良加州的公立學院和大學設施。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>203 SI</td>
<td>204 NO</td>
<td>APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocurren del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.</td>
<td>延期徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估價所增實業稅可延期繳付。財政影響：這個提案將由於屋主延期繳付實業稅而導致州或地方政府損失數以百萬元計。這些損失會在屋主賣出他們的房屋時最終獲得補償。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO
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212 SI 贊成
213 NO 反對
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反對
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.

222 SI 贊成
223 NO 反對
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asbesto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.

227 SI 贊成
228 NO 反對
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.

¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?  
YES 237  NO 238

G
Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?  
YES 241  NO 242

H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?  
YES 245  NO 246

I
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?  
YES 248  NO 249

J
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?  
YES 252  NO 253

END OF BALLOT
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

237 SI 賛成
238 NO 反對
¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escritano de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escritano del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?

241 SI 賛成
242 NO 反對
¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y éste ejecutará sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil?

245 SI 賛成
246 NO 反對
¿Ya no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgando, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad?

248 SI 賛成
249 NO 反對
¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?

252 SI 賛成
253 NO 反對
¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?

FIN DE LA BALOTA
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

______________________________

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE, OFFICE #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is trial attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
• 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
• Hastings Law School graduate
• Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
• Delinquency Prevention Commissioner (1985 – 1987)
• Volunteer attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
• Former faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
• Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:
SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficey, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola
10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENIOR Milton Marks
ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto
SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebeim, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlota delPortillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni
BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick
COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblentz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Biernan

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
• Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
• In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.
• It's time to make history!
• I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
  • Honors graduate — George Washington University.
  • Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
  • Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s Office.
  • “Barrister of the Year” — 1988.
  • Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
  • Coro Foundation Fellow.
  • American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
• Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.
As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.
I will also be a role model for our young men and women.
My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hogasian; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melecio Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brassington.
Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Ellen Chaitin

Janet W. Forsythe
DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39

My qualifications for office are:
As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women’s History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years

My qualifications for office are:
Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

- Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar
- Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
- Pro tem Municipal Court Judge, Volunteer civil arbitrator.
- Named an “Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service” by Bar Association.
- Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
- Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality.

As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Barry Melton
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

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

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":

1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or
   the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four
   members of the Board, if the measure was
   submitted by same.

2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or
   members designated by the Board.

3. The Mayor.

4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has
   filed as a campaign committee in support of the
   measure.

5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combina-
   tion of voters and association of citizens.

6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":

1. For a referendum, the person who files the refer-
   endum petition with the Board of Supervisors.

2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or
   members designated by the Board.

3. The Mayor.

4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has
   filed as a campaign committee opposing the
   measure.

5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combina-
   tion of voters and association of citizens.

6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park’s electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park’s public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park’s irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $76,300,000
- Bond interest: $93,791,500
- Debt service requirement: $130,091,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROPONEENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of citylife for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park's one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park's infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park's basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park's infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park's water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and resealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONEENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we're in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions "A", "B", "C", and "D"?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it's $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year's bills!

Remember, that's how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alex Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a
recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of
Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite
the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are
asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions
of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New
York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top
of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate
staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government
before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might
be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage
the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the
equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to
borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure
ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession,
the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them
will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the
bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL
BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B",
"C" AND "D"!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvesri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions
A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that
"San Francisco deserves better".
"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further
deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open
spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be
preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can
continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center
Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget
deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is
balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law.
The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with
balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what
they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New
York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing
bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future,
investments which will not increase annual operating costs but
may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals
which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their con-
tinued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh,
Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Treni W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O’Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Ezquerra, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco’s most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park’s infrastructure, preserving the park’s safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting YES on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

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

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park’s forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burkes, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

San Francisco's elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Caroita del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebein, Member, Board of Education
Tom Amman, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
Johanne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodes, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let’s bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council; AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park Bond

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City’s economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nothenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehrman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Carter*
Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quaranta, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Kile Osier, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP’S, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lilienthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Bierman
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwen Craig
Kelly Cullen
Susanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Rotea Gifford
Louis J. Giraudo
Richard Grossboll
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaicks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kalil
Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Reverend John and Donneter E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Otto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sululagi Palega
Lois Pavlov
Marianne H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Saslavsky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomaira N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Mailllard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinkhon
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell's drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combating AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco's former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loveliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park's delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women's Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco's park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco's neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Gossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Miller, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your YES vote on Proposition A will insure that the park's trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote YES on Proposition A.

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

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court’s decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park’s aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city’s infrastructure are supposed to come from the city’s general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted upon the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city’s infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it’s free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you’ll see that these things aren’t free. It’s City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven’t been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It’s telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — “No New Taxes.” But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don’t tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you’ll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You’ll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you’ll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION B, PROPOSITION C AND PROPOSITION D

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, TO PROVIDE AND APPEAL TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECITING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREON; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on the 2nd day of June, 1992, 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.

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the Civic Center and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of elections for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precints, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting...

(Continued on next page)
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto."

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system."

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto."

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

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

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

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

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

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

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City’s current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $26,700,000
- Bond interest: $18,823,500
- Debt service requirement: $45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of. Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION! Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we're in the middle of a recession! Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions "A," "B," "C," and "D"?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it's $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year's bills?

Remember, that's how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years.
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvesiti, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that "San Francisco deserves better".
"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.
The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.
The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Franciscan’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!
Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.
As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.
Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.
Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Couler
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Song
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

Jean Kaid
Library Commissioner

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechle
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco’s heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city's needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote NO on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According to the Controller's statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let's get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.
A pretty picture is not a guarantee.
Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer's Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children's playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall's delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?
Let's see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSITION C
CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "C"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $24,000,000
- Bond interest: $16,220,500
- Debt service requirement: $40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.0040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.
Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City’s Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds
Civic Center Garage Bonds

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco's Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City's general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent's statement that the Civic Center area "has excess parking". Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as "excess parking". Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way "risk the City's General Fund". There is no "risk" because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area.

This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage will provide parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote Yes on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Strong
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

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

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner
David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works
Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager
Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.
Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers' funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That’s why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can’t you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We’re here asked to “incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage” to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C’s high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $53,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that’s just for the garage — it doesn’t include the costs of the other three projects.

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board’s esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board’s decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don’t we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a “white elephant”. Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board’s budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco’s Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city’s residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let’s not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let’s logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Filpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

Mar 7 Basic June 13 Advanced Sept 12 Basic
Mar 28 Basic June 27 Worm Sept 26 Basic
Apr 11 Advanced July 18 Basic Oct 10 Worm
Apr 25 Worm July 25 Basic Oct 24 Basic
May 9 Basic Aug 1 Advanced Nov 7 Advanced
May 23 Basic Aug 22 Worm

SLUG Compost Hotline—468-0262 • Recycling Hotline—554-6193
Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364
PROPOSITION D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $21,220,000
- Bond interest: 14,860,100
- Debt service requirement: $36,180,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. 
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than “a hot water system.”

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.

Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system. Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government

is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!
The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually. ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS! Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D. Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs. VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition D will replace the Civic Center’s antiquated, wasteful steam heating plant with a modern, energy-efficient system. By passing Proposition D, we will save an estimated $750,000 in energy costs every year. Proposition D makes financial and environmental sense. Join us in voting YES on Proposition D.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Milton Marks
State Senator
Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assembly Speaker

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings. San Francisco’s Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that’s consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.

The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.

VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.

Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.

Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D

The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a “new” hot water heating system at Civic Center.

Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?

This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

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

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, "capital projects" includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current City services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.

NO: Achtenberg, Brit, Migden and Ward.

ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City’s General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City’s buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That’s clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor’s recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor’s recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What’s wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials’ power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco’s other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That’s not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

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

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children’s Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans’ needs.

This time we’re asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawnmowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don’t!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT’S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with “lawnmowers” as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Briti, Migden and Ward.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City's General Fund. Inflexibility doesn't matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the "Children's Fund" which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its "best".) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City's general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City's objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City's other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 relating to annual mandated levels of funds for protection and maintenance of the City's infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each budget and annual appropriation ordinance, through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount (CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages specified below for the identified years of General Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:

- Fiscal Year 1993/1994: 1.5%
- Fiscal Year 1994/1995: 2.0%
- Fiscal Years 1995/1996 through 2003/2004: 2.5%
- Fiscal Year 2004/2005: 1.5%

For the purpose of this section the term "general fund revenue sources" shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereon belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1) In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

2) In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City's then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The board of supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department, Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telecommunication exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director.

The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineers. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department.

The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be and are hereby placed under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court; provided, however, that any person who holds a civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption by the electorate of the amendment adding this paragraph to the charter shall continue to have a civil service status in said position under the civil service provision of the charter.
PROPOSITION F

Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES  ✧✧  NO  ✧✧

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk's office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator's Office is not modified."

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "F"

Proposition "F" makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder's Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk's and Recorder's Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk's Office to the County Recorder's Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent's Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F
PROPOSITION G

Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

YES  NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

Chief Zoo Veterinarian

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to choose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of "G" miss the point: This measure isn't about health care for zoo animals, IT'S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create "flexibility" in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to "exempt" that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That's patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards.

If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians' appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE "NO" ON "G"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember

Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

“G” is “GREEDY”!

Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.

And that’s what “G” is about: Political Patronage!

Every time a position is “exempted” from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.

Surprised?
You shouldn’t be!

“G” was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!

Say “NO” to patronage hiring!
Say “No” To “G”!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care! Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong, well-guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the “friends” that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

---

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

---

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives
The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
Inventory Control

PROPOSITION H

Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City’s many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments’ operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which "own" the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing’s inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of "H" is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect "savings" like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, "H" would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser’s office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out?

Of course not! They’re too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as "H".

Send City Hall a message that you’re tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C", "D", "G", "H", "I" and "J"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member

Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

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

“H” is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee “on the take.”

“H” would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!
Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That’s right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition “H”.
VOTE “NO” ON “H”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

______________________________

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H’s opponents want City government to be cumbersome.

In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.

If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller’s Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.
The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

______________________________

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section.

The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report the same to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

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

Controller's Statement on "I"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:
Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "I"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Dividing California into Two States

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California’s government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That’s the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn’t make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That’s not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your “YES” vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We’ll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won’t move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn’t get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state’s economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting)!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese...

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California’s ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California’s voice in legislation is vital in preserving our state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON’T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren’t interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don’t they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California’s counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn’t San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn’t our right to express our opinion worth that much?
Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DIVIDING CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES

NO PAID ARGUMENTS WERE SUBMITTED IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There’s no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn’t even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won’t solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It’s enough to make Jimmy Gonzales’ mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a “substantial, but presently indeterminable amount”.

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should “interact” in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There’s no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It’s sad that some people feel the answer to California’s problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Save the spotted owl!
Don’t let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heros Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn’t support California’s breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California’s problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don’t double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Kopp’s Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors’ proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless “advisory” trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn’t even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than “hype” or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates “city policy”. Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it’s an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers’ time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

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

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOSITION J
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES ➡
NO ➡

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION J IS ON PAGE 82.
San Francisco in Northern California

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a “state-back” guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let’s keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote “YES” on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don’t let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don’t speak of “Northern California Girl” or “Hotel Southern California.”

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN’T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The “State-Split” Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"J" IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.

Proposition "J" asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.

Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of "Northern California" Those who want a "Northern California" state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!

To vote "YES" on Proposition "J" is to say you think this backwoods "state-splitting" scheme is o.k.

Tell City Hall you're tired of the jokes like Proposition "J" the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.

Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.

Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!
VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE "STATE-SPLIT" JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!
What Proposition "J" really asks is, "If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?"

In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?

California will only continue to grow! It's a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.

San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don't let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

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

Don’t be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn’t even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it’s spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you’re elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members’ minds? Vote NO on J.

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON’T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.

Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of this pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT
To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING
Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
<th>152</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CANDIDATES - Name #

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Did you remember to **SIGN** your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election

Sign this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

Check One:

☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.

☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.

☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address

City State Zip Code

Check Here If Appropriate:

☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote.

☐ My new address is printed below.

(Residence Address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name Apt. No.

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 941 [illegible]

Zip Code

Check below all that apply, then sign your name:

☐ You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.

☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish [illegible], Chinese [illegible].

Your signature - DO NOT PRINT

Date Signed

Day Time Phone

Evening Phone
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet
and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION
I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr) __________________________ Your Signature __________________________
Print Your First Name __________________________ MI __________________________ Print Your Last Name __________________________
Print Your Residence Address __________________________ Zip Code __________________________
Day Phone [_____] -- [_____] Eve. Phone [_____] -- [_____] I HAVE a car: [ ] (Please Check)

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:
Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other: ____________________________________________________________________________

Assigned Precinct: __________________________ Home Precinct: __________________________
Affidavit Number: __________________________ Clerk: [ ] Inspector: [ ]
[ ] E.O. Bk. [ ] 6/2 [ ] 6/6 __________ Code __________ Reg. Attach. __________ Init's __________

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); ........................................ 15-27
2. the location of your polling place ........................ (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; ........................................ back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; ..................................... 6
5. information for disabled voters; .......................... 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; ........................................ 30-31
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; ........................................ 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; .......................... 12
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. ........................................ inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

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

Paso 2. Aségrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con los dos cabezales rojos.

第二步
請確認選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

第三步
請把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。

STEP 4

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguella en el lugar oficial de votación.

四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your Signature.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:

• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don’t find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odcli
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries (“The Way It Is Now,” “The Proposal,” “A ‘Yes’ Vote Means,” and “A ‘No’ Vote Means.”) of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee prepares: the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters’ basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Seville, Jim Stevens and Molly Wood.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.

Ex-officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(DOES NOT INCLUDE S.F. UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT OR
S.F. COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE &amp; FEDERAL GRANTS FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (E.G., AIDS PREVENTION, AFDC PAYMENTS)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$720 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES GENERATED BY CITY DEPARTMENTS AND USED BY SAME DEPARTMENT (E.G., LANDING FEES PAID BY AIRLINES TO S.F. INT'L. AIRPORT)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$666 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS, SALES &amp; OTHER TAXES &amp; OTHER INCOME</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$504 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY TAX</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$480 MILLION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON-GENERAL FUND REVENUE</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$1.1 BILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER GENERAL FUND REVENUE</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$260 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUE</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$1.03 BILLION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES
PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES
$1.03 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC PROTECTION</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$409 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH &amp; WELFARE</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$321 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION &amp; CULTURE</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$52 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES &amp; TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$114 MILLION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$146 MILLION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This includes only the General Fund subsidy to the Municipal Railway. The total budget for the Municipal Railway is $232 Million, including state and federal grants.

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- ADOPT
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- ALTER
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m. Daily
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
To express your preference for a candidate for nomination for President, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Your vote in this portion of the ballot is advisory only.

To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person’s name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite “YES” or “NO” for that measure. All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

和平自由黨

選民須知
如要表達你對提名總統候選人的優先選擇，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。你投票這部分僅屬表達意見性質。

投票選舉選票上所列的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。如果要選舉超過兩名競選同一官職的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的所有候選人姓名旁邊打孔，但請勿選舉超過要選的候選人的數目。

投票選舉合格寫入候選人，請在選票卡的長方形票尾的空白上寫上該候選人的姓名和官職。如有不明之處，請向助選員求助。

投票任何一項提案，請用藍色筆尖在提案旁邊的“YES”（贊成）或“NO”（反對）打孔。

如果你對選票有明顯污損或撕掉痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你投票錯了，或者選票撕破了，應把選票交回選區的選舉委員，再拿一份新選票。

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO POR LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD
INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES
Para expresar su preferencia por un candidato que será nombrado Presidente, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Su voto en esta porción de la balota sirve sólo como guía.

Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.

Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de “Sí” o “No” para dicha medida.

Se prohíbe todo tipo de marcas y borradores; esto anularía la balota.
Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y dañara la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請轉下頁。
PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.

TO START VOTING,
GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>總統優先選舉權</th>
<th>PREFERENCIA PRESIDENCIAL</th>
<th>Presidential Preference</th>
<th>請選一人</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>美國總統</td>
<td>R. ALISON STAR-MARTINEZ</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LENORA B. FULANI</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RON DANIELS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>參加全國大會的代表</td>
<td>DELEGADOS PARA LA CONVENCION NACIONAL</td>
<td>Delegates to the National Convention</td>
<td>請選一人</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO DELEGATION HAS FILED</td>
<td>NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUNA DELEGACION</td>
<td>沒有候選人參選</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SAMPLE BALLOT

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

## UNITED STATES SENATOR — Full Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENEVIEVE TORRES</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigadora del cáncer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHIRLEY LEE</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Clerk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empleada de hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## UNITED STATES SENATOR — Short Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GERALD HORNE</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maestro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAIME “JIM” MANGIA</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Gay Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Organización homosexual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTY</td>
<td>CANDIDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD PARTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTANT DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td>MARY WELDON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL, DISTRITO 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td>KITTY REESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td>Voto por no más de 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEMBRO, COMITE CENTRAL DEL CONDADO, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td>Vote for no more than 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, County Central Committee — 12th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF JACOBY</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student / Estudiante 学生</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIZABETH PENDRY</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist / Terapeuta 治療師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B. OPDYCKE</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraiser / Recaudador de fondos 募款家</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM HARRIS</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker / Trabajador de mantenimiento 维修工人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUNICE STRONGER</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary / Secretaria 秘書</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARREN LIEBESMAN</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor / Editor 编辑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO DE LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2, 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT

Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本区在本页是空白
## Sample Ballot

### Consolidated Primary Election, June 2, 1992, City and County of San Francisco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Nonpartisan Ballot BALOTA APARTIDARIA 無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez del Tribunal Municipal, Oficina Numero 5</td>
<td>Juez del Tribunal Municipal, Oficina Numero 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ellen Chaitin</strong></td>
<td><strong>BARRY MELTON</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Attorney</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada Litigante 嘉訴律師</td>
<td>Abogado 律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogada de Oficio Delegada 助理公辯律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Janet W. Forsythe</strong></td>
<td><strong>DONNA LITTLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Public Defender</td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada de Oficio Delegada 助理公辯律師</td>
<td>Juez del Tribunal Municipal 市裁判法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

7E NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

152 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.
YES 185  ❯
NO 186  ❯

153 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.
YES 193  ❯
NO 194  ❯

154 PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.
YES 203  ❯
NO 204  ❯
### SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</th>
<th>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185 SI 贊成</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td>1992年学校設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債十九億元（$1,900,000,000），提供資金作建設或改良公立學校之用。</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193 SI 贊成</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Esta acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalecerán la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 136 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejoras de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.</td>
<td>1992年6月高等教育設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債九億元（$900,000,000），用於興建或改良加州的公立學院和大學設施。這些建設工程創造就業，確保加州學生獲得高等教育，並使各公立學院和大學培養出一批訓練有素的、競爭力強的勞動大軍，充實加州的經濟。授權興建的138公立校園計畫，包括，但並不等於限制於防震和其他衛生安全的改良、實驗室的現代化，以便跟上科學的發展和建築課室、圖書館等等。</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 SI 贊成</td>
<td>APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocuran del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de miles de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.</td>
<td>延期徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估計所增實業稅可延期徵付。財政影響：這個提案將由於屋主延期繳付實業稅而導致州或地方政府損失數以百萬元計。這些損失會在屋主賣出他們的房屋時最終獲得補償。</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*7F-0-ALL*
GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

YES 212  NO 213

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES 218  NO 219

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

YES 222  NO 223

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

YES 227  NO 228

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

YES 232  NO 233
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajística, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.

212 SI 贊成
213 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asbesto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.

222 SI 贊成
223 NO 反對

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.

227 SI 贊成
228 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?

232 SI 贊成
233 NO 反對

1992年改良金門公園公債法案。發行公債$76,300,000，用於支付金門公園的興建、重建、修復、再造林和整備，包括供水系統和灌溉、湖和水的流向，公用事業包括街燈和保安照明，修復和整備公園的面貌，自然美化，包括便利殘障人士使用的廁所。

1992年改良市政中心公債法案。發行公債$26,700,000，用於支付改善市政中心廣場和宮殿街林徑人行道，自然美化和市政廳周圍及鄰近地區的街燈。

1992年改良市政中心公債法案。發行公債$24,000,000，用於支付擴建市政中心車停車場或在新建車停車場，包括減少石棉和為殘障人士提供方便。

1992年改良市政中心公債法案。發行公債$21,200,000，用於支付興建或重建市政中心地區內的供暖系統，包括管道和熱水系統。

應否規定市政府每年撥出一定比例的普通基金，連續十二年（1993-2005），用於特定的基礎工程，如興建、保養和購置市府大樓和其他公共物業？
### Nonpartisan Ballot

**City & County of San Francisco, Consolidated Primary Election, June 2, 1992**

**Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters — City & County Propositions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pieza</th>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escribano de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escribano del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pieza</th>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y éste ejecutará sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pieza</th>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Ya no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgando, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pieza</th>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas del Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pieza</th>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIN DE LA BALOTA
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgments. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

__________________________________________________________

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE, OFFICE #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
- 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
- Hastings Law School graduate
- Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
- Volunteer Attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
- Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
- Married, two children
A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:
SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficey, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola
10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENATOR Milton Marks
ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto
SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebein, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carla delPortillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni
BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick
COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblentz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Bierman

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.
Its time to make history!
I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
- Honors graduate — George Washington University.
- Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
- Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s Office.
- Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
- Coro Foundation Fellow.
- American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
- Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.
As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.
I will also be a role model for our young men and women.
My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reid; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoogasian; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melecio Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brassington.
Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Ellen Chaitin

Janet W. Forsythe

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

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39.

My qualifications for office are:
As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers' Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women's History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years

My qualifications for office are:
Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

• Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
• Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
• Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
• Named an “Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service” by Bar Association.
• Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
• Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality. As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Porillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Barry Melton
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

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

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park's electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park's public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park's irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$76,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>53,791,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$130,091,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $5,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of city life for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park's one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park's infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park's basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park's infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park's water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and resealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we're in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions "A," "B," "C," and "D"?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it's $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year's bills!

Remember, that's how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE "NO" ON "A," "B," "C" AND "D"!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!

But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!

San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.

“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area's open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Stiglitz, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dierauf, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouge, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco's Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City's neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it's necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggehmire, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O'Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Esquerrro, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene Mcelroy, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco's most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work. Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park's infrastructure, preserving the park's safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting YES on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park’s forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burkes, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

San Francisco’s elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Millon Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessy, Sheriff
Carlota del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let’s bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Roselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38

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

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City’s economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nothenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehrman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Carter*
Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quaranta, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Kile Oslar, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP’S, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lilienthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Bierman
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwenn Craig
Kelly Cullen
Susanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Rotea Gilford
Louis J. Giraudo
Richard Grossboll
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaicks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kalil
Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortium
Reverend John and
Donnister E. Lane
Pai Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Newberger
George Newkirk
Jane Oto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sululagi Palega
Lois Pavlow
Marianne H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Sasafsky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomatra N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovic Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinkhon
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combatting AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loneliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women’s Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco’s park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhodes
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Miller, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park’s trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Argumenta printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court's decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park's aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city's infrastructure are supposed to come from the city's general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city's infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it's free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you'll see that these things aren't free. It's City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven't been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It's telling that every presidential candidate—Republican and Democrat alike—is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year—"No New Taxes." But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do—they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don't tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you'll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or how about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You'll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you'll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, for the purpose of submitting to the voters 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the Civic Center and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, Civic Center landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,900,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,900,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and refer to the special election hereby called to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting (Continued on next page)"
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler systems."

"CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $34,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto.

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

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

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

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

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

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

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City’s current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $26,700,000
- Bond interest: $18,823,500
- Debt service requirement: $45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,278,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.0044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
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PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B
San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of. Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills!

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 million or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years. But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history! San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that "San Francisco deserves better".

"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Francisco’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!
Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.
As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.
Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

VOTE YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect.

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig  
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn  
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley  
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtle  
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt  
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane  
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis  
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

Proposition B will make San Francisco’s Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city’s traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne  
City Attorney

Arlo Smith  
District Attorney

Milton Marks  
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.  
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco’s heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein  
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city’s needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castile, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

---

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According to the Controller’s statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let’s get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

---

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.
A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer’s Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children's playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall’s delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?
Let’s see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B.

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSITION C

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

Bond redemption $24,000,000
Bond interest 16,920,500
Debt service requirement $40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Ayes: Supervisors Achenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.
Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT "cure parking headaches" in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City's bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City's Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What's more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can't, the garage shouldn't be built. We believe the City's General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn't be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco's Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City's general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent's statement that the Civic Center area "has excess parking". Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as "excess parking". Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way "risk the City's General Fund". There is no "risk" because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help

Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area. This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn't be at the expense of the Farmer's Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer's trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer's trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer's Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers' trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the "Heart of the City".

Please vote YES on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer's Market

The Civic Center Farmer's Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers' trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.
Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner

David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works

Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager

Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL

Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers’ funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator

Louise Renne
City Attorney

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Mayor Frank Jordan
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That’s why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can’t you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We’re here asked to “incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage” to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C’s high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $33,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that’s just for the garage — it doesn’t include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR’S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOODGETOGGLE!

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOODGETOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board’s esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board’s decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don’t we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a “white elephant”. Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board’s budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco’s Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city’s residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let’s not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let’s logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

Mar 7 Basic June 13 Advanced Sept 12 Basic
Mar 28 Basic June 27 Worm Sept 26 Basic
Apr 11 Advanced July 18 Basic Oct 10 Worm
Apr 25 Worm July 25 Basic Oct 24 Basic
May 9 Basic Aug 1 Advanced Nov 7 Advanced
May 23 Basic Aug 22 Worm

SLUG Compost Hotline—468-0262 • Recycling Hotline—554-6193

Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPOSITION D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

YES ➞ NO ➞

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption $21,220,000
- Bond interest 14,960,100
- Debt service requirement 36,180,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alito.
Civic Center
Heating System Bonds

PROponent's argument in Favor of Proposition D

Please vote Yes on Proposition D
A Yes on D Vote is a Vote for Economy
And for Energy Efficiency.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center
heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The
old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years.
Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out
and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This
old system requires constant oversight when in operation and
requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy
than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and
inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main
Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department,
City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and
maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

VOTE Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez,
Hallinan, Hsieh, Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

Rebuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you
believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expec
ted and accepted way for the city to fund a new boiler system
for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving
this bond measure taxpayers will save $750,000 annually in
operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook
does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down
the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No
descriptive language other than "a hot water system."

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work
on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond
salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36
million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors
have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from
taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every
dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the
way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real
cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting
way of doing business.

VOTE No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding!
This bond - increase in property taxes - was placed on the
ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate
enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with
no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the
approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in
bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of
$36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the
most expensive heating system in the world which could join
sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes
or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want
to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a
$150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.
Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating
costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old,
energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain
heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings
with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system.
Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy,
not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right”
time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one
needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the
long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing
business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government

is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be
penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh,
Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!
The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.

ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!
Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D.
Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.
VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition D will replace the Civic Center’s antiquated, wasteful steam heating plant with a modern, energy-efficient system.
By passing Proposition D, we will save an estimated $750,000 in energy costs every year.
Proposition D makes financial and environmental sense. Join us in voting YES on Proposition D.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Million Marks
State Senator
Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assembly Speaker

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.
San Francisco’s Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that’s consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.
The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.
VOTE NO ON D.
For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.
Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.
Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D
The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a "new" hot water heating system at Civic Center.
Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?
This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

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

 Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, “capital projects” includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current city services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.

NO: Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City's General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City's buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Nees: Supervisors Achtenberg, Brit, Migden and Ward.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That's clearly an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor's recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor's recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What's wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials' power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco's other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That's not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp's Good Government Committee

By Cheryl Arenson
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children's Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans' needs.

This time we're asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawnmowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and unforeknowst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing.

Do you believe that? We don't!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT'S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp's Good Government Committee

By Cheryl Arenson

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition "E" requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer's assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition "E" deals not with "lawnmowers" as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition "E" would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition "E" is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City's General Fund. Inflexibility doesn't matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the "Children's Fund" which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its "best".) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City's general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City's objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City's other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 relating to annual mandated levels of funds for protection and maintenance of the City’s infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county of adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each budget and annual appropriation ordinance, through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount (CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages specified below for the identified years of General Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Capital Fund Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993/1994</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/1995</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/1996</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/2004</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2005</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this section the term "general fund revenue sources" shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereon belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1. In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance.
2. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance.
3. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance.

The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City’s then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.

☐
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the tele

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage and operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. In the event of November 6, 1984, two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court, provided however that any person who holds a civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption of the ordinance amending this paragraph to the charter shall continue to have civil service status in said position under the civil service provisions of the charter.
PROPOSITION F

Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk's office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator's Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION F IS ON PAGE 66.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION “F”

Proposition “F” makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder’s Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk’s and Recorder’s Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk’s Office to the County Recorder’s Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent’s Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This position would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to choose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of “G” miss the point: This measure isn’t about health care for zoo animals, IT’S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create “flexibility” in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to “exempt” that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That’s patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards.

If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians’ appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE “NO” ON “G”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

“G” is “GREEDY”!
Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the
grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot
with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get
their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil
service.
And that’s what “G” is about: Political Patronage!
Every time a position is “exempted” from civil service the
politicians get a chance to hire their friends.
Surprised?
You shouldn’t be!
“G” was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried
to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount
of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from
wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9
million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same
Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and
a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign
policy!
Say “NO” to patronage hiring!
Say “No” To “G”!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!
Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary
medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated
with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from
Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to
conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate
in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical
program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this
specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary
school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the “friends” that will
benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsiieh,
Kennedy, Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives

The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

**********
Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.

**********
Inventory Control

PROPOSITION H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City's many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

73
Inventory Control

PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments’ operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which “own” the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing’s inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of “H” is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect “savings” like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, “H” would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser’s office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out!

Of course not! They’re too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as “H”.

Send City Hall a message that you’re tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.


CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"H" is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee "on the take."
"H" would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!
Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That's right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition "H".
VOTE "NO" ON "H"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H's opponents want City government to be cumbersome.
In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.
If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller's Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.
The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller certifies that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require such department reconditioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies, and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report the same to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?  

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California's government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That's the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn't make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizens, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That's not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue their separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your "YES" vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We'll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won't move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn't get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capital and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state's economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting)!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese . . .

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California’s ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California’s voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON’T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren’t interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don’t they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California’s counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn’t San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway. Isn’t our right to express our opinion worth that much? Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There's no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolibirdness, that it wouldn't even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won't solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It's enough to make Jimmy Gonzales' mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a "substantial, but presently indeterminable amount".

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should "interact" in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There's no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It's said that some people feel the answer to California's problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Save the spotted owl!
Don't let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heros Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn't support California's breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don't double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Kopp’s Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors’ proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless “advisory” trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn’t even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than “hype” or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates “city policy”. Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it’s an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers’ time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION II

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan
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TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION I

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

☐

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?

☐
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

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

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION J IS ON PAGE 82.
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California. The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California. Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angeles. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a "state-back" guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let's keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue their own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote "YES" on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don't let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don't speak of "Northern California Girl," or "Hotel Southern California."

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN'T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on J and J!!

Committee Against The "State-Split" Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

"J" IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.
Proposition "J" asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.
Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of "Northern California" Those who want a "Northern California" state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!
To vote "YES" on Proposition "J" is to say you think this backwoods "state-splitting" scheme is o.k.
Tell City Hall you're tired of the jokes like Proposition "J" the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.
Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.
Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!
VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE "STATE-SPLIT" JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!
What Proposition "J" really asks is, "If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?"
In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?
California will only continue to grow! It's a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.
San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don't let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher
San Francisco in Northern California

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition J

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Don't be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn't even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it's spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you're elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members' minds?
VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.
Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, she must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to **SIGN** your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

_________________________
_________________________
_________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554-4375

Ballot Type
9242

Peace and Freedom
12th Assembly District
8th Senate District
12th Congressional

Precincts Applicable
2300's, 2400's,
2500's, 2600's,
2800's

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place.
The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

Vote-By-Mail Voters --- Cut or Tear Along Perforated Line

Do Not Remove Label

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED
YES OR NO

ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election
Sign this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

Check One:
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address

City State Zip Code

Check Here If Appropriate:
☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote.
☐ My new address is printed below.
(Residence Address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name

SAN FRANCISCO, CA

9 4 1

Check below all that apply, then sign your name:
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish [ ] Chinese [ ]

You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

Your signature - DO NOT PRINT

Date Signed Day Time Phone Evening Phone
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet
and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine O. Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility...

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION
I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr)  Your Signature

Print Your First Name  MI  Print Your Last Name

Print Your Residence Address  Zip Code

Day Phone  --  Eve. Phone  --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:  I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

---------------------------------------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ----------------------------------------

Assigned Precinct:  Home Precinct:  

Affidavit Number:  Clerk:  Inspector:  

[ ] E.O. Bk.  [ ] 6/2  [ ] 6/6  Code  [ ] Reg. Attach.  [ ] Init's

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .................................................. 15-27
2. the location of your polling place .......................................................... (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; ......................................................... back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; ....................................................... 6
5. information for disabled voters; ................................................................. 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; .................... 30-31
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .................................................. 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; ...................................................... 12
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. .......................................................... inside back cover
**How to Vote on the Votomatic Vote Recorder**

**Special Note:**
If you make a mistake, return your card and get another.

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

**Step 1**
Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双手持票向自动投票机将整张选票插入。

**Step 2**
Be sure the two slots in the stub of your card fit down over the two red pins.

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

第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，对合於二红钉之上。

**Step 3**
Hold punch vertical (straight up). Punch straight down through the ballot card to indicate your choice. Do not use pen or pencil.

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

第三步
请把投錠之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入
打孔投票。

**Step 4**
After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la boleta a lo largo de las perforaciones y entreguela en el lugar oficial de votación.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，
沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監遏員。
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says "I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER" and sign your name where it says "Your SIGNATURE."

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

To be a "Permanent Absentee Voter" you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a "P" then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992.

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate.

Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:

- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don’t find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar's Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar's Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

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

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

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

Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrougeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q. Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(Does not include S.F. Unified School District or S.F. Community College District)

1991-92 Estimated Revenue
$2.4 Billion

State & Federal Grants
For specific programs (e.g., AIDS prevention, AFDC payments)
30%
$720 Million

Revenues Generated by City Departments and used by same department
(e.g., landing fees paid by airlines to S.F. Intl. Airport)
29%
$696 Million

Business, Sales & Other Taxes & Other Income
21%
$504 Million

Property Tax
20%
$480 Million

1991-92 Estimated Budget
$2.4 Billion

Non-General Fund Revenue
46%
$1.1 Billion

Other General Fund Revenue
11%
$260 Million

General Fund Regular Revenue
43%
$1.03 Billion

Expenditures
Paid from General Fund Regular Revenues
$1.03 Billion

Public Protection
39%
$409 Million

Health & Welfare
31%
$321 Million

Recreation & Culture
5%
$53 Million

Utilities & Transportation
11%
$114 Million

General Administration
14%
$146 Million

Portion of General Fund Regular Revenue Which Would Be Allocated to the Infrastructure Fund If Prop E Passes (1.5% in first year).

This includes only the General Fund subsidy to the Municipal Railway. The total budget for the Municipal Railway is $292 Million, including state and federal grants.

Note: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- **ADOPT**
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- **ALTER**
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- **ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY**
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

---

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m.
Daily
SAMPLE BALLOT
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PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
To express your preference for a candidate for nomination for President, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Your vote in this portion of the ballot is advisory only.

To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person's name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite "YES" or "NO" for that measure. All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

和平自由黨

選民須知

如要表達你對提名總統候選人的優先選擇，請用蓝色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。
你投票這一部分僅屬表達意見性質。

投票選舉選票上所列的候選人，請用蓝色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。如果要選舉超過兩名競選同一官職的候選人，請用蓝色筆尖在你所選擇的所有候選人姓名旁邊打孔，但請勿選舉超過要選的候選人的數目。

投票選舉合格寫入候選人，請在選票卡的長方形票尾的空位上寫上該候選人的姓名及官職。如有不明之處，請向助選員求助。

投票任何一項提案，請用蓝色筆尖在提案旁邊的“YES”（贊成）或“NO”（反對）打孔。

如果選票有明顯污損或摺壞痕跡，選票作廢。

如果你投票错了，或者選票撕破了，應把選票交回選區的選舉委員，再拿一份新選票。

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO POR LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES
Para expresar su preferencia por un candidato que será nombrado Presidente, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Su voto en esta porción de la balota sirve sólo como guía.

Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.

Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tapa de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pídeles que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.

Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de "SI" o "NO" para dicha medida.

Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca y borradura; esto anularía la balota.
Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請轉下頁。
PARA COMENZRAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.

TO START VOTING,
GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LENORA B. FULANI</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON DANIELS</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. ALISON STAR-MARTINEZ</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presidential Preference**

**Delegates to the National Convention**

NO DELEGATION HAS FILED
NO SE HA PRESENTADO NINGUNA DELEGACION

There are no candidates listed.
### SAMPLE BALLOT
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>部門</th>
<th>項目</th>
<th>候選人名稱</th>
<th>職務</th>
<th>票數</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>美國參議員 全任期&lt;br&gt;SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS — PERIODO COMPLETO&lt;br&gt;United States Senator — Full Term</td>
<td>SHIRLEY LEE&lt;br&gt;Hospital Clerk&lt;br&gt;Empleada de hospital</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GENEVIEVE TORRES&lt;br&gt;Cancer Researcher&lt;br&gt;Investigadora del cáncer</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>美國參議員 短任期&lt;br&gt;SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS — PERIODO CORTO&lt;br&gt;United States Senator — Short Term</td>
<td>JAIME “JIM” MANGIA&lt;br&gt;Director, Gay Organization&lt;br&gt;Director, Organización homosexual</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GERALD HORNE&lt;br&gt;Teacher&lt;br&gt;Maestro</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS, DISTRITO 8
U.S. Representative in Congress — 8th District

CESAR G. CADABES
AIDS Project Director
Director de un Proyecto por el SIDA

80

PARTIDO DE LA PAZ
Y LA LIBERTAD

ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS
2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
STATE SENATOR

SENADOR ESTATAL, DISTRITO 3
State Senator — 3rd District

GIOVANNI GRAHAM
Female Impersonator
Transformista femenino

91

PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 2, 1992
MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

MIEMBRO DE LA ASamblea ESTATAL, DISTRITO 13
Member, State Assembly — 13th District

WALTER MEDINA
Sheet Metal Worker
Trabajador metalúrgico

98

ágenda:  
Y la libertad
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, County Central Committee — 13th District</th>
<th>Vote for no more than 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALICE RYDEL Fundraiser / Recaudadora de fondos</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERROLD ROSENBLUM Social Service Worker / Trabajador de servicio social</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AINKA J. FULANI Student / Estudiante 学生</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYNTHIA M. CARPATHIOS Fundraiser / Recaudadora de fondos</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEATHER C. MARTIN Fundraiser / Recaudadora de fondos</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAIME (JIM) MANGIA Gay Activist / Activista homosexual 同性恋活動家</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELODY KNIGHT Union Clerical Worker / Empleado de oficina sindical 工會文員</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD PATUTO Democracy Activist / Activista por la democracia 民主活動家</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSHA PLAFKIN Graphic Designer / Diseñadora grafica 圖案設計師</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVE ZELTZER Engineer / Ingeniero 工程師</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARGE GOLDEN Fundraiser / Recaudadora de fondos</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT WAGNER Fundraiser / Recaudadora de fondos</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLAN HALSE People Rights Activist / Activista de derechos del pueblo 人權活動家</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLLY HONIGSFELD Engineer / Ingeniera 工程師</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER HENRY Fundraiser / Recaudador de fondos</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INA BRANSOME Lobbyist / Cabildera 議員</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATHLEEN BECKHAM Administrator / Administradora 行政主任</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGDALENA S. LOPEZ Fundraiser / Recaudadora de fondos</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY TUTIN Incumbent / Titular 現任者</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PARTIDU DE LA PAZ Y LA LIBERTAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY</td>
<td>CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2, 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT**

Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本區在本頁是空白
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</th>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>市法庭法官, 第五庭</td>
<td>JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 5</td>
<td>請選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAFTIN</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>➤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada Litigante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET W. FORSYTHE</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>➤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada de Oficio Delegada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</th>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>市法庭法官, 第六庭</td>
<td>JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 6</td>
<td>請選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRY MELTON</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>➤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA LITTLE</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>➤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez del Tribunal Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

152
SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.
YES 185
NO 186

153
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.
YES 193
NO 194

154
PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.
YES 203
NO 204
SAMPLE BALLOT
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BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.

1992年學校設施公債法案。本提案
授權發行公債十九億元（$1,900,000,000），提供資金建建設或改良公立學校之用。

193 SI 贊成
194 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalecerán la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 136 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejoras de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.

1992年6月高等教育設施公債法案。本提案
授權發行公債九億元（$900,000,000），用於興建或改善加州的公立學院和大學設施。

203 SI 贊成
204 NO 反對

APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocuren del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.

延期徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案
授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估值所增加稅負可延期徵收。
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# SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

## 8E
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSITION</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Código</td>
<td>Descripción</td>
<td>Resumen</td>
<td>Pregunta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992.</td>
<td>Contrar una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.</td>
<td>1992年改金門公園公債法案。發行公債$76,300,000，用於支付金門公園的興建、重建、修復、再造林和整頓，包括供水系統和灌溉，湖和水的流向，公用事業包括衛生和保健照明，修復和整頓公園的面貌，自然美化，包括便利殘障人士使用 的廚房。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992.</td>
<td>Contrar una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.</td>
<td>1992年改善市政中心公債法案。發行公債$26,700,000，用於支付改 善市政中心廣場和富頓街林倦人行 道，自然美化市政聨煦動及鄰近 地區的街燈。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992.</td>
<td>Contrar una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asfalto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.</td>
<td>1992年改善市政中心停車場公債法 案。發行公債$24,000,000，用於支 付擴建市政中心停車場或在鄰近建 築停車場，包括減少石礫和為殘障 人士提供方便。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992.</td>
<td>Contrar una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.</td>
<td>1992年改善市政中心保暖系統公債 法案。發行公債$21,200,000，用於 支付興建或重建市政中心地區的 保暖系統，包括管和熱水系統。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?</td>
<td>應否規定市政府每年撥出一定比例 的普通基金，連續十二年（1993— 2005），只用於特定的基礎工程，如 興建、保養和購買市政府大樓和其他 公共物業？</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO
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237 SI 贊成
238 NO 反對
問：轉移的責任和人的事職務從高等法院
官員被調到政府服務部門，並在市首
席行政官的監督下任職？

F

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對
問：將將動物園獸醫主郵局應否由康樂與
公園管理局局長委任，但須經康樂與
公園委員會批准，而不是行政條例管
轄下任職？

G

245 SI 贊成
246 NO 反對
問：現在不必要求購入材料，維修設
備，更新，及設備勞工維護的設備
物品，交給政府部門管理？

H

248 SI 贊成
249 NO 反對
問：是否政府在北加州和南加州
兩面國界？

支持把加州劃分為北加州和南加州
應否是舊金山市議會的政策？

I

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對
問：是否政府在北加州和南加州，
舊金山城內也應分開，這是否
是舊金山市議會的政策？

J

FIN DE LA BALOTA
巣終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

______________________________

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
- 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
- Hastings Law School graduate
- Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
- Volunteer Attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
- Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
- Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:

SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficey, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond

RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazans, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola

10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS

SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENATOR Milton Marks

ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto

SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebeim, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlota delPorillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly

COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni

BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick

COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblentz, Louis Chan, Paul Woitman, Sue Bierman

ELLEN CHAITIN

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
- Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
- In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.
- Its time to make history!
- I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
  - Honors graduate — George Washington University.
  - Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
  - Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s Office.
  - Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
  - Coro Foundation Fellow.
  - American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
  - Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.

As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.

I will also be a role model for our young men and women.

My supporters include:
Mayoral Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoogasian; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Red; Melodie Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brassington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe

Ellen Chaitin

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #6

DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are:

As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women’s History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Deerman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years
My qualifications for office are:

Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

• Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
• Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
• Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
• Named an "Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service" by Bar Association.
• Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
• Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality.

As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Superintendents: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portil

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Barry Melton

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

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

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park’s electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park’s public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park’s irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption $76,300,000
- Bond interest 53,781,500
- Debt service requirement $130,081,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROponent’s ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of citylife for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park’s one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park’s infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating, Lakes are leaking, Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park’s basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park’s infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park’s water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and rescaled; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’s ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!
Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills!

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a
cession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of
Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!

But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite
the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are
asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions
of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New
York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top
of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!

San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate
staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government
before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might
be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage
the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the
equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to
borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure
ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession,
the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them
will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the
bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL
BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”,
“C” AND “D”!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions
A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that
“San Francisco deserves better”.

“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further
deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open
spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be
preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can
continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center
Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget
deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is
balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law.
The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with
balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what
they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New
York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing
bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future,
investments which will not increase annual operating costs but
may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals
which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their con-
tinued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh,
Migden, Shelley and Ward.

Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area’s open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dieruf, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco’s Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City’s neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it’s necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eckerman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O’Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Esquerro, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco’s most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work. Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park’s infrastructure, preserving the park’s safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting YES on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

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

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

San Francisco's elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carlotia del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Deneheim, Member, Board of Education
Tom Amman, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park's forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burke, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Stybuing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let's bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Roselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazosla, Plumbers Local 38

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

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City's economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nothenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehrman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Carter*
Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quaranta, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Kile Osier, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP'S, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lilienthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Bierman
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwenn Craig
Kelly Cullen
Susanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Rotea Gilford
Louis J. Giraudo
Richard Grossboll
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaicks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kalil
Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Reverend John and Donneter E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Otto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sulalagi Palega
Lois Pavlow
Marianne H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Sastafsky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomara N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinkhon
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell's drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combating AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco's former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loneliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women's Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco's park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco's neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Millet, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park's trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

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

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court’s decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park’s aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city’s infrastructure are supposed to come from the city’s general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city’s infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it’s free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you’ll see that these things aren’t free. It’s City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven’t been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It’s telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — “No New Taxes.” But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don’t tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you’ll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or how about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You’ll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you’ll pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION B, PROPOSITION C AND PROPOSITION D

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIALELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED THIRTY-TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,320,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECEIVING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY SUCH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

The ordinance was passed 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 2nd day of June, 1992, 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the Civic Center Mall and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, Civic Center Mall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including streets and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

That said resolutions were passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenditures 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 providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the principal amounts not to exceed the principal amounts specified.

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting

(Continued on next page)
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto."

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.”

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.”

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto.”

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

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

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

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

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

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
PROPOSITION B
CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded
indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center
Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surround-
ing the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding
area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations
Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include
the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on
Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general
obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza, the
Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The
City’s current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a
pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic
Center area.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing
general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds
for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following state-
ment on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:
In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and
bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate
costs to be:

- Bond redemption $26,700,000
- Bond interest 18,823,500
- Debt service requirement 45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the
average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be
approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four
hundredths cents ($0.0044) in the current tax rate. The increase in
annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of
$250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be
noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized
bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years,
the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the
maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"
On February 16, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0
to place Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan,
Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher, Migden, Shelley and Ward.
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of. Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills!

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO TO THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a
recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of
Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite
the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are
asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions
of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New
York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top
of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate
staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government
before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might
be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage
the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the
equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to
borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure
ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession,
the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them
will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the
bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL
BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”,
“C” AND “D”!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeeemember

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions
A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that
“San Francisco deserves better”.
“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further
deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open
spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be
preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can
continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center
Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a “budget
deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is
balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law.
The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with
balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what
they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New
York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing
bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future,
investments which will not increase annual operating costs but
may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals
which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their con-
tinued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh,
Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisors Aliotto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.
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The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers' trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote YES on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

---

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Franciscan’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!

Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

---

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

---

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.

Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulier
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Strong
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

---

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more usable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtle
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

Proposition B will make San Francisco’s Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city’s traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne
City Attorney

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

Milton Marks
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco’s heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city’s needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According the the Controller’s statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let’s get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer’s Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children’s playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall’s delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?

Let’s see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B.

San Francisco Tomorrow
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PROPOSITION C

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

YES → NO →

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $24,000,000
- Bond interest: $16,920,500
- Debt service requirement: $40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Allioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
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PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.

Absent: Supervisors Brit, Maher and Ward.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City’s Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

 Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area. This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

 VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote YES on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Song
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kallil
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re‐opens.

Proposition C is a cost‐effective, environmentally‐sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner

David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works

Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager

Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

S. FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary‐Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers’ funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above‐ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That's why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can't you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We're here asked to "incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage" to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C's high cost. The Board of Supervisor's budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $53,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that's just for the garage — it doesn't include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR'S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board's esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board's decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don't we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a "white elephant". Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board's budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco's Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city's residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let's not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let's logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco’s revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 7</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Sept 12</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 28</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>June 27</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>Sept 26</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>July 18</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>Worm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 25</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Oct 24</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Aug 1</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Aug 22</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLUG Compost Rollin—468-0262 • Recycling Hotline—554-6193
Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPOSITION D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates  I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $21,220,000
- Bond interest: 14,960.100
- Debt service requirement: 36,180.100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $9.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY
AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.
Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable. Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than "a hot water system."

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business. Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guiness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation


The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.

Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system. Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!

The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.

ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!

Vote YES to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D.
Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.

VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

---

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.

San Francisco's Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that's consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.

The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.

VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.

Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.

Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D

The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a "new" hot water heating system at Civic Center.

Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?

This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council
PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

YES

NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, "capital projects" includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current city services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.

NO: Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
PROPOSAL'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City's General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City's buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense, it is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSAL'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That's clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor's recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor's recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What's wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials' power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco's other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That's not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

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

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children’s Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans’ needs.

This time we’re asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawn mowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don’t!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT’S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with “lawnmowers” as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 relating to annual mandated levels of funds for protection and maintenance of the City’s infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each budget and annual appropriation ordinance, through Fiscal Year 2004/2005 only, an amount (CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages specified below for the identified years of General Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:
   Fiscal Year 1993/1994 1.5%
   Fiscal Year 1994/1995 2.0%
   Fiscal Years 1995/1996 through 2003/2004 2.5%
   Fiscal Year 2004/2005 1.5%

For the purpose of this section the term “general fund revenue sources” shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereon belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1. In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

2. In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City’s then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103
Describng and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agents authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates prepared by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager. It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be administered under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court, provided, however, that no person who holds civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption of the charter as amended under the present charter amendment, shall have the right to retain such position under the civil service provisions of the charter.
PROPOSITION F

Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES

NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk's office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator’s Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION F IS ON PAGE 66.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION “F”

Proposition “F” makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder’s Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk’s and Recorder’s Offices under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk’s Office to the County Recorder’s Office. The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent’s Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the
gleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Depart-
ment, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission,
rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Man-
ger to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of
the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employ-
ees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo
Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a char-
ter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be
hired or fired under the civil service sys-
tem. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian
would serve at the discretion of the Gen-
eral Manager, with the approval of the
Recreation and Parks Commission.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
Chief Zoo Veterinarian

PROPOSAL'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to chose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSAL'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of "G" miss the point: This measure isn't about health care for zoo animals, IT'S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create "flexibility" in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to "exempt" that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That's patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards.

If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians' appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE "NO" ON "G"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

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

“G” is “GREEDY”!
Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.

And that’s what “G” is about: Political Patronage!
Every time a position is “exempted” from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.

Surprised?
You shouldn’t be!

“G” was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!

Say “NO” to patronage hiring!
Say “No” To “G”!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!
Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the “friends” that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives

The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation, and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for anAbsentee Ballot. Just complete the form on theback cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in.You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

YES    NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City's many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
Inventory Control

PROPOLENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments' operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which "own" the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing's inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUFAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of "H" is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect "savings" like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, "H" would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser's office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out?

Of course not! They're too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as "H".

Send City Hall a message that you're tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C", "D", "G", "H", "I" and "J"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

“H” is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or
city employee “on the take.”
“H” would eliminate central inventory controls over City sup-
plies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and,
instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own
inventory!
Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That’s right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you
expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in
passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to
well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed
to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to
pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new
Metergates in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner
streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering
our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition “H”.
VOTE “NO” ON “H”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplica-
tion of effort. Proposition H’s opponents want City government
to be cumbersome.
In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Pur-
chasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Pur-
chasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport,
Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is
being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect
this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the
Charter necessitated by the transfer.
If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory
information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not
passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchas-
ing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step
is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the
process.

The Controller’s Office will continue to monitor inventory in-
formation. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce
off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.
The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from gov-
ernment.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh,
Kennedy, Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section.

The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require such departmental requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police, telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use, in all departments and offices of the city and county.

He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report the same to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

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

Controller's Statement on "I"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "I"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Ailoto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
Dividing California into Two States

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California's government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That's the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn't make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That's not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: a brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your "YES" vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We'll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won't move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn't get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state's economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting)!}

Committee Against Splitting the State

Alexa Smith
Arla H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

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

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese...

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California's ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California's voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state's beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON'T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren't interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don't they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California's counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn't San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn't our right to express our opinion worth that much?

Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

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

There's no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn't even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won't solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It's enough to make Jimmy Gonzales' mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a "substantial, but presently indeterminable amount".

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should "interact" in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There's no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It's sad that some people feel the answer to California's problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Save the spotted owl!
Don't let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heroes Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn't support California's breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don't double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

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

Kopp’s Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors’ proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless “advisory” trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn’t even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than “hype” or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates “city policy.” Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it’s an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers’ time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!!

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan
TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION I

DEscribing and setting forth a declaration of policy to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, relating to the question of dividing the State of California into two states, North California and South California.

Be it moved, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DEscribing and setting forth a declaration of policy to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, relating to the question of the City and County of San Francisco being a part of the state of North California, in the event the State of California is divided into two states.

Be it moved, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOSITION J
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES ➡

NO ➡

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

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

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "J"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

- The Supervisors voted as follows:
  ABSENT: Supervisor Attelo.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION J IS ON PAGE 82.
San Francisco in Northern California

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a “state-back” guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let’s keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote “YES” on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

---

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don’t let car commercials fool you.

Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don’t speak of “Northern California Girl” or “Hotel Southern California.”

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN’T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what?

Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The “State-Split” Joke

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"J" IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.

Proposition "J" asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.

Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of "Northern California" Those who want a "Northern California" state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!

To vote "YES" on Proposition "J" is to say you think this backwoods "state-splitting" scheme is o.k.

Tell City Hall you’re tired of the jokes like Proposition “J” the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.

Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.

Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE "STATE-SPLIT" JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!
What Proposition "J" really asks is, "If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?"

In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?

California will only continue to grow! It’s a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.

San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don’t let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

---

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

Don’t be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn’t even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it’s spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you’re elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members’ minds?

VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.
Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT
To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING
Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.

2. Put a 29c stamp where indicated.

3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

___________________________
___________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA  94102-4691
### Ballot Type

**Peace and Freedom**
- 13th Assembly District
- 3rd Senate District
- 8th Congressional

**Precincts Applicable**
- 3000's

---

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place. The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

---

**Location of Your Polling Place**

**Mailing Address**

---

**Absentee Ballot (Vote-By-Mail) Application - June 2, 1992 Primary Election**

*Sign* this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

#### Check One:
- [ ] Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
- [ ] I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

**P.O. Box or Street Address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Check Here If Appropriate:
- [ ] I have moved since I last registered to vote.
  
  **My new address is printed below.** (Residence Address ONLY.)

**Number and Street Name**

[ ]

**Apt. No.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Check Below All That Apply, Then Sign Your Name:

- [ ] I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- [ ] I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- [ ] All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish [ ], Chinese [ ].

You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

**Your Signature - DO NOT PRINT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Signed</th>
<th>Day Time Phone</th>
<th>Evening Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet
and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters,
Germaine Q. Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr) Your Signature

Print Your First Name MI Print Your Last Name

Print Your Residence Address Zip Code

Day Phone -- Eve. Phone -- I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

------------------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS -------------------

Assigned Precinct: Home Precinct:

Affidavit Number: Clerk: Inspector:

E.O. Bk. 6/2 6/6 Code Reg. Attach. Init's

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .................. 15-27
2. the location of your polling place ........................................... (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; .................. back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; ........................................... 6
5. information for disabled voters; ........................................... 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; ........................................... 30-31
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; ........................................... 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; ........................................... 12
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. ........................................... inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

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

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

第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，契合于二红点之上。

STEP 3

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

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

第三步
请把带针之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之后，把选票取出，沿虚线提起选票交给选举办理票员。
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:
• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don't find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party's candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as "independent” or "non-partisan” voters. People who checked "American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with "2." Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with "3."

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries (“The Way It Is Now,” “The Proposal,” “A ‘Yes’ Vote Means,” and “A ‘No’ Vote Means”) of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee prepares: the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters’ basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(DOES NOT INCLUDE S.F. UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT OR S.F. COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Federal Grants for Specific Programs</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$720 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES GENERATED BY CITY DEPARTMENTS AND USED BY SAME DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$596 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Sales &amp; Other Taxes &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$504 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$400 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$1.1 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$260 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Regular Revenue</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$1.03 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES
$1.03 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Protection</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$409 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$321 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Culture</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$53 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$114 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$146 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.

Portion of General Fund Regular Revenue which would be allocated to the Infrastructure Fund if Prop E Passes (1.5% in first year).
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- ADOPT
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- ALTER
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m.
Daily
LIBERTARIAN PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS

To express your preference for a candidate for nomination for President, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Your vote in this portion of the ballot is advisory only.

To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person’s name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite "YES" or "NO" for that measure.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

BALLOT DEL PARTIDO LIBERAL

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES

Para expresar su preferencia por un candidato que será nombrado Presidente, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Su voto en esta porción de la balota sirve sólo como guía.

Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.

Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pídale que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.

Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de "SI" o "NO" para dicha medida.

Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca o borrador; esto anularía la balota.

Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

START VOTING,
GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
### SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>自由黨</th>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>總統優先選舉權</td>
<td>PREFERENCIA PRESIDENCIAL</td>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE MARROU</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>參加全國大會的代表</td>
<td>DELEGADOS PARA LA CONVENCION NACIONAL</td>
<td>Delegates to the National Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DELEGATION IS NECESSARY</td>
<td>NO ES NECESARIA NINGUNA DELEGACION</td>
<td>不需有代表團</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-5=ALL
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

2

PARTIDO LIBERAL
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 2, 1992
UNITED STATES SENATOR

Liberal
United States Senator — Full Term

SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS — PERIODO COMPLETO
United States Senator — Full Term

JUNE R. GENIS
Computer Programmer
Programadora de computadoras

Vote for One

54

RICHARD B. BODDIE
Adjunct Professor/Mediator
Profesor adjunto/Mediador

Vote for One

69
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

3

PARTIDO LIBERAL
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS
2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
STATE SENATOR

STATE REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

LIBERTARIAN PARTY
CONSORTIUM PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 2, 1992
MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY

JAMES R. ELWOOD
Small Business Owner
Dueño de una pequeña empresa 小商業業主

REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS, DISTRITO 8
U.S. Representative in Congress — 8th District

THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT
No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito

ANTON SHERWOOD
Office Worker
Empleado de oficina 辦公室工人

MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12
Member, State Assembly — 12th District

ANTON SHERWOOD
Office Worker
Empleado de oficina 辦公室工人

3-5-1

18
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

4

PARTIDO LIBERAL
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS
2 DE JUNIO DE 1992

LIBERTARIAN PARTY
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 2, 1992

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT
Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本区在本頁是空白
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAMPLE BALLOT**

CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

**THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT**

Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本区在本頁是空白
## SAMPLE BALLOT
### CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

### NONPARTISAN BALLOT
**BALOTA APARTIDARIA** 無黨派選票

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>市法庭法官, 第五庭</th>
<th>九九年六月二日</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELLEN CHAITIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada Litigante 高訴律師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>161</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JANET W. FORSYTHE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada de Oficio Delegada 助理公共辯護律师</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>市法庭法官, 第六庭</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BARRY MELTON</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogado 律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DONNA LITTLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez del Tribunal Municipal 市法庭法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.  

**YES 185  ➤  NO 186 ➤**

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.  

**YES 193 ➤  NO 194 ➤**

PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.  

**YES 203 ➤  NO 204 ➤**
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas. 1992年學校設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債十九億元（$1,900,000,000），提供資金作建設或改良公立學校之用。

193 SI 贊成
194 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalezcan la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejoras de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas. 1992年高等教育設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債九億元（$900,000,000），用於興建或改良加州的公立學院和大學設施。

203 SI 贊成
204 NO 反對

APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocurran del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas。延期徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估值所增實業稅可延期繳付。

財政影響：這個提案將由於屋主延期繳付實業稅而導致州或地方政府損失數以百萬元計。這些損失會在屋主賣出他們的房屋時最終獲得補償。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES Vote</th>
<th>NO Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPÓSITOS DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

212 SI 贊成
213 NO 反對
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.

218 SI 贊成
219 NO 反對
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.

222 SI 贊成
223 NO 反對
BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asbesto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.

227 SI 贊成
228 NO 反對
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.

232 SI 贊成
233 NO 反對
¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?

8F-0-ALL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</td>
<td>CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPÓSITOS DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Opinión</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>237 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escritor de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escritor del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>縣幹事的職責和人事應否從高級法庭幹事調整到政府服務部，並在首席行政官的監督下任職？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y este ejecutará sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>市動物園獸醫主管應否由康樂局局長委任，但須經康樂局和公園委員會批准，而不在公務條例管轄下任職？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Ya no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgando, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>市採購官應否不必為市政府其他部門管理所有物資、補給和器材的存貨，而由市各部門自行負責任管理這些存貨？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>支持把加州劃分為北加州和南加州應否成為舊金山市縣人民的政策？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td>如果加州劃分為北加州和南加州，舊金山則屬於北加州版圖，這應否成為舊金山市縣人民的政策？</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIN DE LA BALOTA

票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

-------------------------

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
- 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
- Hastings Law School graduate
- Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
- Volunteer Attorney, Women's Health Clinic
- Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
- Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I'm honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:

SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Manson, Michael Dufficy, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy von Beroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazanus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola

10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENATOR Milton Marks

ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto
SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Dencheim, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlota delPortillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni
BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick

COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblenz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Bierman

Ellen Chaitin

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
- Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
- In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.
- It's time to make history!
- I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
  - Honors graduate — George Washington University.
  - Dean's Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
  - Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender's Office.
  - "Barristor of the Year" — 1988.
  - Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
  - Coro Foundation Fellow.
  - American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
  - Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.
  - As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.
  - I will also be a role model for our young men and women.

My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoogasian; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melecio Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brasington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #6

DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are:

As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women’s History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

DONNA LITTLE

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years
My qualifications for office are:

Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

• Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
• Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
• Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
• Named an “Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service” by Bar Association.
• Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
• Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality.

As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Heechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kanter, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

BARRY MELTON

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

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

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
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Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park's electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park’s public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park’s irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption $76,300,000
- Bond interest $53,791,500
- Debt service requirement $130,091,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of city life for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park's one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park's infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park's basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the Park is dying. In addition, many of the Park's basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park's infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park's water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and resealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we're in the middle of a recession! Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions "A," "B," "C," and "D"?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it's $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year's bills?

Remember, that's how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE "NO" ON "A," "B," "C" AND "D"

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Ario H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!!
STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPO NENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that "San Francisco deserves better".
"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area's open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dierauf, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco’s Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City’s neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it’s necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenhime, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O'Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Ezquerra, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco’s most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park’s infrastructure, preserving the park’s safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

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

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park's forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burkes, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Stybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

San Francisco's elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carlota del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebheim, Member, Board of Education
Ton Ammiano, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let's bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park Bond

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City’s economic well-being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nothenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehrman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Cartier*
Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quarania, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Kile Ozier, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP’S, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lilienthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Bierman
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwenn Craig
Kelly Cullen
Susanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Rotea Gilford
Louis J. Giraudo
Richard Grossboll
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany
Ricardo Hernandez
Robert Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaicks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kalil
Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Reverend John and Donnie E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCrathy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Oto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sululagi Palega
Lois Pavlov
Marianne H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Saslawsky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomata N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinkhon
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell's drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combatting AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco's former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loveliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park's delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women's Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco's park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco's neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Millet, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park's trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court's decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park's aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city's infrastructure are supposed to come from the city's general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted on the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city's infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it's free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you'll see that these things aren't free. It's City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven't been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It's telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — "No New Taxes." But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don't tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you'll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or how about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You'll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you'll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICIALS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. This Ordinance is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler systems together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of elections for such special election as hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting

(Continued on next page)
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system."

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto."

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

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

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

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

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

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

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
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PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES

NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City’s current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $26,700,000
- Bond interest: $18,823,500
- Debt service requirement: $45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,278,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of. Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills?

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.

“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsich, Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.
As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.
Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Song
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

Jean Kail
Library Commissioner

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!
Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Francisco’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!
Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and Civic Center Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more usable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtle
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

Proposition B will make San Francisco’s Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city’s traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne
City Attorney

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

Millon Marks
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco’s heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city's needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.
Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.
Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According to the Controller's statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let's get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.
A pretty picture is not a guarantee.
Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer's Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children's playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall's delivery trucks.
What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?
Let's see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PROPOSITION C
CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$24,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>$16,920,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$40,920,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.0040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
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PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage is now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.

Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City’s Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area.

This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a domino effect in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People do drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Culien

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote Yes on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Stang
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner

David Hurd
General Manager, George Cotes Performance Works

Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager

Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers’ funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That’s why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can’t you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We’re here asked to “incure a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage” to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C’s high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $53,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that’s just for the garage — it doesn’t include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR’S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board’s esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board’s decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don’t we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $33,000 per space for a “white elephant”. Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board’s budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco’s Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city’s residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let’s not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let’s logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

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

San Francisco's revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by 8 F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

Mar 7 Basic  June 13 Advanced  Sept 12 Basic
Mar 28 Basic  June 27 Worm  Sept 26 Basic
Apr 11 Advanced  July 18 Basic  Oct 10 Worm
Apr 25 Worm  July 25 Basic  Oct 24 Basic
May 9 Basic  Aug 1 Advanced  Nov 7 Advanced
May 23 Basic  Aug 22 Worm

SLUG Compost Hotline—468-0262  •  Recycling Hotline—554-6193
Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364
PROPOSITION D

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $21,220,000
- Bond Interest: $14,960,100
- Debt service requirement: $36,180,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a not assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable. Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor


REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than "a hot water system."

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Proposition D is a dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.

Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system. Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!

The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.
ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!

Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn-out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D.
Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.
VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition D will replace the Civic Center’s antiquated, wasteful steam heating plant with a modern, energy-efficient system.

By passing Proposition D, we will save an estimated $750,000 in energy costs every year.
Proposition D makes financial and environmental sense. Join us in voting YES on Proposition D.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Million Marks
State Senator
Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assembly Speaker

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.
San Francisco’s Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that’s consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.
The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.

VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.
Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.
Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D

The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a “new” hot water heating system at Civic Center.
Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?

This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, "capital projects" includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside for capital projects.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on "E"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current City services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.
NO: Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

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

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City's General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City's buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That's clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor's recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor's recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What's wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials' power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco's other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That's not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp's Good Government Committee

By Cheryl Arenalson

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

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children’s Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans’ needs.

This time we’re asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawn mowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don’t!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT’S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with “lawnmowers” as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a non-working electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.

Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DesERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the quality elected of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 relating to annual mandated levels of funds for protection and maintenance of the City's infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county of adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each budget and annual appropriation ordinance, through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount (CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages specified below for the identified years of General Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993/1994</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/1995</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/1996</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/2004</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2005</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this section the term "general fund revenue sources" shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereon belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1. In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing only the question of the change in allocation percentage.

2. In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City's then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner’s Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the warehouse, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for materials, real estate, planning, and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director.

The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which any such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner’s office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county’s convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management.

Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, excluding but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, excluding, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be and are hereby placed under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court; provided however, that any person who holds civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption of the amendment to this paragraph to this charter shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of the charter.
PROPOSITION F

Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES

NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk’s office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator's Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION “F”

Proposition “F” makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder’s Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk’s and Recorder’s Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk’s Office to the County Recorder’s Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent’s Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F
PROPOSITION G

Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Y E S  ➡
N O  ➡

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "G"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school, a license to practice veterinary medicine in California, and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to choose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of "G" miss the point: This measure isn't about health care for zoo animals, IT’S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create "flexibility" in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to "exempt" that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That’s patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards. If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians’ appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified? VOTE "NO" ON "G"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

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

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

"G" is "GREEDY"!
Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.
And that's what "G" is about: Political Patronage! Every time a position is "exempted" from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.
Surprised?
You shouldn't be!
"G" was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!
Say "NO" to patronage hiring!
Say "No" To "G"!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!
Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the "friends" that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager: Other Executives
The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
Inventory Control

PROPOSITION H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

YES ⇒ NO ⇒

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City’s many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments’ operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which “own” the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing’s inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOINENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of “H” is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect “savings” like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, “H” would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser’s office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out!

Of course not! They’re too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as “H”.

Send City Hall a message that you’re tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.


CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

"H" is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee "on the take."
"H" would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!
Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That's right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition "H".
VOTE "NO" ON "H"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arla H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H's opponents want City government to be cumbersome.
In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.

If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller's Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.
The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to that department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSITION 1
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition 1 would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “I”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:
Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “I”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.
DIVIDING CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California's government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That's the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn't make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That's not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your "YES" vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We'll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on 1 commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on 1.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won't move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn't get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capital and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state's economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting)

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa
DIVIDING CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese...

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California’s ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California’s voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON’T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren’t interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don’t they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California’s counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn’t San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn’t our right to express our opinion worth that much?
Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There’s no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fateful Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn’t even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won’t solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It’s enough to make Jimmy Gonzales’ mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a “substantial, but presently indeterminable amount”.

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should “interact” in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There’s no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It’s sad that some people feel the answer to California’s problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

Save the spotted owl!
Don’t let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heroes Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn’t support California’s breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California’s problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don’t double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Kopp’s Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors’ proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless “advisory” trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn’t even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than “hype” or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates “city policy”. Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it’s an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers’ time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudeville antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

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

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

□

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?

□
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

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

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPONET'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a "state-back" guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let's keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote "YES" on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPONET'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don't let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don't speak of "Northern California Girl" or "Hotel Southern California."

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN'T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The "State-Split" Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

"J" IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.
Proposition "J" asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.
Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Sunham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of "Northern California" Those who want a "Northern California" state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!
To vote "YES" on Proposition "J" is to say you think this backwoods "state-splitting" scheme is o.k.
Tell City Hall you’re tired of the jokes like Proposition "J" the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.
Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.
Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!
VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE "STATE-SPLIT" JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!
What Proposition "J" really asks is, "If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?"
In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?
California will only continue to grow! It’s a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.
San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don’t let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition J

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Don't be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn't even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it's spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you're elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members' minds?

VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President

Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.

Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet. and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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**POLLING PLACE CARD:** To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to **SIGN** your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

________________________________________________________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554 - 4375

Ballot Type

Libertarian
12th Assembly District
8th Senate District
8th Congressional

Precincts Applicable
2000's, 2100's,
2200's, 2700's,
2900's

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place.
The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

Vote-By-Mail Voters --- Cut or Tear Along Perforated Line

Do Not Remove Label

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE

MAILING ADDRESS

ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election

Sign this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

Check One:

☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address

City State Zip Code

Check Here If Appropriate:

☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote.
☐ My new address is printed below.
(Residence Address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name

Apt. No.

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 9411

Check below all that apply, then sign your name:

☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish _____ Chinese _____

You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

Your signature - DO NOT PRINT

Date Signed

Day Time Phone

Evening Phone
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet
and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr)  Your Signature

Print Your First Name  MI  Print Your Last Name

Print Your Residence Address  Zip Code

Day Phone --  Eve. Phone --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

Assigned Precinct:  Home Precinct:

Affidavit Number:  Clerk:  Inspector:

E.O. Bk.  6/2  6/6  Code  Reg. Attach.  Ini'tls

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET  
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:  

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .................. 15-27  
2. the location of your polling place .................. (see the label on the back cover)  
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; .................. back cover  
4. Your rights as a voter; .................. 6  
5. information for disabled voters; .................. 5  
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; .................. 30-31  
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller's Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .................. 33-86  
8. definitions of words you need to know; .................. 12  
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. .................. inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

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

第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

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

第三步
請把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線折起選票交給選舉監票員。
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absence ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate.

Only "qualified" write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:
- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don’t find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
NEW STATE SENATE DISTRICTS

8th State Senate District

3rd State Senate District

OLD STATE SENATE DISTRICTS

3rd State Senate District

8th State Senate District
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Bialock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markeli
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

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

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, Jim Stevens and Molly Wood.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrgeorge, George Mix, Jr., Sansson Wong, Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(DOES NOT INCLUDE S.F. UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT OR S.F. COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

- STATE & FEDERAL GRANTS FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (E.G., AIDS PREVENTION, AFDC PAYMENTS) 30% $720 MILLION
- REVENUES GENERATED BY CITY DEPARTMENTS AND USED BY SAME DEPARTMENT (E.G., LANDING FEES PAID BY AIRLINES TO S.F. INTL. AIRPORT) 29% $698 MILLION
- BUSINESS, SALES & OTHER TAXES & OTHER INCOME 21% $504 MILLION
- PROPERTY TAX 20% $480 MILLION

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

- NON-GENERAL FUND REVENUE 46% $1.1 BILLION
- OTHER GENERAL FUND REVENUE 11% $260 MILLION
- GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUE 43% $1.03 BILLION

EXPENDITURES PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES $1.03 BILLION

- PUBLIC PROTECTION 39% $409 MILLION
- HEALTH & WELFARE 31% $321 MILLION
- RECREATION & CULTURE 5% $53 MILLION
- UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION 11% $114 MILLION
- GENERAL ADMINISTRATION 14% $146 MILLION

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- ADOPT
Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- ALTER
Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY
Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
© 1994 City and County of San Francisco

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m. Daily
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

LIBERTARIAN PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
To express your preference for a candidate for nomination for President, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Your vote in this portion of the ballot is advisory only.
To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.
To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person’s name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.
To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite “YES” or “NO” for that measure.
All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.
If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

自由黨

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES
Para expresar su preferencia por un candidato que será nombrado Presidente, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Su voto en esta porción de la balota sirve sólo como guía.
Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.
Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.
Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de “SÍ” o “NO” para dicha medida.
Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca o borrador; esto anularía la balota.
Si usted se equivoca al votar, o al romper y dañar la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

1

自民党

自由黨

PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE

PREFERENCIA PRESIDENCIAL

Presidential Preference

ANDRE MARROU

DELEGADOS PARA LA CONVENCION NACIONAL

Delegates to the National Convention

NO DELEGATION IS NECESSARY

NO ES NECESARIA NINGUNA DELEGACION

不需有代表團

1-6-ALL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO LIBERAL</td>
<td>JUNE R. GENIS</td>
<td>United States Senator — Full Term</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD B. BODDIE</td>
<td>United States Senator — Short Term</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE BALLOT

CONSORTIATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>自由黨</th>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS</td>
<td>CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td>JUNE 2, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>美國衆議員，第十二區</td>
<td>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS, DISTRITO 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Representative in Congress — 12th District</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>請選一人</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGE L. O'BRIEN</td>
<td>GEORGE L. O'BRIEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Manager</td>
<td>Gerente financiero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>財務經理</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|  | 州參議員，第八區 | SENADOR ESTAL, DISTRITO 8 |
| | STATE SENATOR | State Senator — 8th District |
| | THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT | No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito |
| | 沒有人競選本區這一公職 | |

|  | 州衆議員，第十二區 | MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTAL, DISTRITO 12 |
| | MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY — 12th District | Vote for One |
| | 請選一人 | Vote por Uno |
| | ANTON SHERWOOD | ANTON SHERWOOD |
| | Office Worker | Empleado de oficina |
| | 辦公室工人 | |
| | 98 | 98 |
SAMPLE BALLOT
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PARTIDO LIBERAL
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS
2 DE JUNIO DE 1992

LIBERTARIAN PARTY
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 2, 1992

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT
Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本区在本页是空白
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>PARTIDO LIBERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIBERTARIAN PARTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUNE 2, 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT**

Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本区在本页是空白
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT, OFFICE #5</th>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 5</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</td>
<td>無黨派選票</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Trial Attorney</td>
<td>Abogada Litigante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET W. FORSYTHE</td>
<td>Deputy Public Defender</td>
<td>Abogada de Oficio Delegada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT, OFFICE #6</th>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUEZ DEL TRIBUNAL MUNICIPAL, OFICINA NUMERO 6</td>
<td>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</td>
<td>無黨派選票</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRY MELTON</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA LITTLE</td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court</td>
<td>Juez del Tribunal Municipal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

152 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 185
NO 186

153 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California's public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California's students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state's economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.

YES 193
NO 194

154 PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.

YES 203
NO 204
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

7F

185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.

1992年學校設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債九億元（$1,900,000,000），提供資金作建設或改良公立學校之用。

152

193 SI 贊成
194 NO 反對

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalezcan la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejorías de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.

1992年6月高等教育設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債九億元（$900,000,000），用於興建或改良加州的公立學院和大學設施。這些建設工程創造就業，確保加州學生獲得高等教育，並使各公立學院和大學培訓出一批訓練有素的、競爭力強的勞動大軍，充實加州的經濟。授權興建的138公立校園計劃，包括，但並不等於限制於防震和其他衛生安全的改良、實驗室的現代化，以適跟上科學的發展和建築課室、圖書館等等。

153

203 SI 贊成
204 NO 反對

APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocurran del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.

延期徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估值所增實業稅可延期徵收。

財政影響：這個提案將由於屋主延期徵付實業稅而導致州或地方政府損失數以百萬元計。這些損失會在屋主賣出他們的房屋時最終獲得補償。

154

7F-0-ALL
SAMPLE BALLOT
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8E
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

A
YES 212
NO 213

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

B
YES 218
NO 219

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

C
YES 222
NO 223

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

D
YES 227
NO 228

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

E
YES 232
NO 233
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CÍVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa e estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asbesto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.

¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

F   Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?    YES 237  NO 238

G   Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?    YES 241  NO 242

H   Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?    YES 245  NO 246

I   Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?    YES 248  NO 249

J   Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?    YES 252  NO 253

END OF BALLOT
## SAMPLE BALLOT

CONolidated PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

### BALOTA APARTIDARIA

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO  |  城市和縣
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992  |  1992年6月2日
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

| 237 SI 贊成 | Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escribano de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escribano del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal? | 無黨派選票 |
| 238 NO 反對 |  | F |

| 241 SI 贊成 | ¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y este ejercerá sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil? | G |
| 242 NO 反對 |  | |

| 245 SI 贊成 | ¿Yá no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgando, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad? | H |
| 246 NO 反對 |  | |

| 248 SI 贊成 | Será la política de las personas del Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur? | I |
| 249 NO 反對 |  | |

| 252 SI 贊成 | ¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur? | J |
| 253 NO 反對 |  | |

### FIN DE LA BALOTA

票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

______________________________________________________________

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
• 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
• Hastings Law School graduate
• Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
• Delinquency Prevention Commissioner (1985 – 1987)
• Volunteer Attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
• Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
• Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:

SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficey, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola

10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS

SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENATOR Milton Marks

ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto

SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebeim, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlaio delPorlullo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly

COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodol Rodis, Robert Varni

BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick

COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblentz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Bierman

Ellen Chaitin

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
• Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
• In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.
• It's time to make history!
• I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
  • Honors graduate — George Washington University.
  • Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
  • Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s Office.
  • “Barrister of the Year” — 1988.
  • Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
  • Coro Foundation Fellow.
  • American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
  • Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.

As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.

I will also be a role model for our young men and women.

My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinsein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoogashian; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Molecio Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brassington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe
DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39

My qualifications for office are:
As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers' Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women’s History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perke Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidaday; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years

My qualifications for office are:
Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

• Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
• Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
• Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
• Named an “Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service” by Bar Association.
• Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
• Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality. As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Heechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Barry Melton

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

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

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

**"Proponent's Argument":**
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

**"Opponent's Argument":**
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park’s electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park’s public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park’s irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption $76,300,000
- Bond interest 53,791,500
- Debt service requirement $130,091,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROPOLEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of city life for families, neighbors, and communities from all over the City. Within the Park's one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park's infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park's basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park's infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park's water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and ressealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Migden, Shelley and Ward
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROPOLEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we're in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions "A," "B," "C," and "D"?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it's $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year's bills?

Remember, that's how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

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

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.
To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!
STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.

“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future; investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area’s open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sieg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dierg, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco’s Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City’s neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it's necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eckman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O’Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Esquerro, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco’s most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park’s infrastructure, preserving the park’s safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

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

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park’s forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burkes, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Slow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

San Francisco’s elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carlota del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebeim, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammannio, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland T. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodol Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let’s bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38

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

37
Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City’s economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nothenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehrman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Cartier*
Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quaranta, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Kile Osier, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP’S, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lilienthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Bierman
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwen Craig
Kelly Cullen
Suzanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Rotea Gilford
Louis J. Giraudo
Richard Grossboll
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heaney
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaicks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kallil
Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Reverend John and Donneter E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Oto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sululagi Palega
Lois Pavlow
Marianne H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russel-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Sastafsky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomaara N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Mailllard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinkhon
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combatting AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco’s park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Millet, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your YES vote on Proposition A will insure that the park’s trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court's decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park’s aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city’s infrastructure are supposed to come from the city’s general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city's infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it’s free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you’ll see that these things aren’t free. It’s City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven’t been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It’s telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year— "No New Taxes." But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don’t tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you’ll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or how about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You’ll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you’ll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION B, PROPOSITION C AND PROPOSITION D

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCU All THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE ON WHICH SUCH AN ELECTION WILL BE HELD; AND AUTHORIZING THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREON; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the Civic Center and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including, but not limited to, supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of elections 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 officers of election for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting (Continued on next page)"
surrounding the City Hall and areas adja-
cent thereto."

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYS-

To incur a bonded indebtedness of
$21,220,000 to pay the cost of construc-
tion or reconstruction of a heating sys-
tem within the Civic Center area
including pipelines and hot water boiler
system."

"CIVIC CENTER PARKING GA-
RAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS,

To incur a bonded indebtedness of
$24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement
of the Civic Center Parking Garage or
construction of a parking garage adja-
cent thereto, including asbestos abate-
ment and providing access for the
disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPRO-

To incur a bonded indebtedness of
$76,300,000 to pay the cost of the con-
struction or reconstruction of repair,
re-
forestation and rehabilitation of Golden
Gate Park including water system sup-
ply and irrigation, lakes and water
courses, utilities including street and sec-
urity lighting, repair and rehabilitation of
park features, landscaping, restrooms
including disabled access thereto."

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

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

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

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

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

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employ-
ees, representatives and agents of the City and
County of San Francisco are hereby authorized
and directed to do everything necessary or desir-
able to the calling and holding of said special
election, and to otherwise carry out the provi-
sions of this ordinance.

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be
Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for Improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES  NO

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City's current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $26,700,000
- Bond interest: $18,623,500
- Debt service requirement: $45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($.0044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
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PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B
San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of.
Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center
plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City
Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera
House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a
superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic
Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step
towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped
pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and
our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center
Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original
historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved
street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area
and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera
House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space
to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and
history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and
bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our
Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez,
Hallinan, Hsieh, Migden, Shelley and Ward.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to
re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan.
These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a
new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo
system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the
City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a
budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILL-
LION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we're in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of
new bonds proposed in Propositions "A," "B," "C," and "D"?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000
to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry
if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular
monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to
refurbish parks, when it's $150 MILLION short of funds to pay
this year's bills!

Remember, that's how New York City spent itself into receivers-
ship!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!

This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!

But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!

San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who has just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.

“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law.

The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.

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

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Francisco’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!

Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.
As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.
Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Song
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect.

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig  
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn  
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley  
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtle  
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt  
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane  
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis  
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect.

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

James Haas  
Chair, Civic Pride

Carolyn Diamond  
Executive Director, Greater Market Street Development Association

Robert Friese  
President, San Francisco Beautiful

Proposition B will make San Francisco’s Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city’s traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne  
City Attorney

Arlo Smith  
District Attorney

Milton Marks  
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.  
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco’s heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein  
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city’s needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According the the Controller’s statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote No on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let’s get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer’s Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children’s playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall’s delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?

Let’s see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $24,000,000
- Bond interest: 16,920,500
- Debt service requirement: 40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.0040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.

Absents: Supervisors Brit, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT "cure parking headaches" in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City's bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City's Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What's more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can't, the garage shouldn't be built. We believe the City's General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn't be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds
Civic Center Garage Bonds

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area. This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

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

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote Yes on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.
Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner
David Hard
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works
Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager
Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers' funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That's why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can't you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We're here asked to "incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage" to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $733,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are besieged to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C's high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $33,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that's just for the garage — it doesn't include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board's esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board's decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don't we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a "white elephant". Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board's budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco's Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city's residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let's not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let's logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco’s revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.

Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

Mar 7 Basic June 13 Advanced Sept 12 Basic
Mar 28 Basic June 27 Worm Sept 26 Basic
Apr 11 Advanced July 18 Basic Oct 10 Worm
Apr 25 Worm July 25 Basic Oct 24 Basic
May 9 Basic Aug 1 Advanced Nov 7 Advanced
May 23 Basic Aug 22 Worm

SLUG Compost Rollline-468-0262 • Recycling Hotline-554-6193
Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPOSITION D

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$21,220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>$14,960,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$36,180,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than "a hot water system."

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.
Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system. Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
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PROponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City's General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City’s buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

Rebuttal to Proponent’s Argument in Favor of Proposition E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That’s clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor’s recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor’s recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What’s wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials’ power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco’s other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That’s not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee

By Cheryl Arenson
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children’s Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans' needs.

This time we’re asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawnmowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don’t!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT’S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPOENENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with “lawnmowers” as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition E

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

. The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition I fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
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TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 relating to annual mandated levels of funds for protection and maintenance of the City's infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county of adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each budget and annual appropriation ordinance, through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount (CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages specified below for the identified years of General Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:

- Fiscal Year 1993/1994: 1.5%
- Fiscal Year 1994/1995: 2.0%
- Fiscal Years 1995/1996 through 2003/2004: 2.5%
- Fiscal Year 2004/2005: 1.5%

For the purpose of this section the term "general fund revenue sources" shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereof belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1. In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

2. In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City's then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.

☐
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the liens and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department.

The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage and operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be administered under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court. Provided, however, that any person who holds civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption of the resolution to the contrary shall continue to have civil service status and be appointed under the civil service provisions of this charter.
PROPOSITION F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES
NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk’s office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator’s Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "F"

Proposition "F" makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder's Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk's and Recorder's Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk's Office to the County Recorder's Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent's Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "G"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to choose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of “G” miss the point: This measure isn’t about health care for zoo animals, IT’S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create “flexibility” in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to “exempt” that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That’s patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards.

If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians’ appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE “NO” ON “G”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member

Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

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

"G" is "GREEDY"!
Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.
And that’s what "G" is about: Political Patronage! Every time a position is "exempted" from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.
Surprised? You shouldn’t be!
"G" was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!
Say "NO" to patronage hiring!
Say "No" To "G"!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care! Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.
This is no giveaway of public funds and the “friends” that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives

The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
Inventory Control

PROPOSITION H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City’s many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments' operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which "own" the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing's inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of "H" is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy. It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect "savings" like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, "H" would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser's office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out?

Of course not! They're too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as "H".

Send City Hall a message that you're tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C", "D", "G", "H", "I" and "J"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

"H" is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee "on the take."
"H" would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!

Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That's right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!

Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition "H".
VOTE "NO" ON "H"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H’s opponents want City government to be cumbersome.

In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.

If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller’s Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.

The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.

Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County on an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unif for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section.

The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when more than one type, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers or, dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchase of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops hereof are maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
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PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

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

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Arruito.
Dividing California into Two States

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California’s government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That’s the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn’t make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should localize, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That’s not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your “YES” vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We’ll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won’t move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn’t get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state’s economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting)

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

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

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, grumpies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese . . .

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California’s ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California’s voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON'T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren’t interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don’t they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California’s counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn’t San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn’t our right to express our opinion worth that much?

Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There's no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn't even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won't solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It's enough to make Jimmy Gonzales' mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a "substantial, but presently indeterminable amount".

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should "interact" in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There's no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It's sad that some people feel the answer to California's problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

Save the spotted owl!
Don't let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heros Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn't support California's breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DIVIDING CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Kopp's Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors' proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless "advisory" trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn't even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than "hype" or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates "city policy". Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it's an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers' time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

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

PROPOSITION I

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION J

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOSITION J
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminate amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. TEXT FOR PROPOSITION J IS ON PAGE 82.
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOSITOR’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a “state-buck” guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let’s keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote “YES” on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSITOR’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don’t let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don’t speak of “Northern California Girl” or “Hotel Southern California.”

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN’T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The “State-Split” Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"J" IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or
so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep
this frivolous measure off the ballot.
Proposition "J" asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco
should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden
State is divided.
Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural inter-
ests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker
environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who
want an all-white rural state of "Northern California" Those who
want a "Northern California" state government and congressional
delegation with few women and minorities!
To vote "YES" on Proposition "J" is to say you think this
backwoods "state-splitting" scheme is o.k.
Tell City Hall you're tired of the jokes like Proposition "J" the
Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.
Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting
us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than
grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot mea-
sures like the present one.
Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!
VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE "STATE-SPLIT" JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!
What Proposition "J" really asks is, "If you would like to discuss
the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would
you prefer to be in?"
In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty
counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we
belong in?
California will only continue to grow! It's a fact. If you had 30
million relatives come live with you, would you keep all in
one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying
another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and
discuss creating another state.
San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and
culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communi-
ties will have more representation, not less! Don't let the right to
shape your own destiny be taken from you!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

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

Don’t be misled, The Board of Supervisors doesn’t even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it’s spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you’re elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members’ minds?

VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President

Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.
Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

__________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election

Sign this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

Check One:
- [ ] Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
- [ ] I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address

City State Zip Code

Check Here If Appropriate:
- [ ] I have moved since I last registered to vote. My new address is printed below. (Residence Address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name

SAN FRANCISCO, CA Zip Code

Apt. No.

Check below all that apply, then sign your name:
- [ ] I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- [ ] I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- [ ] All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish ____, Chinese ____

You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

Your signature - DO NOT PRINT Date Signed Day Time Phone Evening Phone
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet
and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q. Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo/ Da/ Yr)       Your Signature

Print Your First Name       MI       Print Your Last Name

Print Your Residence Address       Zip Code

Day Phone   --   Eve. Phone   --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

Assigned Precinct:       Home Precinct:

Affidavit Number:       Clerk:       Inspector:

E.O. Bk.       6/2       6/6       Code       Reg. Attach.       Init'ls

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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## PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .......................................................... Page 15-27
2. the location of your polling place .................................. (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; ........................................................................ Back Cover
4. Your rights as a voter; .................................................. Page 6
5. information for disabled voters; .................................... Page 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; .......................................................... Page 30-31
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .......................................................... Page 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; .......................... Page 12
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. .......................... inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

Using Both Hands
Insert the Ballot Card All the
Way into the Votomatic.
Usando las dos manos, meta la
tarjeta de voto completamente
dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
请双手持票向自动機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

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

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

第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接
合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

Hold Punch Vertical (Straight
Up). Punch Straight Down
Through the Ballot Card To
Indicate Your Choice. Do Not
Use Pen or Pencil.

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

第三步
请把带针之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入
打孔投票。

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at
the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，
沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監選員。

STEP 4

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic,
doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y
entreguela en el lugar oficial de votacion.

4
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate. Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:

- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or

- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don't find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lesson's the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar's Office in City Hall. Absentee ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar's Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City's constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odel
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

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

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, Jim Stevens and Molly Wood.
Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.
Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; and studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(Does not include S.F. Unified School District or
S.F. Community College District)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

STATE & FEDERAL GRANTS FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS
(E.G., AIDS PREVENTION,
AFDC PAYMENTS)
30 %
$720 MILLION

REVENUES GENERATED BY CITY DEPARTMENTS AND USED BY SAME DEPARTMENT
(E.G., LANDING FEES PAID BY AIRLINES TO S.F. INT'L. AIRPORT)
29 %
$696 MILLION

BUSINESS, SALES & OTHER TAXES & OTHER INCOME
21 %
$504 MILLION

PROPERTY TAX
20 %
$480 MILLION

PORTION OF PROPERTY TAX
(Approx. 6.45%)
Used to Repay General Obligation Bonds

EXPENDITURES
PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES
$1.03 BILLION

PUBLIC PROTECTION
39 %
$409 MILLION

HEALTH & WELFARE
31 %
$321 MILLION

RECREATION & CULTURE
5 %
$53 MILLION

UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION
11 %
$114 MILLION

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
14 %
$146 MILLION

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

NON-GENERAL FUND REVENUE
46%
$1.1 BILLION

OTHER GENERAL FUND REVENUE
11%
$260 MILLION

GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUE
43%
$1.03 BILLION

PORTION OF GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUE WHICH WOULD BE ALLOCATED TO THE INFRASTRUCTURE FUND IF PROP E PASSES (1.5% IN FIRST YEAR).

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

ADOPT
Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

ALTER
Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY
Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
© 1999 City and County of San Francisco

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Open for Adoptions 11 a.m. to 6 p.m. Daily
LIBERTARIAN PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
To express your preference for a candidate for nomination for President, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Your vote in this portion of the ballot is advisory only.

To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person’s name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite “YES” or “NO” for that measure.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

自由黨

選民須知
如要表達你對提名總統候選人的優先選擇，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。
你投票這一部分僅屬表達意見性質。

投票選舉選票上所列的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。如果要選舉超過兩名候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的所有候選人姓名旁邊打孔，但請勿選舉超過要選的候選人的數目。

投票選舉合票選舉候選人，請在選票卡的長方形票尾的空白上寫上該候選人的姓名和官職。如有不明之處，請向助選員求助。

投票任何一項提案，請用藍色筆尖在提案旁邊的“YES”（贊成）或“NO”（反對）打孔。

如果選票有明顯污損或撕破痕跡，選票即作廢。

如果你投票錯了，或者選票撕破了，應把選票交回選區的選舉委員，再拿一份新選票。

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO LIBERAL

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES
Para expresar su preferencia por un candidato que será nombrado Presidente, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Su voto en esta porción de la balota sirve sólo como guía.

Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.

Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.

Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de "Sí" o "No" para dicha medida.

Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca y borrador; esto anularía la balota.

Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請轉下頁。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.

TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Presidential Preference</th>
<th>Delegates to the National Convention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ANDRE MARROU</td>
<td>NO DELEGATION IS NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIBERTARIAN PARTY**

**PARTIDO LIBERAL**

**ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS**

2 DE JUNIO DE 1992

**PRESIDENTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS**

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION**

JUNE 2, 1992

**PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

1-5-ALL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>CANDIDATE</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO LIBERAL</td>
<td>JUNE R. GENIS</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Programmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programadora de computadoras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>計算機程序編制員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERTARIAN PARTY</td>
<td>RICHARD B. BODDIE</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjunct Professor/Mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profesor adjunto/Mediador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>講教授／調解人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample Ballot**

**Consolidated Primary Election, June 2, 1992, City and County of San Francisco**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator - Full Term</td>
<td>JUNE R. GENIS</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Programmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programadora de computadoras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>計算機程序編制員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator - Short Term</td>
<td>RICHARD B. BODDIE</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjunct Professor/Mediator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profesor adjunto/Mediador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>講教授／調解人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>美國衆議員, 第八區</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS, DISTRITO 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Representative in Congress — 8th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES R. ELWOOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dueño de una pequeña empresa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>小商業東主</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>請選一人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 80 | → |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>州參議員, 第三區</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL, DISTRITO 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Senator — 3rd District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILL C. WOHLER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dueño de una pequeña empresa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>小商業東主</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>請選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 98 | → |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>州衆議員, 第十三區</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member, State Assembly — 13th District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARK VALVERDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>請選一人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 98 | → |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PARTIDO LIBERAL</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBERTARIAN PARTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 2, 1992</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PARTIDO LIBERAL
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS
2 DE JUNIO DE 1992

LIBERTARIAN PARTY
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION
JUNE 2, 1992
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Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本區在本頁是空白
### SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONPARTISAN BALLOT</th>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada Litigante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JANET W. FORSYTHE</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada de Oficio Delegada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARRY MELTON</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DONNA LITTLE</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez del Tribunal Municipal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>市法院法官</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6-0-ALL
SAMPLE BALLOT
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

152 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 185
NO 186

153 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.

YES 193
NO 194

154 PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.

YES 203
NO 204
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992

MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.

1992年學校設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債十九億元（$1,900,000,000），提供資金作建設或改善公立學校之用。

183 SI 贊成
184 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalezcan la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejorías de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.

1992年6月高等教育設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債九億元（$900,000,000）,用於興建或改善加州的公立學院和大學設施。

203 SI 贊成
204 NO 反对

APLAGAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocuren del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recorridos eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.

延闢徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估值所增加業稅可延期徵付。

財政影響：這個提案將由於房主延期徵收業稅而導致州或地方政府損失數以百萬元計。這些損失會在房主賣出他們的房屋時最終獲得補償。
GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

YES 212  
NO 213  

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES 218  
NO 219  

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

YES 222  
NO 223  

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

YES 227  
NO 228  

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

YES 232  
NO 233
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Número de Votos (A)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (B)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (C)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (D)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Número de Votos (A)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (B)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (C)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (D)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Número de Votos (A)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (B)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (C)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (D)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asbesto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Número de Votos (A)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (B)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (C)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (D)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Número de Votos (A)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (B)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (C)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (D)</th>
<th>Número de Votos (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>¿Debe la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES 237
NO 238

G
Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

YES 241
NO 242

H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

YES 245
NO 246

I
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES 248
NO 249

J
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES 252
NO 253

END OF BALLOT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEDIAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Opciones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escribano de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escribano del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?</td>
<td>SI: Sí  NO: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y éste ejecutará sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil?</td>
<td>SI: Sí  NO: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>¿Ya no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgando, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad?</td>
<td>SI: Sí  NO: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas del Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
<td>SI: Sí  NO: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
<td>SI: Sí  NO: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIN DE LA BALOTA**

票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

---

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
- 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
- Hastings Law School graduate
- Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
- Volunteer Attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
- Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
- Married, two children

A judgship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:

SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficey, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola

10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS

SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENATOR Milton Marks

ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto

SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denehein, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlota delPortillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly

COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni

BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick

COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Cob lentz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Bierman

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.

Its time to make history!
I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
- Honors graduate — George Washington University.
- Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
- Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s Office.
- Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
- Coro Foundation Fellow.
- American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
- Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.

As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.

I will also be a role model for our young men and women.

My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoagasin; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melecio Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brassington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe

Ellen Chaitin

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #6

DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are:

As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers' Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women's History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Loise; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Vanacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years
My qualifications for office are:

Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

- Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar,
- Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirschbein. Extensive criminal trial experience,
- Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
- Named an "Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service" by Bar Association,
- Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association's referral service in landlord-tenant law.
- Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality.

As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
- Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
- Sheriff Mike Hennessey
- Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
- Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
- Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
- Police Sergeant Art Tapia
- Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
- School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Puro

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Barry Melton

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

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

"Proponent’s" and "Opponent’s" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent’s Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent’s Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent’s Argument" and "Opponent’s Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent’s Argument" and the "Opponent’s Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent’s Argument":
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent’s Argument":
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent’s Argument" and "Opponent’s Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park’s electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park’s public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park’s irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$76,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>53,791,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$130,091,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alito.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of citylife for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park’s one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park’s infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park’s basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park’s infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park’s water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and resealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A”, “B”, “C”, “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills!

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

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

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!

San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.

“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area’s open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dierau, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco’s Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City’s neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it’s necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Treni W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O’Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Ezquerro, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco’s most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park’s infrastructure, preserving the park’s safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

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

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

San Francisco's elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park's forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schement, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burke, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Striving Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let's bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38
Golden Gate Park Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City’s economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zabak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nothenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Carter*
Parker A. Maddox, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quaranta, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Kile Ozier, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP’S, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lilienthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fussell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Birnem
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwenn Craig
Kelly Cullen
Susanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Rotea Gilford
Louis J. Giraudo
Richard Grossboll
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaiicks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kalil
Tony Kitroy
Jean Kortum
Reverend John and
Donneter E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Otto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sululagi Palega
Lois Pavlow
Marianne H. Peterson
David Pilpel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Salsafsky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomata N. Scott
Barbara H. Stevens
Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Tee
Robert W. Zinkhon

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

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combatting AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loveliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women’s Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco’s park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Millet, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park’s trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court’s decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park’s aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city’s infrastructure are supposed to come from the city’s general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city's infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it's free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you’ll see that these things aren’t free. It’s City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven’t been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It’s telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — “No New Taxes.” But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don’t tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you’ll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You’ll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you’ll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECEIVING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

It is 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 2nd day of June, 1992, 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the Civic Center Plaza and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakés and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

That said resolutions were passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recital 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 expenditures thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of elections for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting (Continued on next page)"
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto."
"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system."
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled."
"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto." Each voter to vote for any said propositions 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 special election, each voter to vote for any said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.
Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 12 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, provided, that interest for the first year after the date of any of said bonds may be payable at or before the end of that year.
The votes cast for and against said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.
Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.
Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City's current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$26,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>18,823,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service requirement</td>
<td>$45,523,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,278,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.0044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
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PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of. Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills?

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

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

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.
“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.

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

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.
The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.
The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote YES on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Francisco’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!

Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.
As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.
Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Siong
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

San Francisco’s Civic Center, which should symbolize our city’s beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more usable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtie
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

Proposition B will make San Francisco’s Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city’s traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne
City Attorney

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

Millon Marks
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of the City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco’s heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city's needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According to the Controller's statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote No on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let's get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer's Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children's playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall's delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?

Let's see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSITION C

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on “C”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $24,000,000
- Bond interest: $16,920,500
- Debt service requirement: $40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
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PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.

Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City’s Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds
Civic Center Garage Bonds

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area.

This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers' trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the "Heart of the City".

Please vote Yes on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Strong
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner

David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works

Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager

Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers’ funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That’s why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can’t you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We’re here asked to “incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage” to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naïve or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C’s high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $53,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that’s just for the garage — it doesn’t include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR’S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board’s esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board’s decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don’t we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a “white elephant”. Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board’s budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco’s Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city’s residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let’s not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let’s logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
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TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

Mar 7 Basic June 13 Advanced Sept 12 Basic
Mar 28 Basic June 27 Worm Sept 26 Basic
Apr 11 Advanced July 18 Basic Oct 10 Worm
Apr 25 Worm July 25 Basic Oct 24 Basic
May 9 Basic Aug 1 Advanced Nov 7 Advanced
May 23 Basic Aug 22 Worm

SLUG Compost Rotline—468-0262 • Recycling Hotline—554-6193

Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364
PROPOSITION D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

Bond redemption $21,220,000
Bond interest 14,860,100
Debt service requirement 36,180,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than “a hot water system.”

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center
Heating System Bonds

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guiness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $130 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs. Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong. Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system. Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!
The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.
ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!
Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D. Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.
VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition D will replace the Civic Center's antiquated, wasteful steam heating plant with a modern, energy-efficient system.
By passing Proposition D, we will save an estimated $750,000 in energy costs every year.
Proposition D makes financial and environmental sense. Join us in voting YES on Proposition D.

Michael Hennessery
Sheriff
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Milton Marks
State Senator
Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assembly Speaker

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.
San Francisco's Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that's consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.
The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.

VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.
Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.
Send the spenders your message. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D

The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a "new" hot water heating system at Civic Center.
Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?

This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, "capital projects" includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current city services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.

NO: Achtenberg, Brit, Migden and Ward.

ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City's General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for—when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center—are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City's buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That's clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor's recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor's recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What's wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials' power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco's other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That's not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children’s Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans’ needs. This time we’re asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawnmowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don’t!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT’S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPOPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with “lawnmowers” as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Alito, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.

Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition E

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 relating to annual mandated levels of funds for protection and maintenance of the City’s infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county of adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each budget and annual appropriation ordinance, through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount (CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages specified below for the identified years of General Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:

Fiscal Year 1993/1994 1.5%
Fiscal Year 1994/1995 2.0%
Fiscal Years 1995/1996 through 2003/2004 2.5%
Fiscal Year 2004/2005 1.5%

For the purpose of this section the term "general fund revenue sources" shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereon belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

(1) In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

(2) In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City's then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.

☐
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner's Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central storages and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the tele-

phone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner's office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department ofWeights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county's convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management.

Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be and are hereby placed under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court, provided, however, that any person who holds civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption of the charter shall continue to have civil service status in said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.
PROPOSITION F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk’s office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator’s Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION F IS ON PAGE 66.
PROPOSED ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION “F”

Proposition “F” makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder’s Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk’s and Recorder’s Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk’s Office to the County Recorder’s Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent’s Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

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

Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
Chief Zoo Veterinarian

PROponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to chose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor


REButtal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition G

The proponents of "G" miss the point: This measure isn't about health care for zoo animals, IT'S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING! In order to create "flexibility" in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to "exempt" that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That's patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards.

If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians' appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE "NO" ON "G"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

“G” is “GREEDY”!
Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.

And that’s what “G” is about: Political Patronage!
Every time a position is “exempted” from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.

Surprised?
You shouldn’t be!
“G” was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!

Say “NO” to patronage hiring!
Say “No” To “G”!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!
Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the “friends” that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strikeout type.

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives

The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29c stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City’s many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments’ operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which “own” the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing’s inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of “H” is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect “savings” like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, “H” would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser’s office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out!

Of course not! They’re too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as “H”.

Send City Hall a message that you’re tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.


CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

“H” is Hilarious! Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee “on the take.” “H” would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory! Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop? That’s right! But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit? The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department! Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than clattering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition “H”. VOTE “NO” ON “H”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H’s opponents want City government to be cumbersome. In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.

If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller’s Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.

The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.

Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors


No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?  

Analysis  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “I”  
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:
Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “I”  
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California’s government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That’s the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn’t make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That’s not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your “YES” vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We’ll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won’t move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn’t get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state’s economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting)!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

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

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of: California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese . . .

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California’s ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California’s voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON’T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPOSITION’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren’t interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don’t they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California’s counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn’t San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn’t our right to express our opinion worth that much? Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There’s no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn’t even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won’t solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It’s enough to make Jimmy Gonzales’ mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Franciscans taxpayers a “substantial, but presently indeterminable amount”.

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should “interact” in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There’s no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It’s sad that some people feel the answer to California’s problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Save the spotted owl!
Don’t let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heros Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn’t support California’s breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California’s problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes. Don’t double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

Kopp's Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors' proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless "advisory" trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn't even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than "hype" or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates "city policy". Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it's an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers' time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan
TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION I

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOSITION J
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

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

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:
Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "J"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION J IS ON PAGE 82.
San Francisco in Northern California

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a “state-back” guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let’s keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote “YES” on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don’t let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don’t speak of “Northern California Girl” or “Hotel Southern California.”

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN’T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The “State-Split” Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alex Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"J" IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.

Proposition "J" asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.

Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of "Northern California" Those who want a "Northern California" state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!

To vote "YES" on Proposition "J" is to say you think this backwoods "state-splitting" scheme is O.K.

Tell City Hall you're tired of the jokes like Proposition "J" the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.

Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.

Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE "STATE-SPLIT" JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!

What Proposition "J" really asks is, "If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?"

In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?

California will only continue to grow! It's a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.

San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don't let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition J

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Don't be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn't even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it's spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you're elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members' minds?

VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President

Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.

Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may "fax" your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

"Cleaning" your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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**POLLING PLACE CARD:** To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. **The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.**

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Did you remember to **SIGN** your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

---

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS  
City and County of San Francisco  
Room 158 - City Hall  
400 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691  
(415) 554 - 4375  

Ballot Type  
Libertarian  
Precincts Applicable  
9253  
13th Assembly District  
3rd Senate District  
8th Congressional  
3000's  

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place. 
The location of your polling place is shown on the label below. 

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below. 

Vote-By-Mail Voters --- Cut or Tear Along Perforated Line  

Do Not Remove Label  

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE ➔  

MAILING ADDRESS ➔  

ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election  
Sign this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.  

Check One:  
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.  
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.  

P.O. Box or Street Address  
City  
State  
Zip Code  

Check Here If Appropriate:  
☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote.  
My new address is printed below.  
(Residence Address ONLY.)  

Number and Street Name  
Apt. No.  

SAN FRANCISCO, CA  
9411  

Check below all that apply, then sign your name:  
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.  
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.  
☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish____ Chinese____.  

You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.  

Your signature - **DO NOT PRINT**  

Date Signed  
Day Time Phone  
Evening Phone
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet
and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q. Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION
I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr) __________________________________________________________

Your Signature

Print Your First Name

Print Your Last Name

Print Your Residence Address

Zip Code

Day Phone ___________ -- ___________ Eve. Phone ___________ -- ___________

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English:

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other: _____________________________

I HAVE a car: [ ] (Please Check)

Temporary Placement: [ ] Yes [ ] No

Assigned Precinct: ___________________________ Home Precinct: ___________________________

Affidavit Number: ___________________________

Clerk: [ ] Inspector: [ ]

E.O. Bk. [ ] 6/2 [ ] 6/6 [ ] [ ] Code [ ] Reg. Attach. [ ] Init'ls

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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## PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a **Sample Ballot** (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); 15-27
2. the location of your **polling place** (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an **Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot** and for permanent absentee voter status; back cover
4. **Your rights as a voter**; 6
5. information for **disabled voters**; 5
6. **statements from candidates** who are running for local office; 30-31
7. **information about each local ballot measure**, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; 12
9. a **Polling Place Card** to mark your choices before voting; inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

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

第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

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

第三步
請把帶鉛之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4
After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線摺起選票交給選舉站監票員。

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del Votomatic, doble la balota a lo largo de las perforaciones y entregúela en el lugar oficial de votación.
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 31 and 30, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate.

Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:

- Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
- Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall—we ask for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don’t find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blatock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

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

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, Jim Stevens and Molly Wood.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.

Ex-officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(DOES NOT INCLUDE S.F. UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT OR S.F. COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

1. STATE & FEDERAL GRANTS FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (E.G., AIDS PREVENTION, AFDC PAYMENTS) 30% $720 MILLION
2. REVENUES GENERATED BY CITY DEPARTMENTS AND USED BY SAME DEPARTMENT (E.G., LANDING FEES PAID BY AIRLINES TO S.F. INT'L. AIRPORT) 29% $656 MILLION
3. BUSINESS, SALES & OTHER TAXES & OTHER INCOME 21% $504 MILLION
4. PROPERTY TAX 20% $480 MILLION

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

1. NON-GENERAL FUND REVENUE 46% $1.1 BILLION
2. OTHER GENERAL FUND REVENUE 11% $260 MILLION
3. GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUE 43% $1.03 BILLION

EXPENDITURES PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES
$1.03 BILLION

1. PUBLIC PROTECTION 39% $409 MILLION
2. HEALTH & WELFARE 31% $321 MILLION
3. RECREATION & CULTURE 5% $53 MILLION
4. UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION 11% $114 MILLION
5. GENERAL ADMINISTRATION 14% $146 MILLION

PORTION OF GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUE WHICH WOULD BE ALLOCATED TO THE INFRASTRUCTURE FUND IF PROP E PASSES (1.5% IN FIRST YEAR).

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- ADOPT
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- ALTER
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

Animal Care & Control
1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m.
Daily
INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS

To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

A vote for "None of the above" may affect the ability of a Green Party candidate to go forward and appear in the November 3, 1992 General Election. If more votes are cast for "None of the above" no candidate shall go forward to the general election. NOTE: For the contest for Member, County Council, the choice of "None of the above" is not available.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person's name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite "YES" or "NO" for that measure.

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

GREEN PARTY BALLOT

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO VERDE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES

Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.

Un voto "Ninguno de los anteriores" podría afectar la capacidad del candidato del Partido Verde de seguir adelante y presentarse en las Elecciones Generales del 3 de noviembre de 1992. Si se emiten más votos de "Ninguno de los anteriores", no se presentará ningún candidato en las elecciones generales. NOTA: Para la contienda del puesto de Miembro, Consejo del Condado, no se dispone de la opción "Ninguno de los anteriores".

Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco previsto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.

Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de "SÍ" o "NO" para dicha medida.

Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca y borrador; esto anularía la balota.

Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請翻下頁。

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.

TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>總統優先選舉權</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARTIDO VERDE</td>
<td>PREFERENCIA PRESIDENCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS</td>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESIDENTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GREEN PARTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JUNE 2, 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT A PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION

El Partido Verde no participará en las elecciones primarias presidenciales

綠黨不參加總統初選
| 2 | 美國參議員　全任期  
SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS — PERIODO COMPLETO  
United States Senator — Full Term |
|---|---|
| | THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT  
A PRIMARY ELECTION FOR THIS OFFICE.  
El Partido Verde no participará en las  
elecciones primarias para este puesto.  
綠黨不在初選競選此公職 |

| 美國參議員　短任期  
SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS — PERIODO CORTO  
United States Senator — Short Term |
|---|---|
| | THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT  
A PRIMARY ELECTION FOR THIS OFFICE.  
El Partido Verde no participará en las  
elecciones primarias para este puesto.  
綠黨不在初選競選此公職 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREEN PARTY</td>
<td>REPORSENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS, DISTRITO 8</td>
<td>THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT A PRIMARY ELECTION FOR THIS OFFICE.</td>
<td>El Partido Verde no participará en las elecciones primarias para este puesto.</td>
<td>綠黨不在初選競選此公職</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN PARTY</td>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL, DISTRITO 8</td>
<td>THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT</td>
<td>No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito</td>
<td>沒有人競選本區這一公職</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN PARTY</td>
<td>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td>THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT A PRIMARY ELECTION FOR THIS OFFICE.</td>
<td>El Partido Verde no participará en las elecciones primarias para este puesto.</td>
<td>綠黨不在初選競選此公職</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSEJO DEL CONDADO</td>
<td>縣委會</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert C. Raven</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Cesnik</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Dutcher</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashele (Shelly) Martin</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Monnot</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross B. Mirkarimi</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Gouse</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucinda A. Govorchin</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen R. White</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Haven</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina M. Endrizzi</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Blong</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric P. Short</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Stoerkel</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty L. Traynor</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTIDO VERDE**

**ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIDO VERDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSEJO DEL CONDADO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>縣委會</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>銀牌列選</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GREEN PARTY**

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREEN PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-6-ALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**Sample Ballot**

Vote for no more than 16

Vote por no más de 16
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT
Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito
本區在本頁是空白
### SAMPLE BALLOT

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

#### NONPARTISAN BALLOT

**BALOTA APARTIDARIA**  
無黨派選票

| Juez del Tribunal Municipal, Oficina Numero 5 | Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5 | Vote por Uno  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada Litigante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET W. FORSYTHE</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Public Defender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogada de Oficio Delegada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Juez del Tribunal Municipal, Oficina Numero 6 | Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6 | Vote por Uno  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARRY MELTON</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA LITTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez del Tribunal Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

7E

NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992.
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

152 SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 185
NO 186

153 HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.

YES 193
NO 194

154 PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.

YES 203
NO 204
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>185 SI 贊成</th>
<th>7F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td>186 NO 反对</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡ ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por mil novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡ ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Esta acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalezcan la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior pública deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejoras de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡ APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocuren del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.  

YES 212  
NO 213

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.  

YES 218  
NO 219

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.  

YES 222  
NO 223

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.  

YES 227  
NO 228

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?  

YES 232  
NO 233
BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CÍVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CÍVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asbesto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CÍVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.

¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 - 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>237 SI 贊成</td>
<td>¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escritano de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escritano del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 NO 反對</td>
<td>無黨派選票</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 SI 贊成</td>
<td>¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y éste ejecutará sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 NO 反對</td>
<td>縣幹事的職責和人事應否從高級法籍幹事調到政府服務部，並在首府行政官的監督下任職?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 SI 贊成</td>
<td>¿Ya no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgando, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 NO 反對</td>
<td>市動物園獸醫主管應否由康樂與公園管理局局長委任，但須經康樂與公園委員會批准，而不在公務條例管轄下任職?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 SI 贊成</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas del Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249 NO 反對</td>
<td>市採購官應否不必為市政府其他部門管理所有物資、補給和器材的存貨，而交由市各部門自行負責管理這些存貨?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 SI 贊成</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 NO 反對</td>
<td>支持把加州劃分為北加州和南加州，應否成為舊金山市縣人民的政策?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIN DE LA BALOTA

票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE, OFFICE #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
• 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
• Hastings Law School graduate
• Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
• Delinquency Prevention Commissioner (1985 – 1987)
• Volunteer Attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
• Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
• Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:
SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire, Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael Dufficey, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Philip Moscone, Jerome Benson, Dorothy von Beroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich, Daniel Weinstein, John Ernola

10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS

SPEAKER Willie Brown

SENATOR Milton Marks

SUPERVISORS: Kevin Shelley, Willie Kennedy, Carolè Migden, Bill Maher, Roberta Achtenberg, Jim Gonzalez, Tom Hsieh, Terence Hallinan, Harry Britt, Angela Alioto.

ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto

SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebeim, JoAnne Miller, Fred Rodriguez, Carlaota delPortillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly

COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred, Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni

BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick

COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William Coblenz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Bierman

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
• Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
• In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black women.

Is time to make history!
I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
• Honors graduate — George Washington University.
• Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
• Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s Office.
• “Barrister of the Year” — 1988.
• Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
• Coro Foundation Fellow.
• American Fellow — American Association of University Women.
• Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.

As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good judgment to the court.

I will also be a role model for our young men and women.
My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges: Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Police Commissioner; Harold Hoogasian; Pat Norman; William Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melecio Santos; Charles Birenbaum; Michael Brassington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe

Ellen Chaitin

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #6

DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39

My qualifications for office are:
As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women’s History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Phillip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varaealll, Vice-President, SEIU.

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years

My qualifications for office are:
Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

- Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
- Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
- Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
- Named an “Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service” by Bar Association.
- Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
- Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality. As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Donna Little

Barry Melton

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

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

"Proponent's" and "Opponent's" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent's Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent's Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent's Argument" and the "Opponent's Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent's Argument":
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent's Argument":
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent's Argument" or an "Opponent's Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent's Argument" and "Opponent's Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent's Arguments" and "Opponent's Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

**PROPOSITION A**

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

---

**Analysis**
by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park's electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park's public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park's irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

**A "YES" VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

**A "NO" VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “A”**

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $76,300,000
- Bond interest: $53,791,500
- Debt service requirement: $130,091,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effective on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “A”**

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of citylife for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park’s one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park’s infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park’s basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park’s infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park’s water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and ressealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...
And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...
But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!
Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!
Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!
To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!
Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?
Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?
Of course not!
Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills?
Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!

But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!

San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvers, Republican County Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that 'San Francisco deserves better'.

"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.

Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area’s open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Duru, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dieruf, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco’s Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City’s neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it’s necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O’Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Lisa Ezquerra, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAttee, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco’s most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park’s infrastructure, preserving the park’s safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting YES on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park’s forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burkes, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

San Francisco’s elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carlota del Portillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebein, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let's bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
### Golden Gate Park Bonds

**PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A**

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. The Park is a major factor in our City's economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

**Leland M. Gustafson**, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*  
**Grant N. Horne**, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*  
**Robert F. Begley**, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco  
**Alexander Zubak**, President, Northern California Concierge Association*  
**Edward J. Phipps**, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*  
**Marie Brooks**, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*  
**Rudolf Nothenberg**, Chief Administrative Officer  
**Lois Lehman**, Nob Hill Gazette*  
**Anne C. Lawrence**, Diet Dynamics*  
**G. M. Bowles**, President, Bowles Farming Company*  
**Kenneth B. Moore**, Manager, Carlier*  
**Parker A. Maddux**, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*  
**Ann Brown**, Ann Brown Interiors*  
**Albert E. Schlesinger**, Retired, S & C Motors*  
**Melvin M. Swig**, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*  
**Angelo Quaranta**, Restaurant Owner  
**Pamela Berman**  
**Kile Ozier**, The Names Project*  
**Richard H. Peterson**  
**R. Stevens Gilley**, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*  
**Charles Dishman**, GUMP'S, Group Vice President*  
**J. L. Bricker**, President, John L. Bricker Co.*  
**Bruce W. Lilienthal**, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*  
**James G. Fussell, Jr.**, Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*  

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

**Sherry Agnos**  
**Louis J. Amoroso**  
**Ruth Asawa**  
**Barbara Bagot**  
**Vikki Bay**  
**Hilda Bernstein**  
**Susan Bierner**  
**Shirley Black**  
**Jamie Nicol Bowles**  
**Sharon Bretz**  
**Thad Brown**  
**Linda Cannon**  
**Gwenn Craig**  
**Kelly Cullen**  
**Susanne L. Danielson**  
**Ina Deardman**  
**Henry Der**  
**Dino Di Donato**  
**Steven J. Doi**  
**Mrs. Morris Doyle**  
**Doug Engmann**  
**Rotea Gilford**  
**Louis J. Giraudo**  
**Richard Grossboil**  
**Anne Halsted**  
**Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany**  
**Ricardo Hernandez**  
**Roberto Hernandez**  
**Claudine Huey**  
**Agar Jaicks**  
**Maurice James**  
** Cameo F. Jones**  
**Shirley Jones**  
**Jean Kalil**  
**Tony Kilroy**  
**Jean Kortum**  
**Reverend John and Donneter E. Lane**  
**Pat Lynch**  
**Victor Makras**  
**Kenneth Maley**  
**Esther Marks**  
**Robert J. McCarthy**  
**Pamela Minarik**  
**Gina Moscone**  
**Steven M. Neuberger**  
**George Newkirk**  
**Jane Otto**  
**Terry Ow-Wing**  
**Sululagi Palega**  
**Lois Pavlow**  
**Marianne H. Peterson**  
**David Pielpel**  
**Gee Gee Platt**  
**Alice Russell-Shapiro**  
**Anita Sanchez**  
**Richard Sanchez**  
**Sharyn Saslawsky**  
**Gail Schlesienger**  
**Thomatra N. Scott**  
**Barbara H. Stevens**  
**Charlotte Mailliard Swig**  
**Benjamin Tom**  
**John Turnbull**  
**Yori Wada**  
**Minnie and Lovie Ward**  
**Daniel Y. Weinstein**  
**Gerald Whitehead**  
**Midge Wilson**  
**Doug Wong**  
**Harold Yee**  
**Robert W. Zinkhon**

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

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combatting AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loveliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women’s Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco’s park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Millet, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park’s trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court's decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $.22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park's aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city's infrastructure are supposed to come from the city's general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city's infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it's free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you'll see that these things aren't free. It's City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven't been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It's telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — "No New Taxes." But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don't tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you'll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or how about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You'll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you'll pay for it.

Vote NO on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION B, PROPOSITION C AND PROPOSITION D

CALLING, AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,200,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; RECODIFYING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the Civic Center and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,200,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,200,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 55-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

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

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of elections for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting (Continued on next page)"
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto."

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system."

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto."

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

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

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

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

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

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

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSITION B

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City's current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $26,700,000
- Bond interest: $18,823,500
- Debt service requirement: $45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B
San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of. Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice...

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes...

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!
Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills!

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that "San Francisco deserves better".
"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Franciscan’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!

Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)

James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.

Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propotions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's Civic Center, which should symbolize our city's beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailiard Swig
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtle
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

Proposition B will make San Francisco's Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city's traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne
City Attorney

Ario Smith
District Attorney

Milton Marks
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco's heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city’s needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According the Controller’s statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote No on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let’s get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer’s Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children’s playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars,

 asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces
 asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall’s delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush?

Let’s see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSITION C
CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "C"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:
In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:
Bond redemption $24,000,000
Bond interest 16,920,500
Debt service requirement 40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,416,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Ailoto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.

49
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.

Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City's Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area.

This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn't be at the expense of the Farmer's Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer's trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People do drive to evening activities. Farmer's trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engelmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer's Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers' trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the "Heart of the City".

Please vote YES on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer's Market

The Civic Center Farmer's Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers' trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

This bond is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Song
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kall
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner

David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works

Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager

Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers’ funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements. 

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan
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Civic Center Garages Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That’s why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can’t you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We’re here asked to “incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage” to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C’s high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $35,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that’s just for the garage — it doesn’t include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR’S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board’s esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board’s decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don’t we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a “white elephant”. Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board’s budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco’s Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city’s residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let’s not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let’s logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson
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PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Piipel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.
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TURN YOUR GARBAGE
INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by SF League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

Mar 7 Basic June 13 Advanced Sept 12 Basic
Mar 28 Basic June 27 Worm Sept 26 Basic
Apr 11 Advanced July 18 Basic Oct 10 Worm
Apr 25 Worm July 25 Basic Oct 24 Basic
May 9 Basic Aug 1 Advanced Nov 7 Advanced
May 23 Basic Aug 22 Worm

SLUG Compost Hotline-468-0262 • Recycling Hotline-554-6193
Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.
554-6364
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPOSITION D

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

YES ➞ NO ➞

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $21,220,000
- Bond interest: $14,960,100
- Debt service requirement: $36,180,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REbuttal to Proponent's Argument in Favor of Proposition D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than "a hot water system."

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City's great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don't raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong. Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system.

Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!
The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.

ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!
Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D. Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.
VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition D will replace the Civic Center’s antiquated, wasteful steam heating plant with a modern, energy-efficient system.
By passing Proposition D, we will save an estimated $750,000 in energy costs every year.
Proposition D makes financial and environmental sense. Join us in voting YES on Proposition D.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Millon Marks
State Senator
Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assembly Speaker

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.
San Francisco’s Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that’s consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.
The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.

Vote NO on Prop D.
For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.
Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.
Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D

The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a “new” hot water heating system at Civic Center.
Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?
This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council
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PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

Yes No

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, "capital projects" includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current City services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.

NO: Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Infrastructure Fund

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City’s General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City’s buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That’s clearly an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor’s recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor’s recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What’s wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials’ power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco’s other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That’s not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee

By Cheryl Arenson
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OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children’s Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans’ needs.

This time we’re asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawnmowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don’t!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT’S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

---

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with “lawnmowers” as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Brit, Migden and Ward.
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Infrastructure Fund

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition E

PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President

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

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 relating to annual mandated levels of funds for protection and maintenance of the City's infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county of adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each budget and annual appropriation ordinance, through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount (CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages specified below for the identified years of General Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993/1994</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/1995</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/1996</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/2004</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this section the term "general fund revenue sources" shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereon belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

(1) In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

(2) In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City's then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner’s Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendation of the chief of the department.

Coroner’s office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county’s convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into this charter.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be and are hereby placed under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court. Provided, however, that any person who holds civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption by the electorate of this amendment and holding this paragraph of the charter shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of this charter.
PROPOSITION F

Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?  

Analysis  
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk's office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator's Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION “F”

Proposition “F” makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder’s Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk’s and Recorder’s Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk’s Office to the County Recorder’s Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent's Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller's Statement on "G"
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to chose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of “G” miss the point: This measure isn’t about health care for zoo animals, IT’S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create “flexibility” in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to “exempt” that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That’s patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf’ and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards. If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians’ appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE “NO” ON “G”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

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

“G” is “GREEDY”!
Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.

And that’s what “G” is about: Political Patronage!
Every time a position is “exempted” from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.

Surprised?
You shouldn’t be!
“G” was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!

Say “NO” to patronage hiring!
Say “No” To “G”!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!
Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the “friends” that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives
The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
Inventory Control

PROPOSITION H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City's many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:
Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

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

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments’ operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which “own” the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing’s inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisor Maher.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROponent’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of “H” is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect “savings” like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, “H” would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser’s office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out?

Of course not! They’re too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as “H”.

Send City Hall a message that you’re tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C", "D", "G", "H", "I" and "J"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember

Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

"H" is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee "on the take."

"H" would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!
- Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That's right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition "H".
VOTE "NO" ON "H"

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H’s opponents want City government to be cumbersome.

In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.

If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller’s Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.
The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.
Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section.

The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article, requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops hereafter maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies, and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments and offices of the city and county.

He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.

☐
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSITION I
Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES  NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “I”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:
Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “I”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
DIVIDING CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES

PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California’s government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That’s the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn’t make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That’s not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your “YES” vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We’ll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won’t move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn’t get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state’s economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting).

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its geographic diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese...

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California's ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California's voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state's beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of the taxpayers' money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON'T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEparate Northern California State.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren't interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work for us. Don't they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California's counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn't San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn't our right to express our opinion worth that much?

Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Dividing California into Two States

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There's no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn't even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won't solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It's enough to make Jimmy Gonzales' mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a "substantial, but presently indeterminable amount".

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should "interact" in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There's no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It's sad that some people feel the answer to California's problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Save the spotted owl!
Don't let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

_____

City and County of San Francisco heros Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn't support California's breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeeman

_____

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don't double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Kopp’s Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors’ proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless “advisory” trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn’t even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than “hype” or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates “city policy”. Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it’s an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers’ time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION II!

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan
TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION I

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES          NO

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller's Statement on “J”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION J IS ON PAGE 82.
PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a "state-back" guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let's keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote "YES" on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don't let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don't speak of "Northern California Girl" or "Hollywood California."

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN'T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The "State-Split" Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

“J” IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.

Proposition “J” asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.

Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of “Northern California” Those who want a “Northern California” state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!

To vote “YES” on Proposition “J” is to say you think this backwoods “state-splitting” scheme is o.k.
Tell City Hall you’re tired of the jokes like Proposition “J” the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.
Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.
Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!
VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE “STATE-SPLIT” JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!
What Proposition “J” really asks is, “If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?”

In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?

California will only continue to grow! It’s a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.

San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don’t let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

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

Don’t be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn’t even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it’s spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you’re elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members’ minds?

VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President

Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.
Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting  
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to SIGN your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

__________________________

__________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot Type</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Precincts Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9261</td>
<td>12th Assembly District</td>
<td>2000's, 2100's, 2200's, 2700's, 2900's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th Senate District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th Congressional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place. The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION** - June 2, 1992 Primary Election

**Sign** this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

**Check One:**
- Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
- I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

**Check Here If Appropriate:**
- I have moved since I last registered to vote.
- My new address is printed below. (Residence Address ONLY.)

- ____________
- ____________

**SAN FRANCISCO, CA** 9411

**Check below all that apply, then sign your name:**
- I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
- I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
- All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish ____, Chinese ____

You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

**Your signature - DO NOT PRINT**

**Date Signed**

**Day Time Phone**

**Evening Phone**
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet
and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q. Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED

Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION

I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr) ____________________________

Your Signature ____________________________

Print Your First Name ____________________________

MI Print Your Last Name ____________________________

Print Your Residence Address ____________________________

Zip Code ____________________________

Day Phone __________-________

Eve. Phone __________-________

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: [ ] I HAVE a car: [ ] (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

-------------- SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS --------------

Assigned Precinct: ____________________________

Home Precinct: ____________________________

Affidavit Number: ____________________________

Clerk: [ ] Inspector: [ ]

E.O. Bk. [ ] 6/2 [ ] 6/6 [ ] Code [ ] Reg. Attach. [ ] Init'ls

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET
This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); .................................................. 15-27
2. the location of your polling place .................................................. (see the label on the back cover)
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; .................................................. back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; .................................................. 6
5. information for disabled voters; .................................................. 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; .................. 30-31
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; .................. 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; .................................................. 12
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting. .................. inside back cover
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

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

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

第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

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

第三步
請把帶鉛之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，
沿虛線折起選票交給選舉站監選員。
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

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

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

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

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

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

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

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

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

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

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

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

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

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

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

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

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate.
Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

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

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:
• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall – Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don't find that name on your ballot?

IN A PRIMARY ELECTION you will only find federal, state and County Central Committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party's candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

BECAUSE OF REAPPORTIONMENT, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

---

POLLEDING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and Reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

REAPPORTIONMENT

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee Ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall. Absentee Ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar’s Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City’s constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE
Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Oedell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries (“The Way It Is Now,” “The Proposal,” “A ‘Yes’ Vote Means,” and “A ‘No’ Vote Means.”) of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee prepares: the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters’ basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS
Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, Jim Stevens and Molly Wood.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.

Ex officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

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

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(Does not include S.F. Unified School District or S.F. Community College District)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

STATE & FEDERAL GRANTS
FOR SPECIFIC PROGRAMS
(E.G., AIDS PREVENTION,
AFDC PAYMENTS)
30%
$720 MILLION

REVENUES GENERATED BY CITY
DEPARTMENTS AND USED BY SAME
DEPARTMENT
(E.G., LANDING FEES PAID BY AIRLINES TO
S.F. INT'L. AIRPORT)
29%
$696 MILLION

BUSINESS, SALES & OTHER TAXES
& OTHER INCOME
21%
$504 MILLION

PROPERTY TAX
20%
$480 MILLION

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

NON-GENERAL FUND REVENUE
46%
$1.1 BILLION

OTHER GENERAL FUND REVENUE
11%
$260 MILLION

GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUE
43%
$1.03 BILLION

EXPENDITURES
PAID FROM GENERAL FUND REGULAR REVENUES
$1.03 BILLION

PUBLIC PROTECTION
39%
$409 MILLION

HEALTH & WELFARE
31%
$321 MILLION

RECREATION & CULTURE
5%
$59 MILLION

UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION
11%
$114 MILLION

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
14%
$146 MILLION

NOTE: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- ADOPT
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- ALTER
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m.
Daily
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

GREEN PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

A vote for "None of the above" may affect the ability of a Green Party candidate to go forward and appear in the November 3, 1992 General Election. If more votes are cast for "None of the above" no candidate shall go forward to the general election. NOTE: For the contest for Member, County Council, the choice of "None of the above" is not available.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person’s name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the long stub of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite "YES" or "NO" for that measure. All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

選民須知
投票選舉代表擁護選票上所列的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。

如果選舉“非上列候選人”，可能會影響綠黨候選人進入1992年11月3日的選舉。如果太多投選“非上列候選人”，則沒有候選人進入選舉。 注：觀選縣議員沒有“非上列候選人”的選擇。

投票選舉合格寫入候選人，請在選票卡的長方形票尾的空位上寫上該候選人的姓名和官職。如有不明之處，請向助選員求助。

投票任何一項提案，請用藍色筆尖在提案旁邊的“YES”（贊成）或“NO”（反對）打孔。

如果選票有明顯污損或擦掉痕迹，選票即作廢。

如果你投票錯了，或者選票斷了，應把選票交回選區的選舉委員，再拿一份新選票。

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO VERDE
INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES
Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.

Un voto “Ninguno de los anteriores” podría afectar la capacidad del candidato del Partido Verde de seguir adelante y presentarse en las Elecciones Generales del 3 de noviembre de 1992. Si se emiten más votos de “Ninguno de los anteriores”, no se presentará ningún candidato en las elecciones generales. NOTA: Para la contienda del puesto de Miembro, Consejo de Condado, no se dispone de la opción “Ninguno de los anteriores”.

Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el talón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.

Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de "SI" o "NO" para dicha medida.

Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca y borrador; esto anularía la balota.

Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請轉下頁。
PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.
TO START VOTING, GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>PREFERENCIA PRESIDENCIAL</th>
<th>Presidential Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President of the United States</td>
<td>Presidente de los Estados Unidos</td>
<td>總統優先選舉權</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT A PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION**

El Partido Verde no participará en las elecciones primarias presidenciales.

綠黨不參加總統初選
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Language 1</th>
<th>Language 2</th>
<th>Language 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Full Term</td>
<td>The Green Party will not conduct a primary election for this office.</td>
<td>El Partido Verde no participará en las elecciones primarias para este puesto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>The Green Party will not conduct a primary election for this office.</td>
<td>El Partido Verde no participará en las elecciones primarias para este puesto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Language 1</td>
<td>Language 2</td>
<td>Language 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>美國衆議員,第十二區</td>
<td>REPRESENTANTE DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td>U.S. Representative in Congress — 12th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT A PRIMARY ELECTION FOR THIS OFFICE.</td>
<td>El Partido Verde no participará en las elecciones primarias para este puesto.</td>
<td>綠黨不在初選競選此公職</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>省參議員,第八區</td>
<td>SENADOR ESTATAL, DISTRITO 8</td>
<td>State Senator — 8th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THERE IS NO CONTEST FOR THIS OFFICE IN THIS DISTRICT</td>
<td>No hay contienda para este puesto en este distrito</td>
<td>沒有人競選本區這一公職</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>省衆議員,第十二區</td>
<td>MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 12</td>
<td>Member, State Assembly — 12th District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT A PRIMARY ELECTION FOR THIS OFFICE.</td>
<td>El Partido Verde no participará en las elecciones primarias para este puesto.</td>
<td>綠黨不在初選競選此公職</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSEJO DEL CONDADO</td>
<td>縣委員會</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT C. RAVEN</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTHONY CESNIK</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant / Asistente de biblioteca</td>
<td>閱覽館助理</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD DUTCHER</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, Consultant, Activist / Autor, Consultor, Activista 作者,顧問,活動家</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASHELL (SHELLY) MARTIN</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activist / Activista 活動家</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MONNOT</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSS B. MIRKARIMI</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Policy Analyst / Analista de políticas ambientales 環境政策分析員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA GOUSE</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizer / Organizadora comunitario 社區組織者</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCINDA A. GOVRCHIN</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Clerk / Empleada de oficina 辦公室文員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARMEN R. WHITE</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker / Trabajadora 工人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK HAVEN</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS Advocate / Defensor por el SIDA 預防愛滋病倡議者</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGINA M. ENDRIZZI</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Area Manager / Gerente de área minorista 零售業務經理</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA BLOMG</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Educator Environmentalist / Madre, Educadora, Defensora del medio ambiente 家長教育家環境保護者</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC P. SHORT</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filmmaker / Cineasta 電影製片人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAURIE STOERKEL</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY L. TRAYNOR</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor / Editor 編輯</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote for no more than 16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
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**Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELLEN CHAITIN</td>
<td>Trial Attorney</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET W. FORSYTHE</td>
<td>Deputy Public Defender</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARRY MELTON</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA LITTLE</td>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
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NONPARTISAN BALLOT
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

152
SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 185
NO 186

153
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.

YES 193
NO 194

154
PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition. Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.

YES 203
NO 204

7E-O-ALL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
<th>7F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185 SI 贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186 NO 反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193 SI 贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194 NO 反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 SI 贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204 NO 反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1992年學校設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債十九億元（$1,900,000,000），提供資金作建設或改良公立學校之用。

1992年6月高等教育設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債九億元（$900,000,000），用於興建或改善加州的公立學院和大學設施。

此建議工程創建造業，確保加州學生獲得高等教育，並使各公立學院和大學培訓出一批訓練有素的、競爭力強的勞動大軍。在實事求是的經濟。授權興建的138公立校園計 劃，包括，且並不限於限制防震和其他衛生安全的改良。實驗室的現代化，以便跟上科學的發展和建築課室、圖書館等等。

延期徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購買主要住所時重新估值所增實業稅可延期徵收。

財政影響：這個提案將由於屋主延期徵付實業稅而導致州或地方政府損失數以百萬元計。這些損失會在屋主賣出他們的房屋時最終獲得補償。
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
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CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

A
YES 212
NO 213

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

B
YES 218
NO 219

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

C
YES 222
NO 223

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

D
YES 227
NO 228

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

E
YES 232
NO 233
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por los costos de construcción o reconstrucción de reparación, reforestación y rehabilitación del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el sistema de suministro de agua e irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua, servicios que incluyan la iluminación de las calles y de seguridad, la reparación y rehabilitación de los edificios del parque, la arquitectura paisajista, los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los mismos para las personas incapacitadas.

212 SI 赞成
213 NO 反对

1992年改良公園公債法案。發行公債$76,300,000，用於支付公園的興建，重建，修復，再造林和整頓，包括供水系統和灌溉，湖和水的流向，公用事業包括街燈和保安照明，修復和整頓公園的面貌，自然美化，包括便利殘障人士使用的地方。

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e iluminación de las calles que circundan a la Municipalidad y las zonas adyacentes a la misma.

218 SI 赞成
219 NO 反对

1992年改良市政中心公債法案。發行公債$26,700,000，用於支付改良市政中心廣場和富頓街林蔭人行道，自然美化和市政廳周圍及鄰近地區的街燈。

BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24,000,000 para pagar por una ampliación de la playa de estacionamiento del Centro Cívico o la construcción de una playa de estacionamiento adyacente a la misma, incluyendo la disminución del asbesto y el acceso para personas incapacitadas.

222 SI 赞成
223 NO 反对

1992年改良市政中心停車場公債法案。發行公債$24,000,000，用於支付擴建市政中心停車場或在鄰近建築停車場，包括減少石棉和為殘障人士提供方便。

BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE CALEFACCIÓN DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,000 para pagar por la construcción o reconstrucción de un sistema de calefacción dentro de la zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo las tuberías y un sistema de caldera de agua caliente.

227 SI 赞成
228 NO 反对

1992年改良市政中心供暖系統公債法案。發行公債$21,200,000，用於支付供暖或重建市政中心地區內的供暖系統，包括管道和熱水系統。

¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales cada año durante 12 años (1993 – 2005) para que sea usado únicamente para pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos de capital, tales como la construcción, el mantenimiento y la adquisición de los edificios municipales y otra propiedad pública?

232 SI 赞成
233 NO 反对

应否规定市政府每年拨出一定比例的普通基金，连续十二年（1993-2005），只用於特定的基礎工程，如興建、保養和購置市政大樓和其他公共物業？
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA APARTIDARIA</th>
<th>CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</th>
<th>MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>237 SI 贊成</td>
<td>¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escritorio de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?</td>
<td>負金市、縣 聯合初選 一九九二年六月二日 提交選民投票表決的市、縣提案</td>
<td>無黨派選票 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241 SI 贊成</td>
<td>¿Se nombrará al Veterinario Principal del Zoológico, y éste ejecutará sus funciones, según lo desee el Gerente General del Departamento de Recreación y Parques, sujeto a la aprobación de la Comisión de Recreación y Parques, en lugar de hacerlo bajo las reglas del servicio civil?</td>
<td>市動物園獸醫主醫師應否由康樂與公園管理局局長委任，但須經康樂與公園委員會批准，而不在公務條例管轄下任職？</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 SI 贊成</td>
<td>¿Ya no será necesario que el Comprador mantenga un inventario de todos los materiales, suministros y equipos para otros departamentos de la Ciudad, otorgando, en cambio, la responsabilidad de mantener dichos inventarios a cada departamento individual de la Ciudad?</td>
<td>市採購官應否不必為市政府其他部門管理所有物資、補給和器材的存貨，而交由市各部門自行負責管理這些存貨？</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 SI 贊成</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
<td>支持把加州劃分為北加州和南加州應否成為舊金山市縣人民的政策？</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 SI 贊成</td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco que San Francisco forme parte del estado de California del norte en caso de que sea dividida California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
<td>如果加州劃分為北加州和南加州，舊金山則屬於北加州版圖，這應否成為舊金山市縣人民的政策？</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIN DE LA BALOTA
票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
• 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
• Hastings Law School graduate
• Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
• Delinquency Prevention Commissioner (1985 – 1987)
• Volunteer Attorney, Women's Health Clinic
• Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
• Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:
SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire,
         Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael
         Dufficy, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Phillip Moscone,
         Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond
         RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Pajalich,
                  Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola
10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENATOR Milton Marks
SUPERVISORS: Kevin Shelley, Willie Kennedy, Carole
             Migden, Bill Maher, Roberta Achtenberg, Jim Gonzalez, Tom
             Hsieh, Terence Hallinan, Harry Britt, Angela Alioto.
ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto
SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denebeim, JoAnne Miller, Fred
               Rodriguez, Carlotta delPortillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred,
               Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni
BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick
COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy
                     Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William
                     Coblentz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Bierman

Ellen Chaitin

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
• Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San
  Francisco.
  In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black
  women.
  Its time to make history!
I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
• Honors graduate — George Washington University.
• Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
• Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s
  Office.
• “Barrister of the Year” — 1988.
• Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
• Coro Foundation Fellow.
• American Fellow — American Association of University
  Women.
• Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.
  As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial
  courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good
  judgment to the court.
I will also be a role model for our young men and women.
My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor
Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges:
Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty
Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine
Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Poli-
ce Commissioner; Harold Hoogasian; Pat Norman; William
Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melecio Santos; Charles
Birenbaum; Michael Bragginton.
Please join with me in electing the first African-American
woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe

Ellen Chaitin
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #6

DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are:
As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women’s History Month Cavalcade of Women.
My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assembly-person Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julius Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzaola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Vanacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

DONNA LITTLE

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years
My qualifications for office are:
Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:
- Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
- Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
- Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
- Named an “Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service” by Bar Association.
- Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
- Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality. As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migen
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

BARRY MELTON

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

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

“Proponent’s” and “Opponent’s” Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure (“Proponent’s Argument”) and one argument against the measure (“Opponent’s Argument”) are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument” indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The “Proponent’s Argument” and the “Opponent’s Argument” are selected according to the following priorities:

“Proponent’s Argument“:
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

“Opponent’s Argument“:
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a “Proponent’s Argument” or an “Opponent’s Argument,” may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding “Proponent’s Argument” and “Opponent’s Argument.”

Paid Arguments

In addition to the “Proponent’s Arguments” and “Opponent’s Arguments” which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park's electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park's public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park's irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $76,300,000
- Bond interest: $33,791,500
- Debt service requirement: $130,991,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

- ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of city life for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park's one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park's infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park's basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park's infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park's water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and resealed; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we're in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions "A," "B," "C," and "D"?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it's $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year's bills?

Remember, that's how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

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

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a récession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.
“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioratlon of Golden Gate Park.
“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area's open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dierau, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco's Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City's neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it's necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenheime, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eckman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O'Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Ezquerro, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco's most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park's infrastructure, preserving the park's safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

San Francisco's elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carolina del Porto, Member, Board of Education
Libby Denebein, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park's forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedricks, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burkes, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strying Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let's bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazola, Plumbers Local 38

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park Bond

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Franciscans. It is a major factor in our City's economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
Alexander Zubak, President, Northern California Concierge Association*
Edward J. Phipps, Executive Director, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Marie Brooks, President, Downtown Association of San Francisco*
Rudolf Nothenberg, Chief Administrative Officer
Lois Lehrman, Nob Hill Gazette*
Anne C. Lawrence, Diet Dynamics*
G. M. Bowles, President, Bowles Farming Company*
Kenneth B. Moore, Manager, Carter*
Parker A. Maddux, Pillsbury Madison and Sutro*
Ann Brown, Ann Brown Interiors*
Albert E. Schlesinger, Retired, S & C Motors*
Melvin M. Swig, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Angelo Quaranta, Restaurant Owner
Pamela Berman
Klle Ozier, The Names Project*
Richard H. Peterson
R. Stevens Gilley, President, Swig Weiler Dinner Development Co.*
Charles Dishman, GUMP'S, Group Vice President*
J.L. Bricker, President, John L. Bricker Co.*
Bruce W. Lilenthal, President, San Francisco Small Business Institute*
James G. Fassell, Jr., Executive Director, San Francisco Planning & Urban Research Association (SPUR)*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Sherry Agnos
Louis J. Amoroso
Ruth Asawa
Barbara Bagot
Vikki Bay
Hilda Bernstein
Susan Biemn
Shirley Black
Jamie Nicol Bowles
Sharon Bretz
Thad Brown
Linda Cannon
Gwenn Craig
Kelly Cullen
Susanne L. Danielson
Ina Dearman
Henry Der
Dino Di Donato
Steven J. Doi
Mrs. Morris Doyle
Doug Engmann
Rotea Gilford
Louis J. Giraudo
Richard Grossboll
Anne Halsted
Rev. Monsignor John P. Heany
Ricardo Hernandez
Roberto Hernandez
Claudine Huey
Agar Jaiaks
Maurice James
Cameo F. Jones
Shirley Jones
Jean Kalil
Tony Kilroy
Jean Kortum
Reverend John and
Donneter E. Lane
Pat Lynch
Victor Makras
Kenneth Maley
Esther Marks
Robert J. McCarthy
Pamela Minarik
Gina Moscone
Steven M. Neuberger
George Newkirk
Jane Otto
Terry Ow-Wing
Sulubali Palaqa
Lois Pavlow
Marianne H. Peterson
David Pipel
Gee Gee Platt
Alice Russell-Shapiro
Anita Sanchez
Richard Sanchez
Sharyn Saslasky
Gail Schlesinger
Thomatrea N. Scott
Barbara H. Steens
Charlotte Mailliard Swig
Benjamin Tom
John Turnbull
Yori Wada
Minnie and Lovie Ward
Daniel Y. Weinstein
Gerald Whitehead
Midge Wilson
Doug Wong
Harold Yee
Robert W. Zinkhon

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

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community battling AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loneliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women’s Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco’s park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Millet, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will ensure that the park’s trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote Yes on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court’s decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $2.22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park’s aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city’s infrastructure are supposed to come from the city’s general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city’s infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it’s free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you’ll see that these things aren’t free. It’s City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven’t been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It’s telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — “No New Taxes.” But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don’t tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you’ll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You’ll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you’ll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation
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TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION

PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION B, PROPOSITION C AND PROPOSITION D

(Special Election)

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, EXTENSION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY, EXCEPTING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS: FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the Civic Center and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot, water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the enlargement of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

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

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

The rates of interest and the dates on which the payments of principal and interest are to be made are to be determined from time to time by the City and County of San Francisco.

The dates for the making of the payments of principal and interest are to be determined after the dates fixed by the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco for the making of such payments shall be and remain open during the term required by said laws.

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

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said Special Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precint, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for said General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

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

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting (Continued on next page)"
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS," 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

"CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS," 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS," 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto.

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

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

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

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

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

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

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSITION B
CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City's current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $26,700,000
- Bond interest: $18,823,500
- Debt service requirement: $45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
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PROPOUNEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B
San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of.
Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.
Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.
Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.
Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor
This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOUNEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .
And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .
But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!
Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!
Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!
To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!
Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?
Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?
Of course not!
Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills!
Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C" AND "D"

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

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

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!
STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that "San Francisco deserves better".
"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. The fact is that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B!

Proposition B will revitalize the “heart of the City”, increase citizen safety, and demonstrate San Franciscan’s civic pride!

VOTE YES FOR SAN FRANCISCO’S FUTURE!

Proposition B provides for better lighting and a friendlier environment in which everyone can use and enjoy this great public space!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.

As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.

Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.

Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Song
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

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

San Francisco's Civic Center, which should symbolize our city's beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard-Swig
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtle
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

Proposition B will make San Francisco's Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city's traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne
City Attorney

Arlo Smith
District Attorney

Milton Marks
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us on this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco's heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city’s needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According to the Controller’s statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote No on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let’s get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer’s Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children's playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall’s delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush? Let’s see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow

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

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Yes
No

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $24,000,000
- Bond interest: 16.920,500
- Debt service requirement: $40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedule, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,046,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Ayes: Supervisors Achenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.
Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City’s Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City’s general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent’s statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues. If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area.

This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtemberg, Britt, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Migden, Shelley and Ward.

Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bierman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote Yes on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner

David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works

Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager

Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers' funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Mayor Frank Jordan

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

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

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, the Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board’s esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board’s decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don’t we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a “white elephant”? Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board’s budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco’s Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city’s residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let’s not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let’s logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We’re here asked to “incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage” to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $73.300.000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700.000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering.

Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C’s high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $53,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that’s just for the garage — it doesn’t include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR’S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco's revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. - 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)

Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton)
Cost: Free
Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon

Mar 7 Basic       June 13 Advanced    Sept 12 Basic
Mar 28 Basic      June 27 Worm       Sept 26 Basic
Apr 11 Advanced   July 18 Basic      Oct 10 Worm
Apr 25 Worm       July 25 Basic      Oct 24 Basic
May 9 Basic       Aug 1 Advanced     Nov 7 Advanced
May 23 Basic      Aug 22 Worm

SLUG Compost Rotline—468-0262 • Recycling Hotline—554-6193
Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

---

Find Yourself a Best Friend

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPOSITION D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

YES ➤ NO ➤

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $21,220,000
- Bond interest: $14,960,100
- Debt service requirement: $36,180,100

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alloto.

Arguments for and against this measure immediately follow this page. The full text of bond measures A, B, C & D begins on page 41.
PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY
AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than “a hot water system.”

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

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

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City’s great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guinness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don’t raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.

Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system. Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City’s budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the “right” time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is “dumb” is not Proposition D. What’s dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don’t fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.

Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!
The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.
ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!
Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition D.
Proposition D is a wise investment that will allow the City to save an estimated $750,000 a year in energy costs.
VOTE YES on Proposition D.

Mayor Frank Jordan

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

Vote NO on Proposition D
The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a "new" hot water heating system at Civic Center.
Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?
This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.
San Francisco’s Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that’s consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.
The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.
VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.
Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.
Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

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

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

YES  ➞

NO   ➞

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, “capital projects” includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current city services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.
NO: Achtenberg, Brit, Migden and Ward.
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

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

PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City’s General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City’s buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense. It is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achenberg, Brit, Migden and Ward.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That’s clearly an an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor’s recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor’s recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What’s wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials’ power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco’s other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That’s not good government.

Vote NO on Proposition E!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee

By Cheryl Arenson
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OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children's Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans' needs.

This time we're asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawnmowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing.

Do you believe that? We don't!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT'S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp's Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition "E" requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer's assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition "E" deals not with "lawnmowers" as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition "E" would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition "E" is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President

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

For the purpose of this section the term “general fund revenue sources” shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereon belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

1. In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

2. In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City’s then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

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

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner’s Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services, The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner’s office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of weight and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county’s convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department.

The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management. Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to, Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be and are hereby placed under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court, provided, however, that any person who holds civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption of the ordinance amending the Charter shall continue to have civil service status in said position under the civil service provisions of the Charter.
PROPOSITION F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from
the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental
Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs
the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering
business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six
employees within the Superior Court Clerk's office now perform County Clerk
duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder,
the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer
supervises this department.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties
and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Depart-
ment of Governmental Services.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County
Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to
continue to perform these duties.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following
statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in
my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government,
assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief
Administrator's Office is not modified.

How Supervisors Voted on “F”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0
to place Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
YES: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Britt, Gonzalez,
Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher, Migden, Shelley
and Ward.
PROponent'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "F"

Proposition "F" makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder's Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk's and Recorder's Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk's Office to the County Recorder's Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent's Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F
PROPOSITION G

Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

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

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

Chief Zoo Veterinarian

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G. The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to choose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of “G” miss the point: This measure isn’t about health care for zoo animals, IT’S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create “flexibility” in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to “exempt” that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That’s patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards.

If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians’ appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified?

VOTE “NO” ON “G”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

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

"G" is "GREEDY"!
Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.
And that’s what “G” is about: Political Patronage!
Every time a position is “exempted” from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.
Surprised?
You shouldn’t be!
“G” was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!
Say “NO” to patronage hiring!
Say “No” To “G”!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!
Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.
This is no giveaway of public funds and the "friends" that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors
This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

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

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

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

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives

The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be held only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
PROPOSITION H

Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City's many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

PROPOON'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments’ operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which “own” the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing’s inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOON'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of “H” is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect “savings” like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, “H” would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser’s office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out?

Of course not! They’re too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as “H”.

Send City Hall a message that you’re tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.


CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

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

“H” is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee “on the take.”

“H” would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!
Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That’s right!
But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!
Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition “H”.

VOTE “NO” ON “H”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H’s opponents want City government to be cumbersome.

In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.

If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller’s Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.
The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.

Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

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

PROPOSITION H

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

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

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of materials, supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two or more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the articles requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased for, and in use in, all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report thereon to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

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

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
Dividing California into Two States

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California's government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That's the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn't make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That's not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your "YES" vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We'll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won't move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn't get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capital and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state's economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and J (policy favoring state splitting).

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese ... 

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California’s ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California’s voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON’T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren’t interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don’t they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California’s counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn’t San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn’t our right to express our opinion worth that much? Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

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

There's no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn't even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won't solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It's enough to make Jimmy Gonzales' mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a "substantial, but presently indeterminable amount".

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should "interact" in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There's no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senates will be any better than one. It's sad that some people feel the answer to California's problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

**VOTE NO ON I!**

**SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION**

**VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP**

Save the spotted owl!  
Don't let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall  
John Riordan  
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

--

City and County of San Francisco heroes Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn't support California's breakup.

John Riordan  
Democratic Committee Candidate  
Past College Board President

Terence Faulkner  
Republican Committeeman

--

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes. Don't double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

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

Kopp’s Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors’ proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless “advisory” trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn’t even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than “hype” or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates “city policy”. Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it’s an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers’ time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan
TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION I

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIBING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

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

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION J IS ON PAGE 82.
PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a “state-back” guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let’s keep San Francisco in northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote “YES” on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROPONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don’t let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don’t speak of “Northern California Girl” or “Hotel Southern California.”

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN’T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J.

Committee Against The “State-Split” Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

"J" IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.

Proposition "J" asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.

Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of "Northern California" Those who want a "Northern California" state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!

To vote "YES" on Proposition "J" is to say you think this backwoods "state-splitting" scheme is o.k.

Tell City Hall you're tired of the jokes like Proposition "J" the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.

Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.

Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!
VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE "STATE-SPLIT" JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!

What Proposition "J" really asks is, "If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?"

In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?

California will only continue to grow! It's a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.

San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don't let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Don't be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn't even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it's spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you're elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members' minds?

VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President

Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.

Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It’s as easy as 1-2-3.

1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.

Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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POLLING PLACE CARD: To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CANDIDATES - Name       #
-------------------------#
JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 5
JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 6

Did you remember to **SIGN** your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

---

Germaine Q Wong  
San Francisco Registrar of Voters  
Room 158 -- City Hall  
400 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA  94102-4691
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554 - 4375

Ballot Type
Green
Precincts Applicable

9262
12th Assembly District
8th Senate District
12th Congressional
2300's, 2400's,
2500's, 2600's,
2800's

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place.
The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please DO NOT remove the label from the application below.

Vote-By-Mail Voters --- Cut or Tear Along Perforated Line

ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election
Sign this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

Check One:
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

P.O. Box or Street Address

City

State

Zip Code

Check Here If Appropriate:
☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote.
☐ My new address is printed below.
(Residence Address ONLY.)

Number and Street Name

Apt. No.

SAN FRANCISCO, CA

9 4 1

Zip Code

Check below all that apply, then sign your name:
☐ I apply for an Absentee Ballot for June 2, 1992; I have not and will not apply for an absentee ballot by any other means.
☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish ___, Chinese ___

You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

Your signature - DO NOT PRINT

Date Signed

Day Time Phone

Evening Phone
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet
and Sample Ballot

June 2, 1992
Consolidated Primary Election

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

Prepared by the Office of the Registrar of Voters
Germaine Q. Wong, Registrar of Voters
POLL WORKERS NEEDED
Earn $62 to $79
Meet Your Neighbors
Serve Your Community

Throughout California and the entire United States, there is a shortage of poll workers each election. San Francisco is no exception. The Registrar of Voters office challenges you to become more active in the election process. You are highly encouraged to work during the Primary Election - June 2, 1992 - as a Poll Worker.

People who have flexible schedules and are able to work on election day (Tuesday after the first Monday every November and every other June) for the foreseeable future are especially encouraged to apply.

Inspectors are poll workers who supervise the precinct, review and deliver the precinct supplies. Inspectors earn $79 for the day. Poll workers with slightly less responsibilities are called Clerks and are paid $62 for the day. The day begins at 6:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 9-10:30 p.m. When friends work together, the day passes very quickly. It is a terrific opportunity to re-meet your neighbors while performing an important civic responsibility.

Fill out the application below and bring it to City Hall between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Come in early to get the precinct of your choice.

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS - POLL WORKER APPLICATION
I am a Resident of San Francisco and a REGISTERED VOTER of San Francisco. I hereby request to work during the Primary Election to be held on June 2, 1992. If I am not currently registered, my Registration form is attached.

Date of Birth (Mo / Da / Yr) Your Signature

Print Your First Name MI Print Your Last Name

Print Your Residence Address Zip Code

Day Phone -- Eve. Phone --

Circle below any languages you speak in addition to English: I HAVE a car: (Please Check)

Cantonese / Mandarin / Spanish / Vietnamese / Russian / Other:

------------------------------ SPACE BELOW - FOR USE BY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS ------------------------------

Assigned Precinct: Home Precinct: Clerk: Inspector:

Affidavit Number: Code Reg. Attach. Init's

E.O. Bk. 6/2 6/6

Bring this form in person to: Registrar of Voters, Room 158 - City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102
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**PURPOSE OF THE VOTER INFORMATION PAMPHLET**

This Voter Information Pamphlet provides voters with information about the June 2, 1992 Consolidated Primary Election. The Pamphlet includes:

1. a Sample Ballot (a copy of the ballot you will see at your polling place or when you vote by mail); 15-27
2. the location of your polling place (see the label on the back cover) 15-27
3. an application for an Absentee (Vote-By-Mail) Ballot and for permanent absentee voter status; back cover
4. Your rights as a voter; 6
5. information for disabled voters; 5
6. statements from candidates who are running for local office; 30-31
7. information about each local ballot measure, including a summary, the Controller’s Statement, arguments for and against the measure, and the legal text; 33-86
8. definitions of words you need to know; inside back cover
9. a Polling Place Card to mark your choices before voting.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

**STEP 1**

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

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

第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

**STEP 2**

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

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

第二步
請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

**STEP 3**

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfírese con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

第三步
請把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

After voting, remove the ballot from the Votomatic, fold the ballot at the perforation and return it to the precinct official.

第四步
投票之後，把選票取出，沿虛線提起選票交給選舉站當值選員。
ACCESS FOR THE DISABLED VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

BEFORE ELECTION DAY:

ABSENTEE VOTING — All voters may request that an absentee ballot be mailed to them, or they may vote in person at Room 158 in City Hall from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2. In addition, voters with specified disabilities listed below may apply to become Permanent Absentee Voters. Ballots for all future elections will automatically be mailed to Permanent Absentee Voters.

TAPE RECORDINGS — The San Francisco Public Library’s Branch for the Blind at 3150 Sacramento Street produces and distributes tape-recorded copies of the Voter Information Pamphlet for use by visually impaired voters.

T.D.D. (TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVICE FOR THE DEAF) — Hearing-impaired or speech-impaired voters who have a TDD may communicate with the San Francisco Registrar of Voters' office by calling 554-4386.

ON ELECTION DAY:

ASSISTANCE — Persons unable to mark their ballot may bring one or two persons with them into the voting booth to assist them, or they may ask poll workers to provide needed assistance.

CUBSIDING VOTING — If architectural barriers prevent an elderly or disabled voter from entering the polling place, poll workers will bring the necessary voting materials to the voter in front of the polling place.

PARKING — If their polling place is in a residential garage, elderly and handicapped voters may park in the driveway while voting, provided they do not block traffic.

READING TOOLS — Every polling place has large-print instructions on how to vote and special sheets to magnify the type on the ballot.

SEATED VOTING — Every polling place has at least one voting booth which allows voters to vote while sitting in a chair or a wheelchair.

VOTING TOOLS — Every precinct has an easy-grip pen for signing the roster and an easy-grip tool for punching the ballot.

PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER (VOTE-BY-MAIL) QUALIFICATIONS

If you are physically disabled you may apply to be a permanent absentee voter. Once you are on our permanent absentee mailing list, we will automatically mail an absentee ballot to you for every election until you move, re-register, or do not vote. If you do not vote in an election, you will no longer be a permanent absentee voter; however, you will remain on the voter roll.

To become a permanent absentee voter, complete the Absentee Ballot Application form on the back cover and return it to the Registrar of Voters, Room 158 City Hall, San Francisco, CA 94102. Check the box that says “I apply to become a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER” and sign your name where it says “Your SIGNATURE.”

If you move, re-register, or do not vote, you will need to apply again to be a Permanent Absentee Voter. In all other cases, you do not need to re-apply.

To be a “Permanent Absentee Voter” you must have at least one of the following conditions:

_____ Lost use of one or more limbs;
_____ Lost use of both hands;
_____ Unable to move about without the aid of an assistance device (e.g., cane, crutches, walker, wheelchair);
_____ Suffering from lung disease, blindness or cardiovascular disease;
_____ Significant limitation in the use of the lower extremities; or
_____ Suffering from a diagnosed disease or disorder which substantially impairs or interferes with mobility.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTERS

If you have already registered as a permanent absentee voter, your ballot will be mailed by the end of the first week in May. To find out if you are registered as a permanent absentee voter, please look at the label on the back cover of this book. If your affidavit number starts with a “P” then you are a permanent absentee voter. Your affidavit number is the 8 digit number that is printed above the bar code on the label.

If you have not received your absentee ballot by May 14, please call 554-4375.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

Q — Who can vote?
A — U.S. citizens 18 years or older who are registered to vote in San Francisco before May 5, 1992

Q — My 18th birthday is after May 4, but before June 2. May I vote in the June 2 election?
A — Yes, but you must register by May 4.

Q — I moved on or before May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — Only if you re-registered at your new address. You must re-register each time you change your address.

Q — I moved after May 4; can I vote in this election?
A — If you moved within the City between May 5 and June 2, you may go to your old precinct to vote.

Q — What offices can I vote for at this election?
A — Only if you are registered as a member of one of the recognized political parties (American Independent, Democrat, Green, Libertarian, Peace and Freedom or Republican) can you vote for your party’s nominees for President, U.S. Senator, U.S. Representative, State Senator, and State Assembly member. You may also vote for County Central Committee members.

All voters may vote for judges, and on any State and local ballot measures.

Q — Where do I go to vote?
A — Go to your polling place. The address is on your mailing label on the back cover of this book.

Q — When do I vote?
A — Election Day is Tuesday, June 2, 1992. Your polling place will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Q — What do I do if my polling place is not open?
A — Check the label on the back of this book to make sure you have gone to the right place. Polling places often change. If you are at the right place, call the Registrar’s Office at 554-4375 to let them know the polling place is not open.

Q — If I don’t know what to do when I get to my polling place, is there someone there to help me?
A — Yes, the workers at the polling place will help you.

Q — Can I take my sample ballot or my own written list into the voting booth?
A — Yes. Deciding your votes before you go to the polls will help. You may wish to use the Polling Place Card which is on the inside back cover of this pamphlet.

Q — Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A — Yes, if the person is a qualified write-in candidate.

Only “qualified” write-in candidates will be counted. You may ask your poll worker for a list of these candidates. You may vote for these candidates by writing their names on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. If you don’t know how to do this, you may ask your poll worker for help.

Q — Can a worker at the polling place ask me to take any tests?
A — No.

Q — Is there any way to vote beside going to the polling place on election day?
A — Yes, you can vote before June 2 if you:
• Fill out and mail the Absentee Ballot application printed on the back cover of this book. Within three days after we receive your request, a vote-by-mail ballot will be sent to you. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992; or
• Go to the Office of the Registrar of Voters in City Hall — Room 158 from May 4 through June 2. The office hours are from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on May 30 and 31, and from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Election Day, June 2.

Q — If I don’t use an application form, can I get an absentee ballot some other way?
A — You can mail a postcard or a letter to the Registrar of Voters asking for a ballot. This letter must include: your home address, the address where you want the ballot mailed, your printed name and your signature. Your request must be received by the Registrar of Voters no later than May 27, 1992.
IMPORTANT NOTICE

You want to vote for someone, but you don’t find that name on your ballot?

In a primary election you will only find federal, state and county central committee candidates who are members of your political party on your ballot. This is the way members of each political party choose their party’s candidates who will run for election in November. Therefore, in this June 2 election, for partisan races, you may vote only for people who are members of the political party in which you are registered. You may also vote for municipal judge candidates, and state and local measures.

People who decline to state their political affiliation (also called independents or non-partisans) may not vote for party candidates for state or federal offices in primary elections. Voters who did not register with a political party may vote only for municipal judges and state and local measures in the June 2, 1992 election.

The Green Party only has candidates for the County Council in this election. Members of this political party do not have candidates for federal or state offices on the ballot. However, as with all other voters, they may vote for municipal judge candidates and state and local measures.

Some people who have registered with the American Independent Party may have thought they registered as “independent” or “non-partisan” voters. People who checked “American Independent” on their registration affidavit will receive an American Independent Party ballot this election.

You may change your political party affiliation at any time. However, for the June 2, 1992 election, the last day to change registration is May 4. Call 554-4398, if you wish to re-register.

Because of reapportionment, congressional, state senate and assembly, and BART district lines have changed. Thus, your political representatives may no longer be in your new districts. In those situations, you will not see their names on your ballot, even if you belong to the same political party. (See below.)

POLLING PLACE CHANGES

See your mailing label for the address of your polling place.

Although we try not to change polling places, sometimes we have no choice. Building owners need their spaces for other uses. This is particularly true when ownership of a building changes. As a rule, 60 to 70 polling places are re-located in each election.

The number of changes is higher than usual for this election for three reasons. There were the usual cancellations. We re-located polling places to be accessible to handicapped persons. We changed precinct lines to fit the new State and Federal legislative districts formed after the census and reapportionment (see below). We have also changed the precinct numbers. Precincts in the 12th Assembly District and 8th State Senate District now have four digit numbers starting with “2.” Precinct numbers in the 13th Assembly District and 3rd State Senate District now start with “3.”

When we change a polling place, we try to move it to a public building, such as a school, library, church or recreation center. This lessens the need for future changes and gives us more space for voting booths. It also gives voters more space for signing in and waiting.

We apologize for any inconvenience to you because of these changes. If you have suggestions for polling places, please write to the Registrar of Voters, 400 Van Ness Avenue - Room 158, San Francisco, CA 94102.

Reapportionment

Reapportionment is the process of re-drawing congressional, state legislative and BART district lines based on changed census (population) numbers. We were given new lines at the end of February. As a result, San Francisco now has two assembly seats. One state senate seat extends north to include Marin County and part of Sonoma County. Another state senate seat includes a major portion of San Mateo County. One congressional district covers all but the southwestern portion of the City, which is included in a San Mateo County district. The three BART district boundaries have been greatly changed.

Maps of the New and Old Districts are on the following pages.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
by the Ballot Simplification Committee

ABSENTEE BALLOTS (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — Absentee ballots are ballots that are mailed to voters, or given to voters in person at the Registrar's Office in City Hall. Absentee ballots can be mailed back to the Registrar, deposited at the Registrar's Office in City Hall, or turned in at any San Francisco polling place.

CHARTER (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — The Charter is the City's constitution.

CHARTER AMENDMENT (PROPOSITIONS E, F, G, H) — A Charter amendment changes the Charter, and requires a vote of the people. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY (PROPOSITIONS I, J) — A declaration of policy is an ordinance that does not have the force of law, but is intended to be a goal to guide the Board of Supervisors.

GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND (PROPOSITIONS A, B, C, D) — If the City needs money to pay for something such as a library, sewer line, or school, the City may borrow the money by selling bonds. The City pays back the money with interest. The money to pay back these bonds comes from property taxes. A two-thirds majority of the voters must approve the decision to sell general obligation bonds.

INVENTORY (PROPOSITION G) — The quantity of materials, supplies and equipment that the City has on hand is its inventory. From time to time the City inspects these items and makes a detailed list of the quantity and condition of the materials, supplies and equipment.

PRIMARY ELECTION — See Page 7.

PROPOSITION — A Proposition is the same as a Ballot Measure.

QUALIFIED WRITE-IN CANDIDATE (RIGHTS OF VOTERS) — A Qualified Write-In Candidate is a person who has turned in required papers and signatures to the Registrar of Voters. Although the name of this person will not be on the ballot, voters can vote for this person by writing the name of the person on the long stub of the ballot provided for write-in votes. The Registrar counts write-in votes only for qualified write-in candidates.

---

The Ballot Simplification Committee prepares summaries ("The Way It Is Now," "The Proposal," "A 'Yes' Vote Means," and "A 'No' Vote Means.").) of measures placed on the ballot each election. The Committee prepares: the table of contents, an index of candidates and measures, a brief explanation of the ballot pamphlet, definitions of terms in the pamphlet, a summary of voters' basic rights, and a statement as to the term, compensation and duties of each local elective office.

---

The Committee studies and makes advisory recommendations to the officers of the City and County on all matters relating to voter registration, elections and the administration of the office of the Registrar of Voters; investigates compliance with the requirements of Federal, State and local election and campaign reporting, disclosure laws and other statutes relating to the conduct of elections in San Francisco; promotes citizen participation in the electoral process; studies and reports on all election matters referred to it by various officers of the City and County.

---

BALLOT SIMPLIFICATION COMMITTEE

Nicholas DeLuca, Committee Chair
National Broadcast Editorial Association
Kay Blalock
League of Women Voters of San Francisco
George Markell
The Northern California Newspaper Guild
Richard Miller
San Francisco Unified School District
John Odell
National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences
Northern California Chapter
Randy Riddle, Ex-officio
Deputy City Attorney

---

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mayoral appointees: Ernest Llorente, Chair; David Binder, Richard Sevilla, Jim Stevens and Molly Wood.

Board of Supervisors appointees: Martha Gillham, Daniel Kalb, Brian Mavrogeorge, George Mix, Jr., Samson Wong, Richmond Young.

Ex-officio members: Randy Riddle, Deputy City Attorney, and Germaine Q Wong, Registrar of Voters.

Members represent political organizations, political parties, labor organizations, neighborhood organizations, business organizations and other citizens groups interested in the political process.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR 1991-1992
(Does not include S.F. Unified School District or S.F. Community College District)

1991-92 ESTIMATED REVENUE
$2.4 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Federal Grants for Specific Programs</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$720 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues Generated by City Departments and Used by Same Department</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$696 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Sales &amp; Other Taxes &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$504 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$480 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1991-92 ESTIMATED BUDGET
$2.4 BILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$1.1 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Fund Revenue</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$260 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Regular Revenue</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$1.03 Billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures Paid from General Fund Regular Revenues
$1.03 Billion

- Public Protection 39% $409 Million
- Health & Welfare 31% $321 Million
- Recreation & Culture 5% $53 Million
- Utilities & Transportation 11% $114 Million
- General Administration 14% $146 Million

This includes only the General Fund subsidy to the Municipal Railway. The total budget for the Municipal Railway is $282 Million, including state and federal grants.

Note: These numbers are estimates based on budget information submitted prior to June 1991.
MAKE YOUR HOUSE A HOME.

- ADOPT
  Fall in love with the companion of your dreams!

- ALTER
  Help us stop the tragic cycle of pet overpopulation - spay and neuter your pets!

- ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY
  Animals are not toys. Responsible pet ownership takes a major commitment.

1200 15th Street at Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Open for Adoptions
11 a.m. to 6 p.m.
Daily
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

GREEN PARTY BALLOT

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS
To vote for a candidate whose name appears on the ballot, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the name of the candidate preferred. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite the names of all candidates for office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

A vote for “None of the above” may affect the ability of a Green Party candidate to go forward and appear in the November 3, 1992 General Election. If more votes are cast for “None of the above” no candidate shall go forward to the general election. NOTE: For the contest for Member, County Council, the choice of “None of the above” is not available.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the person’s name and office in the blank space provided for that purpose on the back of the ballot card. If you do not know how to do this, ask a poll worker for help.

To vote for any measure, use the blue stylus to punch the hole opposite “YES” or “NO” for that measure. All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly vote, tear, or deface this ballot, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

選民須知
投票選舉代表選護選票上所列的候選人，請用藍色筆尖在你所選擇的候選人姓名旁邊打孔。
如果選舉“非上列候選人”，可能會影響綠黨候選人進入1992年11月3日的普選。如果太多選舉“非上列候選人”，則沒有候選人進入普選。注：競爭縣議員沒有“非上列候選人”的選擇。
投票選舉合格寫入候選人，請在選票卡的長方形選票尾的空位上寫上該候選人的姓名和官職。如有不明之處，請向助選員求助。
投票任何一項提案，請用藍色筆尖在提案旁邊的“YES”（贊成）或“NO”（反對）打孔。
如果選票有明顯污痕或擦掉痕跡，選票即作廢。
如果你投票錯了，或者選票撕破了，應把選票交回選區的選舉委員，再拿一份新選票。

BALOTA DEL PARTIDO VERDE

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LOS ELECTORES
Para votar por un candidato cuyo nombre aparece en la balota, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio que se encuentra al lado del nombre del candidato elegido. Cuando deben elegirse dos o más candidatos para el mismo puesto, utilice el punzón azul para perforar los orificios al lado de los nombres de todos los candidatos para este puesto para los cuales usted desea votar, sin exceder la cantidad de candidatos que deben ser elegidos.
Un voto “Ninguno de los anteriores” podría afectar la capacidad del candidato del Partido Verde de seguir adelante y presentarse en las Elecciones Generales del 3 de noviembre de 1992. Si se emiten más votos de “Ninguno de los anteriores”, no se presentará ningún candidato en las elecciones generales. NOTA: Para la contienda del puesto de Miembro, Consejo del Condado, no se dispone de la opción “Ninguno de los anteriores”.
Para votar por un candidato calificado que no aparece en la lista, escriba el nombre de la persona y el puesto en el espacio en blanco provisto para este propósito en el tarjetón largo de la tarjeta de la balota. Si no sabe cómo hacer esto, pida que un trabajador del lugar de votación le ayude.
Para votar por cualquier medida, utilice el punzón azul para perforar el orificio al lado de “SÍ” o “NO” para dicha medida.
Se prohíbe todo tipo de marca o borrador; esto anularía la balota.
Si usted se equivoca al votar, o si rompe y daña la balota, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del lugar de votación y obtenga otra.

開始投票，請轉下頁。
PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR, PASE A LA PAGINA SIGUIENTE.

TO START VOTING,
GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>總統優先選舉權</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PREFERENCIA PRESIDENCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presidential Preference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT A PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTION**

El Partido Verde no participará en las elecciones primarias presidenciales

綠黨不參加總統初選
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS — PERIODO COMPLETO</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>United States Senator — Full Term</strong></td>
<td><strong>THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT A PRIMARY ELECTION FOR THIS OFFICE.</strong>&lt;br&gt;El Partido Verde no participará en las elecciones primarias para este puesto. 綠黨不在初選競選此公職</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS — PERIODO CORTO</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>United States Senator — Short Term</strong></td>
<td><strong>THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT A PRIMARY ELECTION FOR THIS OFFICE.</strong>&lt;br&gt;El Partido Verde no participará en las elecciones primarias para este puesto. 綠黨不在初選競選此公職</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GREEN PARTY</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONSORTIUM PRIMARY ELECTION</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>JUNE 2, 1992</strong></td>
<td><strong>UNITED STATES SENATOR</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTIDO VERDE**

**ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS**

2 DE JUNIO DE 1992

**SENADOR DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS**
| 3 | 美國衆議員，第八區  
U.S. Representative in Congress — 8th District |
|---|---|
| | THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT  
A PRIMARY ELECTION FOR THIS OFFICE.  
El Partido Verde no participará en las  
elecciones primarias para este puesto.  
綠黨不在初選競選此公職|
| PARTIDO VERDE | 州參議員，第三區  
SENADOR ESTERAL, DISTRITO 3  
State Senator — 3rd District |
| | THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT  
A PRIMARY ELECTION FOR THIS OFFICE.  
El Partido Verde no participará en las  
elecciones primarias para este puesto.  
綠黨不在初選競選此公職|
| STATE SENATOR | 州衆議員，第十三區  
MIEMBRO DE LA ASAMBLEA ESTATAL, DISTRITO 13  
Member, State Assembly — 13th District |
| | THE GREEN PARTY WILL NOT CONDUCT  
A PRIMARY ELECTION FOR THIS OFFICE.  
El Partido Verde no participará en las  
elecciones primarias para este puesto.  
綠黨不在初選競選此公職|
| MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY | CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION  
JUNE 2, 1992  
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS  
2 DE JUNIO DE 1992  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE  
IN CONGRESS |
<p>| 3-6-3 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>CONSEJO DEL CONDADO County Council</th>
<th>Voto por no más de 16 Vote for no more than 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CONSEJO DEL CONDADO 縣委員會</td>
<td>選舉不超過十六人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN PARTY</td>
<td>CONSEJO DEL CONDADO 縣委員會</td>
<td>選舉不超過十六人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIDO VERDE</td>
<td>CONSEJO DEL CONDADO 縣委員會</td>
<td>選舉不超過十六人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992</td>
<td>CONSEJO DEL CONDADO 縣委員會</td>
<td>選舉不超過十六人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT C. RAVEN</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTHONY CESNIK</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD DUTCHER</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASHELL (SHELly) MARTIN</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL MONNOT</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSS B. MIRKARIMI</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA GOUSE</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCINDA A. GOVORCHIN</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARMEN R. WHITE</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK HAVEN</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGINA M. ENDRIZZI</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRBARA BLONG</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC P. SHORT</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAURIE STOERKEL</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY L. TRAYNOR</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>上</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

THIS PAGE IS LEFT BLANK FOR THIS DISTRICT
Esta página queda en blanco para este distrito

本區在本頁是空白
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #5</th>
<th>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELLEN CHAITIN</strong>&lt;br&gt;Trial Attorney&lt;br&gt;Abogada Litigante 試訟律師</td>
<td><strong>JANET W. FORSYTHE</strong>&lt;br&gt;Deputy Public Defender&lt;br&gt;Abogada de Oficio Delegada 助理公共辯護律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for One 161</td>
<td>Vote for One 163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge of the Municipal Court, Judge del Tribunal Municipal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BARRY MELTON</strong>&lt;br&gt;Attorney&lt;br&gt;Abogado 律師</td>
<td><strong>DONNA LITTLE</strong>&lt;br&gt;Judge of the Municipal Court&lt;br&gt;Juez del Tribunal Municipal 市法院法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for One 169</td>
<td>Vote for One 171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

7E
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — STATE PROPOSITIONS

152
SCHOOL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1992. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion nine hundred million dollars ($1,900,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

YES 185
NO 186

153
HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF JUNE 1992. This act authorizes a bond issue of nine hundred million dollars ($900,000,000) to fund the construction or improvement of California’s public college and university facilities. These construction projects will create jobs, ensure access to higher education for California’s students, and enable public colleges and universities to prepare a well trained and competitive workforce to strengthen the state’s economy. Authorized projects for the 138 public campuses shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, earthquake and other health safety improvements, modernization of laboratories to keep up with scientific advances, and construction of classrooms and libraries.

YES 193
NO 194

154
PROPERTY TAX POSTPONEMENT LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. Authorizes Legislature to provide that low-income tenants who acquire their principal place of residence may postpone increases in property taxes which occur from reappraisal upon acquisition.
Fiscal Impact: This measure could result in millions of dollars of costs annually to either the state or local governments as homeowners postpone payment of their property taxes. These costs eventually would be recovered as participating homeowners sell their homes.

YES 203
NO 204
SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

BALOTA APARTIDARIA
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992
MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

185 SI 贊成
186 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES ESCOLARES DE 1992. Este acta dispone una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($1,900,000,000) para proporcionar desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejoramiento de escuelas públicas.

193 SI 贊成
194 NO 反对

ACTA DE BONOS PARA INSTALACIONES PARA LA EDUCACION SUPERIOR DE JUNIO DE 1992. Este acta autoriza una emisión de bonos por novecientos millones de dólares ($900,000,000) para financiar la construcción o mejoramiento de las instalaciones de los colegios superiores y universidades públicas de California. Estos proyectos de construcción producirán fuentes de trabajo, asegurarán el acceso a la educación superior para los estudiantes de California, y permitirán a los colegios de educación superior y universidades poder preparar competentes y bien entrenados trabajadores que fortalezcan la economía del estado. Los proyectos autorizados para los 138 recintos de educación superior públicas, deberán incluir, pero no necesariamente limitarse a éstos, mejoras de seguridad contra terremotos y otras medidas de salud, modernización de los laboratorios para mantenerse al día con los avances científicos, y construcción de salones de clase y bibliotecas.

203 SI 贊成
204 NO 反对

APLAZAMIENTO DEL IMPUESTO A LA PROPIEDAD ENMIENDA CONSTITUCIONAL LEGISLATIVA. Autoriza a la Legislatura a disponer que los inquilinos de bajos recursos económicos que adquieran su principal lugar de residencia puedan aplazar el pago de los aumentos en los impuestos a la propiedad que ocurran del reavalúo durante la compra. Impacto Fiscal: Esta medida podría resultar en costos de millones de dólares al año tanto para los gobiernos locales como estatal cuando los dueños de casa pospongan el pago de sus impuestos a la propiedad. Estos costos serían recobrados eventualmente, cuando los dueños participantes vendan sus casas.

1992年6月高等教育設施公債法案。本提案授權發行公債九億九千零四萬美元（$900,000,000），用於興建或改良加州的公立學院和大學設施。這些建設工程創造就業，確保加州學生獲得高等教育，並使各公立學院和大學培訓出一批訓練有素的、競爭力強的勞動大軍，充實加州的經濟。授權興建的138公立校園計劃，包括，但並不等於限制於防震和其她衛生安全的改良，實驗室的現代化，以跟上科學的發展和建築課室、圖書館等等。

延減徵收實業稅，立法修憲案。本提案授權州議會對低收入住客購置主要住所時重新估價所增實業稅可延期徵付。財政影響：這個提案將由於屋主延期徵收實業稅而導致州或地方政府損失數以百萬元計。這些損失會在屋主賣出他們的房產時最終獲得補償。
GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

A

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

B

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

C

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

D

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

E
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8F</th>
<th>無黨派選票</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212 SI 贊成</td>
<td>舊金山市、縣 聯合初選 一九九二年六月二日提</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 NO 反對</td>
<td>交選民投票表決的市、縣提案</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL PARQUE GOLDEN</td>
<td>1992年改革金門公園公債法案。發行公債$76,300,000,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATE, 1992. Contraer una deuda en</td>
<td>用於支付金門公園的興建、重建、修復、再造</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bonos de $76,300,000 para pagar por</td>
<td>林和整頓,包括供水系統和灌溉,湖泊和水的流</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>los costos de construcción o</td>
<td>行,公用事業包括街道和保潔照明,修復和整頓公</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reconstrucción de reparación,</td>
<td>園的面貌,自然美化,包括便利殘障人士使用的</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reforestación y rehabilitación</td>
<td>門。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del Parque Golden Gate, incluyendo el</td>
<td>門。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sistema de suministro de agua e</td>
<td>水。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irrigación, lagos y cursos de agua,</td>
<td>服務。包括街道照明、保潔照明、整修和公園的</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servicios que incluyan la</td>
<td>門。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iluminación de las calles y de</td>
<td>水。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seguridad, la reparación y</td>
<td>門。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rehabilitación de los edificios</td>
<td>水。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del parque, la arquitectura paisajista</td>
<td>水。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>los baños, incluyendo el acceso a los</td>
<td>水。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mismos para las personas</td>
<td>水。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incapacitadas.</td>
<td>水。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 SI 贊成</td>
<td>1992年改革市政中心公園法案。發行公債$26,700,000,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 NO 反對</td>
<td>用於支付改革市政中心公園和高德街林蔭道行</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL CENTRO CIVICO,</td>
<td>道,自然美化和市政廳周圍及鄰近地區的街道。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992. Contraer una deuda en bonos de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$26,700,000 para mejorar la Plaza del</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro Cívico y el Paseo de la Calle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton, la arquitectura paisajista e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iluminación de las calles que</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circundan a la Municipalidad y las</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zonas adyacentes a la misma.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222 SI 贊成</td>
<td>1992年改革市政中心停車場公債法案。發行公債$24,000,000,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 NO 反對</td>
<td>用於支付擴建市政中心停車場或在鄰近建築</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR LA PLAYA DE</td>
<td>停車場,包括減少石膏和為殘障人士提供方便。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTACIONAMIENTO DEL CENTRO CIVICO, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Contraer una deuda en bonos de $24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000,000 para pagar por una ampliación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de la playa de estacionamiento del</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro Cívico o la construcción de un</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playita de estacionamiento adyacente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a la misma, incluyendo la disminución</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del asfalto y el acceso para personas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incapacitadas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 SI 贊成</td>
<td>1992年改革市政中心供暖系統公債法案。發行公債$21,220,000,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228 NO 反對</td>
<td>用於支付興建或重建市政中心地區的</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONOS PARA MEJORAR EL SISTEMA DE</td>
<td>供暖系統,包括管道和熱水系統。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraer una deuda en bonos de $21,200,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000 para pagar por la construcción o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reconstrucción de un sistema de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calefacción dentro de la</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zona del Centro Cívico, incluyendo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>las tuberías y un sistema de caldera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de agua caliente.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 SI 贊成</td>
<td>應否規定市政府每年撥出一定比例的普通基金，連</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 NO 反對</td>
<td>續十二年（1993-2005），只用於特定的基礎工</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá la Ciudad separar un cierto</td>
<td>程，如興建、保養和購買市府大樓和其他公物</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porcentaje de sus Fondos Generales</td>
<td>業？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cada año durante 12 años (1993-2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para que sea usado únicamente para</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pagar por ciertos tipos de proyectos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de capital, tales como la</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construcción, el mantenimiento y la</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adquisición de los</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edificios municipales y otra propiedad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pública?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SAMPLE BALLOT
CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS — CITY &amp; COUNTY PROPOSITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer? YES 237 NO 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules? YES 241 NO 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong> Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments? YES 245 NO 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state? YES 248 NO 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong> Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state? YES 252 NO 253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF BALLOT
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

**CONSOLIDATED PRIMARY ELECTION, JUNE 2, 1992, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**BALOTA APARTIDARIA**

CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO

**ELECCIONES PRIMARIAS CONSOLIDADAS, 2 DE JUNIO DE 1992**

**MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS ELECTORES — PROPOSICIONES DE LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALOTA</th>
<th>237 SI 贊成</th>
<th>238 NO 反對</th>
<th>241 SI 贊成</th>
<th>242 NO 反對</th>
<th>245 SI 贊成</th>
<th>246 NO 反對</th>
<th>248 SI 贊成</th>
<th>249 NO 反對</th>
<th>252 SI 贊成</th>
<th>253 NO 反對</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Se transferirán las tareas y el personal del Escrivano de la Ciudad desde la oficina del Escrivano del Tribunal Superior al Departamento de Servicios Gubernamentales, bajo la supervisión del Funcionario Ejecutivo Principal?</td>
<td>無黨派選票</td>
<td>舊金山市、縣</td>
<td>聯合初選</td>
<td>一九九二年六月二日</td>
<td>提交選民投票表決的市、縣提案</td>
<td>糾幹事的職責和人事應否從高級法庭幹事調到政府服務部，並在市首席行政官的監督下任職？</td>
<td>市動物園園長應否由康樂與公園管理局局長委任，但須經康樂與公園委員會批准，而不在公務條例管轄下任職？</td>
<td>市採購官應否不必為市政府其他部門管理所有物資、補給和器材的存貨，而交由市各部門自行負責管理這些存貨？</td>
<td>舊金山劃分為北加州和南加州應否成爲舊金山市縣人民的政策？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>248 SI 贊成</td>
<td>249 NO 反對</td>
<td>252 SI 贊成</td>
<td>253 NO 反對</td>
<td>252 SI 贊成</td>
<td>253 NO 反對</td>
<td>252 SI 贊成</td>
<td>253 NO 反對</td>
<td>252 SI 贊成</td>
<td>253 NO 反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Será la política de las personas de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco apoyar la división de California en un estado de California del norte y un estado de California del sur?</td>
<td>支持把加州劃分為北加州和南加州應否成爲舊金山市縣人民的政策？</td>
<td>如果加州劃分為北加州和南加州，舊金山府屬於北加州版圖，這應否成爲舊金山市縣人民的政策？</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIN DE LA BALOTA**

票終
OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes, but when we do we admit it.

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it is possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

May 19, 20 and 21

Look in the Public Notices section of the San Francisco Chronicle, San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Independent.
LOCAL OFFICES TO BE VOTED ON THIS ELECTION

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

A Judge of the Municipal Court presides over civil and criminal controversies, hears arguments, evaluates evidence and makes legal rulings, decisions and judgements. Judge of the Municipal Court is a state judicial officer of limited jurisdiction.

Municipal Court Judges are paid $90,679.92 per year.

__________________________________________

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
LOCAL CANDIDATES

On the following pages are statements of qualifications from local candidates. They have been printed as submitted. Spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

The statements are submitted by the candidates. They have not been checked for accuracy by any City official or agency.
Candidates for Municipal Court Judge, Office #5

ELLEN CHAITIN

My address is 175 Upper Terrace
My occupation is Trial Attorney
My age is 44
My qualifications for office are:
- 20 years criminal/civil trial experience
- Hastings Law School graduate
- Past Chair, Bar Association Criminal Justice Council
- Volunteer Attorney, Women’s Health Clinic
- Former Faculty, Hastings Trial Advocacy College
- Married, two children

A judgeship is a serious professional responsibility and sacred public trust. I’m honored that my professional accomplishments and community service have earned the respect of this diverse cross-section of colleagues and community leaders:

SHERIFF Mike Hennessey
DISTRICT ATTORNEY Arlo Smith
JUDGES: Clinton White, Donna Hitchens, Ollie Marie-Victoire,
Daniel Hanlon, Laurence Kay, Douglas Munson, Michael
Dufficey, Mary Morgan, Herb Donaldson, Phillip Moscone,
Jerome Benson, Dorothy vonBeroldingen, Joseph Desmond
RETIRED: Claude Perasso, Leland Lazarus, Mary Fajalich,
Daniel Weinstein, John Ertola

10 FORMER BAR ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS
SPEAKER Willie Brown
SENATORS Milton Marks
SUPERVISORS: Kevin Shelley, Willie Kennedy, Carole
Migden, Bill Maher, Roberta Achenberg, Jim Gonzalez, Tom
Hsiieh, Terence Hallinan, Harry Britt, Angela Alioto.
ASSESSOR Richard Hongisto
SCHOOL BOARD: Libby Denbech, JoAnne Miller, Fred
Rodriguez, Carlota delPortillo, Leland Yee, Dan Kelly
COLLEGE BOARD: Bill Marquis, Chuck Ayala, Tim Wolfred,
Rodel Rodis, Robert Varni
BART DIRECTOR Mike Bernick
COMMUNITY LEADERS: Melvin Swig, Yori Wada, Wendy
Nelder, Nancy Walker, Jim Mayo, Jose Medina, William
Coblentz, Louis Chan, Paul Wotman, Sue Bierman

Ellen Chaitin

JANET W. FORSYTHE

My address is 138 Seventh Avenue
My occupation is Deputy Public Defender
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are:
- Since 1850, judges have presided over California courts in San Francisco.
- In these 142 years since statehood, none have been Black
women.
- Its time to make history!
- I offer the highest trial court qualifications:
- Honors graduate — George Washington University.
- Dean’s Honor List — Georgetown University Law Center.
- Principal Attorney — Nine Year Veteran, Public Defender’s
Office.
- Board of Directors — Bar Association of San Francisco.
- Coro Foundation Fellow.
- American Fellow — American Association of University
Women.
- Co-founder — Mentors in the Elementary Schools.

As an experienced attorney — skilled in one of the toughest trial
courts in America — I will bring tough-minded fairness and good
judgment to the court.

I will also be a role model for our young men and women.

My supporters include:
Mayor Frank Jordan; Public Defender Jeff Brown; former Mayor
Joseph Alioto; Appeals Court Justice Timothy Reardon; Judges:
Julie Tang, Lilian Sing, Lee Baxter, Donald Mitchell; Betty
Smith — former Chair California Democratic Party; Katherine
Feinstein; Doris Thomas; Leroy King; Clothilde Hewlett — Po-
lice Commissioner; Harold Hoogasian; Pat Norman; William
Terheyden; Larry Martin; Hadie Redd; Melecio Santos; Charles
Brenbaum; Michael Brassington.

Please join with me in electing the first African-American
woman judge in San Francisco history.

Janet W. Forsythe

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DONNA LITTLE

My address is 1380 Greenwich Street
My occupation is Judge of the Municipal Court
My age is 39
My qualifications for office are:

As a Municipal Court Judge, I have delivered justice in a fair and impartial manner. I have worked to protect the rights of all citizens. My qualifications include service as Vice-Chair of the California Commission on the Status of Women, Chair of the California State Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault Victim Services and Chairperson of the California Workers' Compensation Appeals Board. I am a graduate of UCLA Law School and Brown University. My community work includes directing efforts to educate battered women about their rights and conducting a forum on Women and AIDS, co-sponsored by the University of California. I was honored in March 1992 as part of California Women's History Month Cavalcade of Women.

My sponsors include: City Attorney Louise Renne; Assemblyperson Willie Brown; Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg; Supervisor Angela Alioto; Supervisor Tom Hsieh; Supervisor Kevin Shelley; Supervisor Doris Ward; Judge Jack Berman; Judge John Dearman; Judge Joseph Desmond; Judge Herbert Donaldson; Judge David Garcia; Judge Donna Hitchens; Judge Lenard Louie; Judge Perker Meeks; Judge Mary Morgan; Judge Philip Moscone; Judge Ronald Quaidachay; Judge Lillian Sing; Judge Julie Tang; District Attorney Arlo Smith; Larry Mazzola, Secretary-Treasurer, Local 38; Joan-Marie Shelley, President, SF United Educators; Paul Varacalli, Vice-President, SEIU.

Donna Little

BARRY MELTON

My address is 3258 Harrison Street
My occupation is Attorney
My age is 44 years
My qualifications for office are:

Throughout my years as a lawyer and from my early days as a musician, I have donated my legal and musical skills to our community. San Francisco deserves judges committed to democratic principles of fairness and equality. In this spirit, I offer my candidacy:

- Among a handful of self-taught lawyers admitted to the Bar.
- Founding partner, Melton, Duncan & Hirshbein. Extensive criminal trial experience.
- Pro tem Municipal Court Judge. Volunteer civil arbitrator.
- Named an “Outstanding Lawyer in Public Service” by Bar Association.
- Co-chair of Juvenile Justice Section. Trained staff of Bar Association’s referral service in landlord-tenant law.
- Pro-bono work for seniors, juveniles and needy.

My broad support reflects my integrity and impartiality. As a parent, musician and lawyer, I know this community. Now you can choose a San Francisco judge for a San Francisco court.

Supporters include:
Retired Judges: Leland Lazarus, Daniel Weinstein
Sheriff Mike Hennessey
Supervisors: Harry Britt, Jim Gonzalez, Terence Hallinan, Carole Migden
Assistant District Attorney: Richard Hechler
Deputy Public Defender: Kimiko Burton
Police Sergeant Art Tapia
Juvenile Justice Commissioner Arla Escontrias
School Board: JoAnne Miller, Carlotta del Portillo

Art Agnos, Keith Eickman, Katherine Feinstein, David Jenkins, Paul Kantner, Sam Lauter, Enola Maxwell, Ben Tom, Alicia Wang

Barry Melton

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Arguments For and Against Ballot Measures

On the following pages, you will find information about local ballot measures, including arguments for and against the measures. All arguments are strictly the opinions of their respective authors. None have been checked for accuracy by this office or any other City official or agency. Arguments and rebuttals are reproduced as they are submitted, including typographical and grammatical errors.

"Proponent’s" and "Opponent’s" Arguments

For each measure, one argument in favor of the measure ("Proponent’s Argument") and one argument against the measure ("Opponent’s Argument") are printed in the Voter Information Pamphlet free of charge.

The designation, "Proponent’s Argument" and "Opponent’s Argument" indicates only that the arguments were selected in accordance with criteria in Section 5.74.5 of the San Francisco Administrative Code and were printed free of charge. The Registrar does not edit the arguments, and the Registrar makes no claims as to the accuracy of statements in the arguments.

The "Proponent’s Argument" and the "Opponent’s Argument" are selected according to the following priorities:

"Proponent’s Argument":
1. The official proponent of an initiative petition; or the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, or four members of the Board, if the measure was submitted by same.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee in support of the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

"Opponent’s Argument":
1. For a referendum, the person who files the referendum petition with the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Board of Supervisors, or any member or members designated by the Board.
3. The Mayor.
4. Any bona fide association of citizens that has filed as a campaign committee opposing the measure.
5. Any bona fide association of citizens, or combination of voters and association of citizens.
6. Any individual voter.

Rebuttal Arguments

The author of a "Proponent’s Argument" or an "Opponent’s Argument," may also prepare and submit a rebuttal argument. Rebuttals are also the opinions of the author and are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters or any other City official or agency. Rebuttal arguments are printed below the corresponding "Proponent’s Argument" and "Opponent’s Argument."

Paid Arguments

In addition to the "Proponent’s Arguments" and "Opponent’s Arguments" which are printed without charge, any eligible voter, group of voters, or association may submit paid arguments.

Paid arguments are printed after the direct arguments and rebuttals. All of the arguments in favor of a measure are printed together, followed by the arguments opposed to that measure. Paid arguments for each measure are not printed in any particular order; they are arranged to make the most efficient use of the space on each page.

Arguments and rebuttals are solely the opinions of their authors. Arguments and rebuttals are not checked for accuracy by the Registrar of Voters, or by any other City official or agency.
PROPOSITION A

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, rest rooms including disabled access thereto.

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Many of the wells, pumps, pipes, filters and other parts of the water systems for Golden Gate Park are old and in need of repair. Large sections of the Park use drinking water for irrigation. The Park also contains a number of artificial lakes that are leaking. The Park’s electrical wiring and lights are old and require frequent repairs. Some of the Park’s public rest rooms are not accessible to handicapped persons. Old or damaged trees must be replaced to preserve the park.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to improve and repair Golden Gate Park facilities. These include the Park’s irrigation and other water systems, lakes, street lighting and security lighting. The money also would be used for landscaping, replacing trees and making Park rest rooms more accessible to disabled persons.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $76,300,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for improvements and repairs to Golden Gate Park.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $76,300,000
- Bond interest: $53,791,500
- Debt service requirement: $130,091,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $6,504,575 which amount is equivalent to one and twenty-six hundredths cents ($0.0126) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $31.50. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition A on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPOSEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park is a treasure for all San Franciscans. The Park provides a respite from the pressures of citylife for families, neighbors and communities from all over the City. Within the Park's one thousand acres are lakes, streams, waterfalls, hiking trails, bike routes, playgrounds, picnic sites, museums, meadows and forests. To the casual observer, the Park appears to be healthy. However, the Park's infrastructure is old and near collapse. Wells which provide much of the irrigation are failing. Water supply lines are disintegrating. Lakes are leaking. Streams are drying up. Waterfalls are eroding. Electrical utility lines are rotting in the ground. The forest is dying. In addition, many of the Park's basic facilities, such as public restrooms, are not accessible to disabled persons. Some restrooms are not functional. If these problems are not corrected, the City risks losing the Park to erosion and decay.

Proposition A will fund necessary repairs to keep Golden Gate Park healthy for future generations of San Franciscans. Repairs to the Park's infrastructure will include replacing the underground utilities which provide the Park's water supply, drainage system, and electricity. Wells will be restored; pumps will be replaced; lakes will be cleaned and reseeded; waterfalls will be repaired. Also, the replanting of the old and dying forest will be accelerated. In addition, public restrooms throughout the Park will be repaired and made accessible to disabled persons. Proposition A promises to rescue Golden Gate Park from erosion and decay. Help save Golden Gate Park.

Vote YES on Proposition A.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

---

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSEN'T'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we're in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions "A," "B," "C," and "D"?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it's $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year's bills!

Remember, that's how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!
VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

VOTE "NO" ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!
But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City's debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.
About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!
San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.
Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City's future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!
Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!!
STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITIONS "A", "B", "C" AND "D"!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that "San Francisco deserves better".
"San Francisco deserves better" protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.
"San Francisco deserves better" assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.
The opponents' statement that San Francisco has a "budget deficit" is a fiction. It is the fact that the current year's budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.
The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are "nice amenities" by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.
Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Golden Gate Park is a critical link in the Bay Area’s open space system. It serves the recreational needs of hundreds of thousands of city residents every year and is renowned as a unique jewel among urban parks in the nation. We must protect our investment in this invaluable park and preserve it in good condition for future generations.

Beryl Magilavy, Chair, San Francisco Group Sierra Club
Andrew Nash, President, San Francisco Tomorrow
David Strain, President, San Francisco Friends of Urban Forest
Zack Cowan, Vice President, Greenbelt Alliance
Richard and Rhoda Goldman, Goldman Environmental Prize
Isabel Wade, Urban Resource Systems
Dan Hodapp, Robert Dutra, Co-Chairs, Park and Open Space Advisory Committee
Bradford Benson, President, San Francisco League of Conservation Voters
Betty Traynor, San Francisco Greens
Martin Rosen, President, Trust for Public Land*
Jacob Sigg, President, Yerba Buena Chapter, California Native Plant Society*
Edward Dieraffe, San Francisco League of Urban Gardeners*
Donna Gouse, Green Party*

*Affiliation listed for identification purposes only.

Golden Gate Park is the heart of San Francisco’s Open Space and Recreational System. It has truly served all the City’s neighborhoods. To keep this vital resource healthy, it’s necessary to repair and upgrade its infrastructure. Proposition A will do this. The Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods, which represents 54 neighborhood groups throughout the City, strongly urges the passage of Proposition A.

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Golden Gate Park is a special place for all San Franciscans. The Park now needs your help. Its wells are near collapse; its lakes are full of silt; its waterfalls and streams are in decline; its irrigation systems are broken; its forests are dying. We, the Commissioners and former Commissioners of the Recreation and Park Department urge you to help save Golden Gate Park by voting YES on Proposition A.

Trent W. Orr, President, Recreation and Park Commission
Richard J. Guggenheim, Vice President, Recreation and Park Commission
Sidney Chan, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Keith Eickman, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Sue Sommer Loos, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Connie O’Connor, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Santiago Ruiz, Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Luisa Ezquerra, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Eugene L. Friend, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Frances McAteer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Amy Meyer, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Jeffrey K. Mori, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Gladys G. Moore, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Fred A. Rodriguez, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission
Samantha Yruegas, Former Member, Recreation and Park Commission

Golden Gate Park is one of San Francisco’s most valued resources. Unfortunately, this beautiful area is falling into disrepair. Leaking pipes, old lighting systems, dilapidated public restrooms and other facilities need immediate work.

Proposition A will help repair and upgrade Golden Gate Park’s infrastructure, preserving the park’s safety, accessibility and beauty. Please join me in voting yes on Proposition A. Thank you.

Supervisor Roberta Achtenberg

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will directly benefit visitors to the de Young and Asian Art museums. Improved lighting will significantly increase the security of visitors to evening programs and events. Park reforestation will protect and enhance the museums beautiful surroundings. New electrical service will ensure the safety and continuity of power to the museums. Please vote YES on A.

The Museum Society
David Jamison, Chair
Alice Lowe
Richard W. Goss II
Alexandra Phillips
Gail Merriam
Genevieve Spiegel
Audrey Rice Oliver

Golden Gate Park is dying and needs our help. This fragile environment in the heart of the City is crumbling. For the preservation of the Park’s forests, streams, lakes and meadows vote YES on Proposition A.

James C. Kelley, President, California Academy of Sciences
Jean McClatchy, President, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Leslie Schemel, Executive Director, Friends of Recreation and Parks
Tripp Diedrick, President, Golden Gate Angling and Casting Club
Betty Silverman, Golden Gate Park Equestrians
Polly Dingman, Golden Gate Park Stables, Inc.
Mary L. Gregory, President, Randall Museum Society
John Spring, San Francisco Conservatory of Flowers Auxiliary
Bobby Winston, San Francisco Shakespeare Festival
Margaret Burkes, San Francisco Zoological Society
Calvin B. Tilden, Stow Lake Corporation
Susan Addison, President, Strybing Arboretum Society
Edith Fried, Volunteer Collectors of Golden Gate Park

San Francisco’s elected officials urge you to help save Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Willie Brown, Jr., California State Assembly Speaker
John Burton, California State Assembly
Milton Marks, California State Senate
Louise Renne, City Attorney
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Arlo Smith, District Attorney
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff
Carlota del Porrillo, Member, Board of Education
Libby Deneke, Member, Board of Education
Tom Ammiano, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Leland Y. Lee, Member, Board of Education
JoAnne Miller, Member, Board of Education
Dr. Dan Kelly, Member, Board of Education
Ernest Chuck Ayala, Member, Community College Governing Board
Robert Burton, Member, Community College Governing Board
Rodel Rodis, Member, Community College Governing Board
Tim Wolfred, Member, Community College Governing Board

Golden Gate Park did not just happen. Hard working men and women dedicated their lives to create it. Now it is broken and we must fix it. Let’s bring back the Golden Gate Park we remember, the one we want our children to remember. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Walter Johnson, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, San Francisco Building Trades Council
Robert McDonnell, Laborers, Local 261
Thomas Harrison, Laborers, Local 261
Sal Rosselli, Healthcare Workers Union Local 250
J. B. Martin, Automotive Machinists Lodge 1305
Larry Martin, Transport Workers Union
Larry Mazzola, Plumbers Local 38

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Golden Gate Park bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Golden Gate Park improves the quality of life for all San Francisco. The Park is a major factor in our City’s economic well being. It makes good sense to support the restoration of the basic systems that give it life. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Leland M. Gustafson, Vice President, Golden Gate Region Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Grant N. Horne, Vice President, Pacific Gas and Electric Company*
Robert F. Begley, Executive Director, Hotel Council of San Francisco
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Golden Gate Park serves every community in San Francisco. It is a special place for neighborhood events, family gatherings and personal reflection. Unfortunately, Golden Gate Park is deteriorating. Its lakes are leaking, its pathways are crumbling and its aging forest is dying. Proposition A will provide funds to restore Golden Gate Park for the enjoyment of future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.
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PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

The De Laveaga Dell in Golden Gate Park is the future site of the AIDS Memorial Grove. This bond will assist with essential restoration of the Dell’s drainage system and is strongly supported by the community combatting AIDS.

Isabel Wade, AIDS Memorial Grove
John E. Yarling, Executive Director, AIDS Benefit Counselors
Wayne April, Dignity AIDS Support Group
David Jonson, Coming Home Organization
Rick Salinas, AIDS Emergency Fund

San Francisco’s former Mayors understand the critical needs of Golden Gate Park. Golden Gate Park is treasured by all San Franciscans. We urge your support in preserving and sustaining it for future generations. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Dianne Feinstein
Joseph L. Alioto
George Christopher

Golden Gate Park is the centerpiece of San Francisco’s park system. The fragile environment of Golden Gate Park is nearing collapse. The loss of our Park would be a tragedy. San Francisco’s neighborhood organizations urge you to help preserve Golden Gate Park. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Jim Rhoads
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Carole Isaacs, President
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Carol Glossenger
Cole Valley Improvement Association
Jim Lazarus
Planning Association for the Richmond
Richard Millet, President
Potrero Hill Boosters Club
Midge Wilson
Tenderloin Network of Family Services
Kelly Cullen
Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Edward Spivak
Haight Ashbury Improvement Association
Carol Kocivar, President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council

You can run, skate, walk, bicycle, meander or simply sit in it. Golden Gate Park is an oasis of serenity and loveliness from the hustle and bustle of urban life.

What San Franciscan does not have at least one deep-seated, loving memory of this urban jewel? May all of us who have partaken of Golden Gate Park’s delights take action to ensure its future.

Vote YES on PROPOSITION A.

Impala Women’s Racing Team

Golden Gate Park is a city treasure. Your Yes vote on Proposition A will insure that the park’s trees, plants, lakes, fields and buildings are maintained.

If Golden Gate Park is to remain a beautiful place for the eleven million people who enjoy it each year, please vote YES on Proposition A.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The Supreme Court is expected to rule on the constitutionality of Proposition 13 in July. If Proposition 13 is invalidated, some owners of real property in California could be required to pay substantially higher property taxes. With the uncertainty surrounding the Supreme Court’s decision, San Francisco is proposing $150 million in bond measures (Propositions A, B, C and D) which, if approved by a two-thirds majority of the voters, will increase property taxes whether Proposition 13 is invalidated or not. The amount of the increase will be $2.22 for every $1,000 of assessed value (or $77 for a home with an assessed value of $350,000). If Proposition 13 is invalidated, property assessments could be increased and the effect of passage of these bond measures could be even greater for individual property owners.

Under one of the above-mentioned bond measures, Proposition A, the city would issue $76.3 million in general obligation bonds to repair Golden Gate Park’s aging infrastructure. But monies to maintain the city’s infrastructure are supposed to come from the city’s general fund, not general obligation bonds. Why is the city using this financing vehicle for infrastructure maintenance? Because the Board of Supervisors has not done its job and must now turn to property owners to bail the city out.

Golden Gate Park is one of the premiere public parks in the United States and must be preserved. But the responsibility for maintaining it should not be foisted by the supervisors onto property owners through the issuance of general obligation bonds. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition A.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Of course everyone wants our city’s infrastructure improved. City Hall has neglected it for too long. But who pays the bill? Voters may think it’s free. NOT TRUE!

If all four bond measures on this ballot pass, the cost for each rental unit will be approximately $22. Add this to the $24 increase already approved with former Proposition B, and you’ll see that these things aren’t free. It’s City Hall on a credit card spree!

The politicians haven’t been taking care of business. Now the people have to pay the price.

There is no free lunch.

Vote NO on Propositions A, B, C, and D!

Thomas Garber
Vice-President, San Francisco Apartment Association.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

It’s telling that every presidential candidate — Republican and Democrat alike — is saying what our new mayor said in his campaign last year — “No New Taxes.” But that is exactly what Propositions A, B, C, and D do — they raise taxes.

Proposition A calls for a $76.3 million dollar bond for improvements to Golden Gate Park. The big spenders don’t tell you about the $53,791,500 dollars in interest. They conveniently forget to mention the real cost of this bond which is $130,091,500.

A little here, a little there. The politicians also forget to tell you about their proposed $100 million dollar bond measure for repairs at Laguna Honda which you’ll read about in the November Voter handbook. Or how about the proposed $100 million dollar bond for a new juvenile hall. You’ll see that one in the November Voter handbook too.

And how are all these bonds paid for? They are paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

According to a recent report the City can still legally incur in excess of $900 million dollars in new debt. You can be sure of two things: first they will find a way of spending every nickel of it, and secondly, you’ll pay for it.

Vote No on Proposition A.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING BOND ELECTION
PROPOSITION A, PROPOSITION B, PROPOSITION C AND PROPOSITION D

(Special Election)
CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1992, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: TWENTY-SIX MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($26,700,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA AND FULTON STREET MALL; TWENTY-ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($21,220,000) TO IMPROVE THE HEATING SYSTEM WITHIN THE CIVIC CENTER AREA; TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS ($24,000,000) FOR THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE EXISTING CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE OR CONSTRUCTION OF A PARKING GARAGE ADJACENT THERETO; SEVENTY-SIX MILLION THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($76,300,000) FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST 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 AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY: REJECTING THE ESTIMATED COST OF SUCH MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS; FIXING THE DATE OF ELECTION AND THE MANNER OF SUCH ELECTION AND THE PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOR OR AGAINST THE PROPOSITIONS; FIXING THE MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST ON SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION; CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL ELECTION; AND PROVIDING THAT THE ELECTION PRECINCTS, VOTING PLACES AND OFFICERS FOR ELECTION SHALL BE THE SAME AS FOR SUCH GENERAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 1992, for the purpose of submitting to the voters 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:

CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto, including construction and reconstruction necessary or convenient to improve Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, City Hall landscaping and properties adjacent thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system together with all of the work, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the heating system within the Civic Center area of the City and County of San Francisco.

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the existing Civic Center Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and access for the disabled and providing for all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to the expansion of the parking garage at the Civic Center in the City and County of San Francisco.

GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992, $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for such additions and improvements to Golden Gate Park in the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated costs of each of the municipal improvements described in Section 1 hereof were fixed by the Board of Supervisors by the following resolutions and in the amount specified:

Civic Center Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 71-92, $26,700,000; Civic Center Heating System Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 70-92, $21,220,000; Civic Center Parking Garage Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 95-92, $24,000,000; Golden Gate Park Improvement Bonds, 1992, Resolution No. 72-92, $76,300,000.

That said resolutions were passed by two-thirds or more of the Board of Supervisors and approved by the Mayor, and in each said resolution it was recited and found that the sums of money specified were too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for those purposes and will require expenditures greater than the amounts allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts not to exceed the principal amounts specified.

Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolutions are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the results thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California and the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Election of the City and County of San Francisco to be held Tuesday, June 2, 1992, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of elections for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or no later than May 12, 1992.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the punch card ballots used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following, to be separately stated, and appear upon the ballot as a separate proposition:

"CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992.

To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting (Continued on next page)
surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto."

"CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system."

"CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled."

"GOLDEN GATE PARK IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $76,300,000 to pay the cost of the construction or reconstruction of repair, reforestation and rehabilitation of Golden Gate Park including water system supply and irrigation, lakes and water courses, utilities including street and security lighting, repair and rehabilitation of park features, landscaping, restrooms including disabled access thereto."

Each voter to vote for any said propositions hereby submitted and in favor of the issuance of the Bonds, shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "YES" on the ballot to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition and against the issuance of the Bonds shall stamp a cross (X) in the blank space opposite the word "NO" on the ballot to the right of said proposition. On absent voters ballots, the cross (X) may be marked with pen or pencil.

If and to the extent that punch card ballot cards are used at said special election, each voter to vote for any said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "YES" to the right of said proposition, and to vote against said proposition shall punch the ballot card in the hole after the word "NO" to the right of said proposition.

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on the proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 12 per centum per annum, payable semiannually, provided, that interest for the first year after the date of any of said bonds may be payable at or before the end of that year.

The votes cast for and against said respective propositions shall be counted separately and when two-thirds of the qualified electors, voting on such propositions, vote in favor thereof, such proposition shall be deemed adopted.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said City and County set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same 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 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Section 9. The appropriate officers, employees, representatives and agents of the City and County of San Francisco are hereby authorized and directed to do everything necessary or desirable to the calling and holding of said special election, and to otherwise carry out the provisions of this ordinance.

Voters with certain disabilities may qualify to be Permanent Absentee Voters. See page 5.
Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PROPOSITION B
CIVIC CENTER IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $26,700,000 for improvements to the Civic Center Plaza and Fulton Street Mall, landscaping and street lighting surrounding the City Hall and areas adjacent thereto.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Civic Center is made up of Civic Center Plaza and the surrounding area. This includes the block of Fulton Street that joins Civic Center Plaza and United Nations Plaza. About 30 years ago, the Plaza was changed from the original 1912 design to include the present reflecting pool and trees instead of a wide, open area. A planned pedestrian mall on Fulton Street was never built.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to pay for changes to the Civic Center Plaza, the Fulton Street Mall, and surrounding areas, including landscaping and street lighting. The City’s current plans include redesigning the Civic Center based on the 1912 design and building a pedestrian mall. These plans also include a special street lighting system for the entire Civic Center area.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $26,700,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for changes to Civic Center Plaza and the Fulton Street Mall.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption: $26,700,000
- Bond interest: $18,823,500
- Debt service requirement: $45,523,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,276,175 which amount is equivalent to forty-four hundredths cents ($0.0044) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $11.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE. THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

San Franciscans deserve a Civic Center we can be proud of.

Earlier generations of San Franciscans began the Civic Center plan and gave this City a magnificent set of civic buildings: City Hall, Civic Auditorium, the Veterans Building and the Opera House. More recently, Davies Symphony Hall was added and a superb new Main Library will soon be built as part of the Civic Center. YOUR YES ON B vote will take one more vital step towards the completion of the Civic Center.

Your Yes on B vote will help build a new, block-long landscaped pedestrian mall on Fulton Street between the old Main Library and our new Main Library building, and it will restore the Civic Center Plaza to an appearance as close as possible to its beautiful, original historic design of 1912. Proposition B also will provide improved street lighting for pedestrian safety in the Civic Center Plaza area and improve Van Ness Avenue between City Hall, the Opera House and Veterans Building.

Proposition B will provide us with a great new pedestrian space to go along with the great new library, will restore beauty and history to what was once the central jewel of our Civic Center and bring lighting and improved safety for everybody who uses our Civic Center facilities after dark.

Please join us in voting Yes on B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSER'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Sure, it would be nice to improve Golden Gate Park and to re-build Civic Center in accordance with the original 1912 plan. These things would be nice . . .

And it would also be nice if each of us taxpayers could afford a new BMW, a new swimming pool, a new yacht, a new stereo system, new jewelry, new clothes . . .

But we all have to live within our means! This should include the City!

Right now the City is projected to end this fiscal year with a budget deficit of over $150 MILLION!

Since 1986, the City has authorized some ONE HALF BILLION DOLLARS worth of bonds!

To top it off, we’re in the middle of a recession!

Is this any time to approve the over $100 MILLION worth of new bonds proposed in Propositions “A,” “B,” “C,” and “D”?

Let us put the question another way: Would you borrow $15,000 to buy a new car, build a new swimming pool, or purchase jewelry if you were more than $15,000 short of funds to pay your regular monthly bills?

Of course not!

Then why should the City borrow over $100 MILLION to refurbish parks, when it’s $150 MILLION short of funds to pay this year’s bills?

Remember, that’s how New York City spent itself into receivership!

VOTE NO ON THE $100 MILLION WORTH OF BONDS!

VOTE “NO” ON “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committeemember
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

VOTE “NO” ON MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY!
This year the City has a budget deficit of $100 or more. With a recession, and the free-spending habits of the current Board of Supervisors, we can only expect greater shortfalls in future years!

But does that stop the politicians at City Hall? No way! Despite the $100 million budget shortfall, the spendthrift Supervisors are asking you to add to the City’s debt by passing tens of millions of dollars worth of new bonds.

About twenty years ago the politicians in a place called New York City followed a similar policy of issuing new bonds on top of budget deficits. And, as they say, the rest is history!

San Francisco deserves better! It needs a chance to eliminate staggering budget deficits by cutting out the fat in City government before it incurs more bonded indebtedness.

Improvements to Golden Gate Park, and the Civic Center, might be nice amenities, but it would be foolish fiscal policy to mortgage the City’s future for such luxuries during the middle of a recession.

To pass new bond issues for such items at this time would be the equivalent of a person who had just received a lay-off notice to borrow money to build a new deck and swimming pool! It is a sure ticket to bankruptcy court!

Before they ask the voters to issue new bonds during a recession, the Supervisors should draw straws to decide which one of them will sign the Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition for the City when the bottom falls out of the barrel!!

STOP THE BOND SWINDLE! PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY! VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITIONS “A”, “B”, “C” AND “D”!!

COMMITTEE TO PREVENT MUNICIPAL BANKRUPTCY
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committee member
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committee member
Robert Silvestri, Republican County Committee member

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

There is only one statement in the arguments against Propositions A and B which makes sense and with which we can agree. It is that “San Francisco deserves better”.

“San Francisco deserves better” protection against the further deterioration of Golden Gate Park.

“San Francisco deserves better” assurances that public open spaces which have been handed to us from past generations be preserved and enhanced so that we, and future generations, can continue to use and enjoy Golden Gate Park and Civic Center Plaza. That is what Propositions A and B would accomplish.

The opponents’ statement that San Francisco has a “budget deficit” is a fiction. The fact is that the current year’s budget is balanced. Future budgets will also be balanced as provided by law. The fact is that Propositions A and B have nothing to do with balancing budgets.

The opponents are trying to scare you into voting against what they agree are “nice amenities” by a phony comparison to New York which issued bonds for operating deficits. We are proposing bonds for long term capital improvements.

Propositions A and B are necessary investments in our future, investments which will not increase annual operating costs but may decrease them. Propositions A and B are prudent proposals which will protect our heritage open spaces and assure their continued use and enjoyment by all San Franciscans.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS A AND B.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achenberg, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Migden, Shelley and Ward.

Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Britt, Kennedy and Maher.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

The North Of Market neighborhood supports the Civic Center Bonds.

The proposed Civic Center Plaza would be a more usable and friendly park for all San Franciscans. The Fulton Street pedestrian mall will add needed open space. New landscaping and improved lighting throughout the Civic Center area will greatly improve safety. The 4,000 children of the Tenderloin as well as children citywide need access to the children’s play structures that are part of these plans.

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a critical resource for our neighborhood, serving thousands of seniors, children, families and other residents. Yet parking for the market has rapidly disappeared to new developments. The expanded Civic Center garage will replace some of what we lost and provide needed replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks. Without this parking, the future of the Farmer’s Market is in jeopardy.

Please vote Yes on B, C and D! Make San Francisco and the Civic Center a better place to live!

Tenderloin Youth Advocates
Bay Area Women’s Resource Center
North of Market Planning Coalition
Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement
Reality House West
Tenderloin Network of Family Services

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition B.
As Mayor, I am committed to improving public safety, ensuring proper maintenance of our civic facilities and enhancing opportunities for open space. Proposition B will help us accomplish these goals in the Civic Center area.
Proposition B is a modest investment that will pay back rich rewards in increased public safety and civic pride.

VOTE YES ON B.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Proposition B is key to the plans for the new Main Library that will be built in the Civic Center.
Proposition B will improve landscaping, pedestrian access and lighting to make the new library safer and more accessible.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Coulter
President, Library Commission

Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation

Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library

Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner

Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner

Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner

Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner

Your Yes vote on Proposition B will restore the Civic Center Plaza and City Hall area to its original design. New fountains, malls, lighting and landscaping will compliment construction of the new main library and Asian Art Museum.

Propositions C and D also deserve your support. A new heating system for Civic Center buildings will save taxpayers $750,000 a year in operating expenses. The expanded garage will relieve parking congestion in adjacent neighborhoods.

Please vote Yes on Propositions B, C and D. Restore our Civic Center.

Donald D. Doyle
President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

San Francisco's Civic Center, which should symbolize our city's beauty and vibrancy, is suffering from poor design and neglect. Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to its original magnificent design, with enhanced landscaping and more useable open space.

Proposition B will also upgrade lighting throughout the Civic Center, helping to create a safer neighborhood for patrons of performing arts companies and nearby businesses.

Please join us in voting YES ON B, C and D for a Civic Center we all can be proud of again.

Charlotte Mailliard Swig  
President, War Memorial Board

Thomas Horn  
Vice President, War Memorial Board

Thelma Shelley  
Managing Director, War Memorial

Nancy Bechtle  
President, San Francisco Symphony

Joyce Moffatt  
Vice President and General Manager, San Francisco Ballet

John Lane  
Director, Museum of Modern Art

Reid Dennis  
Chairman of the Board, San Francisco Opera

---

Proposition B will make San Francisco's Civic Center greener, safer and more attractive. With Proposition B, the Civic Center will finally have a plaza that reflects our city's traditions and quality of life.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition B.

Louise Renne  
City Attorney

Arlo Smith  
District Attorney

Milton Marks  
State Senator

Willie L. Brown, Jr.  
Assembly Speaker

---

As Mayor, I decided that we needed to bring together diverse interests to create a plan for Civic Center. This plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors in 1987. The plan proposes to complete a vision for Civic Center and, in the process, solve a number of needs in the heart of The City. The plan for Civic Center recommended the construction of a new Main Library, to move the Asian Art Museum into the present Main Library, to solve our office space and court house needs in a cost saving manner and to restore our grand Civic Center in keeping with the great vision of our civic leaders in the early years of the century. San Franciscans have consistently supported the plan since I proposed it in 1987. The first stage — the new Main Library — was overwhelming approved by the voters and is now underway. Realizing the dream for Civic Center will take many years, but we are on track.

The next critical stage is before us this ballot. Proposition B restores part of the greatness of San Francisco's heritage and our status as a world class city. Restoring Civic Center plaza and expanding its role in our cultural life is an important legacy to leave to future generations.

We have the chance to keep the dream alive by voting for Proposition B — the restoration of Civic Center. The entire ballot package of Propositions B, C and D are vital for the future of the Civic Center. To save money, we must pass these propositions now. I urge you to vote for all three on June 2.

Dianne Feinstein  
Mayor of San Francisco (1978-1988)

---
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Civic Center Plaza Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

Proposition B will restore the Civic Center to the beauty of its original design, providing an appropriate environment for our grand public buildings.

Proposition B will enhance open space and will improve public safety by upgrading lighting throughout the neighborhood.

Along with Propositions C and D, Proposition B will provide a Civic Center that meets our city’s needs and reflects its spirit.

We urge you to vote YES on Proposition B.

Genevieve Spiegel, Chair, Asian Art Museum Foundation
Alice Lowe, Chair, Asian Art Commission
Rand Castle, Director, Asian Art Museum

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition B.

Proposition B will provide needed construction jobs while creating a safer, more functional and more attractive Civic Center for all San Franciscans.

Vote YES on B.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote no on Proposition B. While all four bond Propositions, A, B, C, and D, should be defeated, Proposition B is the stupidest one of all.

According the the Controller’s statement of cost, Prop B is a $26,700,000 bond measure with $18,823,500 in bond interest for a whopping total of $45,523,500.

For what? To redesign Civic Center Plaza in accordance with the original 1912 designs. GIVE US A BREAK.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Prop B is obscene.

Send the Board of Supervisors your message and remind the Mayor of his campaign pledge not to raise taxes.

Prop B is an unbelievable Bummer that you are going to pay for. It will be paid for by increasing property taxes. That means an increase in your tax bill if you own property. It means higher rents if you are a renter.

If you are tired of higher taxes Vote No on Propositions A, B, C, and D. Beware of this one.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Vote NO on Proposition B

Have you spent any time walking around Civic Center Plaza lately? Probably not. The area is filthy and overrun with drunks and panhandlers. Yet the city wants property owners to finance a $26.7 million bond measure (Proposition B) for a redesign of the plaza. For whose benefit? Certainly not yours or ours.

Let’s get our priorities straight. Clean up Civic Center Plaza first, then give consideration to redesigning it. This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition B.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

There is no Civic Center Plan, so why should we sign a blank check.

A pretty picture is not a guarantee.

Without a plan, we have no guarantee that the Farmer’s Market will be allowed to remain in Civic Center, much less expand. We have no guarantee that real needs such as a children’s playground, and a safe pedestrian environment will be provided. We are being asked to spend 26.7 million dollars, asked to give up 90 convenient parking spaces asked to share Hyde Street with Brooks Hall’s delivery trucks.

What are we getting in exchange, and why the big rush? Let’s see a plan before we spend the money, Vote NO on B

San Francisco Tomorrow

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PROPOSITION C

CIVIC CENTER PARKING GARAGE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000 to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage or construction of a parking garage adjacent thereto, including asbestos abatement and providing access for the disabled.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is a parking garage located under Civic Center Plaza. This garage is used by persons working in or visiting City Hall, the Main Library and other nearby facilities. A new Main Library will be built in Civic Center during the next 5 years, which will eliminate more than 100 parking spaces. The building where the old Main Library is now located will be used for another purpose. Because of these changes, the City expects that the demand for parking spaces will increase.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to increase the size of the Civic Center Plaza parking garage or to build an adjoining parking garage. Some of the money would be used to provide better access for disabled persons and to remove or reduce the danger of asbestos in the parking garage.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $24,000,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for these changes to the Civic Center Plaza parking garage.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates, I estimate the approximate costs to be:

- Bond redemption $24,000,000
- Bond interest 16,920,500
- Debt service requirement 40,920,500

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $2,048,000 which amount is equivalent to forty hundredths cents ($0.0040) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $10.00. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will cure parking headaches in the Civic Center area.

Presently, parking is totally inadequate for San Franciscans who use the Library, City Hall, the Health Department, Federal and State offices, the Performing Arts complex, or the Farmers Market. Conditions could get worse in the years ahead.

Proposition C will alleviate this dire situation. It will replace approximately 300 parking spaces which will be lost when the great new library is built on an existing parking lot at Marshall Square. It will also provide additional parking to accommodate the increased patronage expected from the new library and the anticipated reuse of the old library building.

Proposition C will significantly benefit the adjacent residential and shopping areas by keeping large numbers of motorists from circling around in a vain search for temporary parking.

Building parking underground, as provided by Proposition C, is more expensive than building surface lots; but there is no surface location available in Civic Center. Significant cost savings can be realized by building the parking underground at the same time as surface construction of the new library and Civic Center beautification. Such savings will occur only if we act now.

The need for the parking is indisputable, the time to build the garage in now.

Please vote YES on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Ayes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Alioto, Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Migden and Shelley.

Absent: Supervisors Britt, Maher and Ward.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will NOT “cure parking headaches” in the Civic Center area. It will increase the City’s bond debt, interest costs, and taxes. It will create more parking, and facilitate more driving when regional and state air quality plans call for less. It does go counter to the City’s Transit First policy.

Civic Center is not a remote location and already has excellent transit access. Muni service should be maintained and expanded, so that more Main Library and Civic Center users could avoid driving and take transit there.

It is false to argue that you can build your way out of congestion — when more parking exists, more people have an incentive to drive and search for spaces. Demand then multiplies. Instead, sensible alternatives must be pursued.

What’s more, parking garages make money. That money should cover construction costs, and if they can’t, the garage shouldn’t be built. We believe the City’s General Fund is at risk — with shrinking revenues and increasing needs, this project would further divert funds from libraries, parks, and other services to build more parking. Parking shouldn’t be subsidized by all taxpayers — it should be paid for by users. Vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C

The proposed expansion of the Civic Center Parking Garage is unnecessary and the proposed financing scheme is inappropriate. Civic Center has excellent pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access, and already has excess parking, including several privately-owned garages within 2 blocks of the new Library. Reducing monthly parking in the Civic Center and nearby Performing Arts Garages should make sufficient short-term parking available. Increasing parking in the Civic Center area would go counter to San Francisco’s Transit First policy, attract more cars, congest the roads, and worsen air pollution. Finally, General Obligation Bonds risk the City's general fund. Other garages have used revenue bonds paid off with parking revenues. Passage of this Bond Act would set a dangerous precedent and is unnecessary. We urge you to vote NO on Proposition C.

Citizens Against Civic Center Garage Bonds

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

We wish that we could agree with the opponent's statement that the Civic Center area “has excess parking”. Any San Franciscan who has to drive to do business in the Civic Center by day or to attend Civic Center area events in the evening knows that there is no such thing as “excess parking”. Parking is very difficult to find at any time of the day or night.

The Environmental Impact Report adopted by the Planning Commission for the new Main Library confirms the shortage of parking as will the residents of the adjacent residential neighborhoods who are tired of being the victims of our failure to provide adequate parking in the Civic Center area itself.

The opponents are sadly confused about the proposed method of financing because General Obligation Bonds do not in any way “risk the City’s General Fund”. There is no “risk” because the debt service for these bonds does not impact other City revenues.

If we are ever going to provide more underground parking to help Civic Center and the adjacent neighborhoods the time is NOW — in conjunction with the other hoped for improvements in the area.

This project is needed for San Franciscans who will need to use the Federal, State, and Municipal Office Buildings in Civic Center or want to use the Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Museums, Performing Arts spaces or open spaces in the area.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Proposition C will construct replacement parking for some 300 spaces lost when the New Library is built and Fulton Street is transformed into a pedestrian Mall. Civic Center upgrading shouldn’t be at the expense of the Farmer’s Market, the Tenderloin neighborhood or cultural activities.

Farmer’s trucks need to be parked during the day. This garage provides parking for them. Unless the garage is expanded, there will be a dramatic drop in available parking at the same time that we are building a new library and adding a new museum. People coming to the Civic Center auditorium or the Orpheum Theatre will look for parking in nearby neighborhoods. Or, civic center cultural attendance will drop off.

This is a realistic solution for the real world. People DO drive to evening activities. Farmer’s trucks NEED parking.

Please vote YES ON PROP C.

Sue Bieman
Doug Engmann
Jim Morales
Sue Hestor
Kelly Cullen

This bond offers San Francisco voters an opportunity to share in the vision for a great civic place at the heart of a great city! Parking has and always will be an important ingredient to the quality of life in cities. This bond provides for replacement parking in an area that needs it most. Allow the City to properly plan for and complete the Civic Center!

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITIONS B, C AND D!

Approval of the Civic Center bond package is a positive civic step toward the next century! Keep San Francisco great, make Civic Center a viable public place!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

The Farmer’s Market at Civic Center brings nutritious affordable produce to thousands of San Franciscans. The expanded Civic Center garage will provide needed parking for the public and for the farmers’ trucks, allowing the market to continue. Open every Wednesday and Sunday, we are a vital part of the life in the “Heart of the City”.

Please vote Yes on Prop C.

Heart of the City Farmer’s Market

The Civic Center Farmer’s Market is a much needed source of fresh produce for thousands of low-income San Franciscans in the central city. The expanded Civic Center garage insures the future of this market by providing nearby replacement parking for the farmers’ trucks which bring food to the market.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C.

St. Anthony Foundation

Proposition C is vital to our plans for a world class new Main Library.

Proposition C will not only replace parking that will be lost by construction of the new library, but it will also provide needed parking for patrons of other public buildings and neighborhood businesses.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Steve Cowler
President, Library Commission
Marjorie Stern
President, Library Foundation
Mary Louise Stong
Board Member, Friends of the Library
Ellen Ramsey Sanger
Library Commissioner
Jean Kalil
Library Commissioner
Dale Carlson
Library Commissioner
Lonnie Chin
Library Commissioner
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Everyone who lives, works or plays in the Civic Center neighborhood knows the frustration of trying to find a parking space almost any time of the day or night.

Unless we act now, parking will get even scarcer when the new Library is built, the Asian Art Museum moves to the old library building and the State Building re-opens.

Proposition C is a cost-effective, environmentally-sensitive solution to the parking nightmare in the Civic Center.

Proposition C will expand the Civic Center Garage — underground and out of sight of the renovated Civic Center Plaza. By building the garage now, we can take advantage of significant cost savings by coordinating construction with other Civic Center building.

Vote YES on Propositions B, C and D.

Chip Conley
Hotel Owner
David Hurd
General Manager, George Coates Performance Works
Gary Cooke
Restaurant Manager
Larry Broughton
Hotel Director of Operations

The working men and women of the San Francisco Labor Council support Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide needed construction jobs while improving parking for everyone who uses the Civic Center.

Vote YES on C.

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL
Walter Johnson, Secretary-Treasurer

Proposition C will provide the additional parking that is desperately needed in the Civic Center neighborhood — at a cost we can afford.

Approving Proposition C now will save taxpayers' funds by allowing the city to coordinate construction of underground parking with the construction of the new library and Civic Center improvements.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition C.

Milton Marks
State Senator
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Please join me in voting YES on Proposition C.

Proposition C will provide parking that is vitally needed by all San Franciscans who patronize the public facilities, performing arts groups and neighborhood businesses in the Civic Center.

It makes good economic sense to expand the underground Civic Center Garage now in conjunction with above-ground construction of the new Main Library and Civic Center Plaza. We can only achieve cost savings if we approve Proposition C in this election.

VOTE YES ON C.

Mayor Frank Jordan

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Vote NO on Proposition C

How much is a parking stall worth? The city says about $65,000. That’s why it wants property owners to pay $24 million to expand Civic Center Garage by 370 stalls.

Can’t you think of a better way to spend $24 million than by providing more parking at Civic Center? This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition C.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

This measure, together with Propositions A, B and D, contains enormous fiscal implications for San Franciscans who pay property taxes.

We’re here asked to “incur a bonded indebtedness of $24,000,000, the estimated cost of construction, to pay for the enlargement of the Civic Center Parking Garage” to accommodate 370 additional spaces or the construction of an adjacent garage. In addition, San Franciscans will be obligated to repay bondholders $16,920,500 in interest over a 20-year period.

Since 1986 San Francisco voters have approved the sale of $753,300,000 in bonds for numerous projects. But city administrators have sold less than half, $362,700,000. With four additional bond issues on this ballot, voters are beseeched to approve another $148,220,000 in indebtedness. The interest on $510,920,000, the total outstanding, is truly staggering. Some members of the Board of Supervisors are either naive or purposely deceptive to proclaim that we can afford to finance any additional debt. The proponents of the measure are not shy about putting us further in debt.

Neither are they shy about Proposition C’s high cost. The Board of Supervisors budget analyst calculates that each parking space will cost $53,076.00. The cost will be borne by property owners whose average tax bill will increase by $9.96 each year for 20 years. And that’s just for the garage — it doesn’t include the costs of the other three projects.

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISOR’S BUDGET ANALYST RECOMMENDED AGAINST THE GARAGE ADDITION. VOTE NO ON THIS BOONDOGGLE!

PROPOSITION C IS AN UNNECESSARY AND COSTLY BOONDOGGLE

At the last possible moment, The Board of Supervisors hastily approved the placement on the ballot of Proposition C, a $24,000,000 Civic Center garage expansion. With an additional $16,920,500 in interest, the proposal totals a whopping $40,920,000.

Yet none of the Board’s esteemed members can state that such construction is necessary or even desirable. In fact, the Board’s decision was made without considering the effect of increased Muni service, transit incentives or a parking fee hike on current patronage at the garage.

Don’t we deserve better than hasty decisions formulated at the last possible moment? Why should San Franciscans pay more than $53,000 per space for a “white elephant”? Why should our property taxes be increased almost $10.00 per year for the next 20 years to pay for a garage. Even the Board’s budget analyst advised that he could not recommend the approval of $40,920,000 in bonded indebtedness because proponents failed to even cursorily evaluate alternatives to expensive construction.

What happened to San Francisco’s Transit First policy? Without much thought, the Board abandoned the clear preference of the city’s residents and voted in favor of raw expediency and fiscal irresponsibility.

Let’s not be hasty. If Propositions B and D pass, the Board, after performing a scrupulously rigorous analysis, can still place Proposition C on the November 1992 ballot. Let’s logically decide if we really need 370 more parking spaces and if the city can afford to increase its indebtedness by more than $40,000,000.

VOTE NO ON THIS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE PROPOSAL

State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President
San Francisco Taxpayers Association

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
Quentin L. Kopp
Dan Dunnigan
Cheryl Arenson
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Civic Center Garage Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION C

San Francisco’s revenues are decreasing because of the recession and new revenue sources appear unlikely. Why squander scarce General Fund money on a questionable project like this? Vote NO on Proposition C.

David Pilpel
Norman Rolfe

Civic Center Garage Expansion is undesirable and unnecessary. The area is well served by public transportation. We should not encourage people to increase congestion and pollution by driving there.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION C!

San Francisco Tomorrow

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

You can vote absentee in person at Room 158 in City Hall starting Monday, May 4, through Tuesday, June 2, during regular working hours — 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Take advantage of this option if you will not be able to go to your polling place on election day.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
**TURN YOUR GARBAGE INTO GOLD**

Compost your coffee grounds, banana peels, other kitchen scraps and yard wastes into a rich soil amendment for your plants!

**Free Hands-on Composting Workshops by S F League of Urban Gardeners (SLUG)**

| Where: Garden for the Environment (Sunset District, 7th & Lawton) |
| Cost: Free |
| Time: Following Saturday Mornings 10 am to 12 noon |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Workshop Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Workshop Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 7</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Sept 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 28</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>June 27</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>Sept 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>July 18</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 25</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Oct 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Aug 1</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Nov 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Aug 22</td>
<td>Worm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLUG Compost Rottine-466-0262 • Recycling Hotline-554-6193

Sponsored by a grant from The San Francisco Recycling Program.

---

**Find Yourself a Best Friend**

The San Francisco Animal Care and Control Department has a wide variety of animals that need good homes. Come down and see us and find yourself a best friend.

Open seven days a week for adoptions, 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., 1200 15th Street at Harrison.

554-6364

Animal Care & Control
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PROPOSITION D
CIVIC CENTER HEATING SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1992. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $21,220,000 to pay the cost of construction or reconstruction of a heating system within the Civic Center area including pipelines and hot water boiler system.

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The central steam heating system for City Hall and six other buildings in the Civic Center area was built in 1915. This system often breaks down and needs major repairs.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds. The money would be used to replace the steam heating system with a hot water system. The new system would be more efficient and less costly to operate. Under the current plans, the new system would provide heat to three more buildings.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to allow the City to borrow $21,220,000 by issuing general obligation bonds to pay for replacing the Civic Center heating system.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to issue general obligation bonds for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “D”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

In my opinion, should the proposed bond issue be authorized and bonds issued at current interest rates I estimate the approximate costs to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$21,220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>14,960,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service</td>
<td>36,180,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a single bond sale and level redemption schedules, the average annual debt requirement for twenty (20) years would be approximately $1,809,005 which amount is equivalent to thirty-five hundredths cents ($0.0035) in the current tax rate. The increase in annual tax for the owner of a home with a net assessed value of $250,000 would amount to approximately $8.75. It should be noted, however, that the City typically does not issue all authorized bonds at one time; if these bonds are issued over several years, the actual effect on the tax rate may be somewhat less than the maximum amount shown herein.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:
ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
THE FULL TEXT OF BOND MEASURES A, B, C & D BEGINS ON PAGE 41.
PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D
A YES ON D VOTE IS A VOTE FOR ECONOMY AND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

Proposition D will replace our now 80 year old Civic Center heating system with a new, energy efficient heating system. The old system installed in 1912 was supposed to last for forty years. Eighty years later it is still in place, but it is completely worn out and no longer economically feasible to operate or maintain. This old system requires constant oversight when in operation and requires continuous repair. On top of that, it uses far more energy than it should for precious little result.

Your Yes on D vote will allow us to replace this expensive and inefficient system with a new heating system for the old Main Library, new Main Library, Civic Auditorium, Health Department, City Hall, Opera House and Veterans Building.

Best of all, it will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs and will be environmentally more desirable.

Vote Yes on D to save money and to save energy.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Kennedy and Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSED'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

In his argument in favor of Prop D, the Mayor would have you believe that taxing and spending $36,180,100 should be an expected and accepted way for the City to fund a new boiler system for Civic Center buildings. He goes on to argue that by approving this bond measure tax payers will save $750,000 annually in operating and maintenance costs.

No where in the ballot argument or Voter Information Handbook does it specify exactly what the public is purchasing or breaks down the costs associated with this proposal. No bids are presented. No descriptive language other than “a hot water system.”

For years the City has neglected to do basic maintenance work on its heating system and now when the situation is beyond salvaging, they expect the taxpayers to commit more than $36 million dollars as some act of faith. The public deserves better.

At some point in time the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors have to be accountable for the money they appropriate from taxpayers. You can be sure that if Proposition D is approved every dime of the more than $36 million dollars will be spent. That is the way governmental bureaucracies work.

Taxpayers have a right to know what they are buying and the real cost associated with the purchase. Prop D is a Dumb and insulting way of doing business.

Vote No on Prop D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Oponent's Argument Against Proposition D

$21,220,000 for a new boiler for City Hall? You gotta be kidding! This bond — increase in property taxes — was placed on the ballot by our Board of Supervisors. If truth be known, they generate enough hot air to heat any of our City's great neighborhoods with no increase in taxes.

Prop D stands for Dumb. The City Controller estimates the approximate cost of this new heating system to be $21,220,000 in bonds, $14,960,100 in bond interest for a grand total of $36,180,100.

This is one for The Guiness Book of World Records. Perhaps the most expensive heating system in the world which could join sourdough bread as a true San Francisco original.

Enough hot air out of City Hall. Don't raise your property taxes or rents for this boondoggle.

Only in San Francisco would our big spending politicians want to raise taxes in the midst of a recession when the city is facing a $150 million dollar budget deficit and potential lay-offs.

Vote no on Propositions A, B, C, and D.

James Slaughter
Treasurer, Property Owners Against Excessive Taxation

Rebuttal to Opponent's Argument Against Proposition D

The opponents of Proposition D have got it wrong.

Proposition D will save the City significant annual operating costs (estimated at $750,000 per year) by replacing an 80 year old, energy inefficient, manually operated and expensive to maintain heating system for all the various Civic Center Municipal Buildings with a modern, energy efficient, operationally cheaper system. Proposition D will decrease the City operating budget for energy, not worsen the City's budget problems as the opponents claim.

The opponents would have you believe that now is not the "right" time for Proposition D. They are wrong. It is precisely when one needs to save money on day to day costs that one has to make the long term capital investments which will reduce the cost of doing business. Any prudent business owner will know that. Government is no different.

What is "dumb" is not Proposition D. What's dumb is to be penny wise and pound foolish. Don't fall into that trap.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.


Absent: Supervisors Alioto, Kennedy and Maher.
Civic Center Heating System Bonds

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION D!
The existing steam plant and heating system is beyond repair. Replacement will save San Francisco $750,000 annually.

ELIMINATE COSTLY MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS!
Vote YES! to avoid inevitable and costly emergency repairs of the worn out existing system!

SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association)
James Fussell, Executive Director

Proposition D will replace the Civic Center’s antiquated, wasteful steam heating plant with a modern, energy-efficient system.

By passing Proposition D, we will save an estimated $750,000 in energy costs every year.

Proposition D makes financial and environmental sense. Join us in voting YES on Proposition D.

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louise Renne
City Attorney
Arlo Smith
District Attorney
Milton Marks
State Senator
Willie L. Brown Jr.
Assembly Speaker

Mayor Frank Jordan

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION D

The issue with Prop D is whether $36,180,100 is the best price for purchasing a new boiler to heat our Civic Center buildings.
San Francisco’s Taxpayers Association believes the old and inefficient current system should be replaced. It must, however, be replaced with a cost and energy efficient system that’s consistent with financial and ecological responsibility.

The public, which will pay for this purchase by increasing property taxes, has the right to know exactly what it is buying. The public also has a right to be certain that the price of the system is the most competitive price available. San Francisco Taxpayers Association consulted a recognized boiler contractor. His opinion is that the price should be considerably less. This bond amount is exorbitant and inflated.

VOTE NO ON D.

For too long politicians have asked for blank checks or enormous commitments of public money for projects like this which could have been done less expensively and more efficiently.

Prop D is more than a lot of hot air. It is the wrong way to conduct public business.

Send the spenders your message. Vote No on Proposition D.

San Francisco Taxpayers Association
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp, Vice-President

Vote NO on Proposition D

The city has a plan to reduce its operating expenses. Spend money! Proposition D provides for the issuance of a $21.22 million bond measure for a “new” hot water heating system at Civic Center.

Other bond measures on the June ballot total $128.7 million. And the city is planning a $500 million bond measure for the November ballot. All to be financed by increased property taxes. When is it going to end?

This Election Day, send a message to City Hall. Vote NO on Proposition D.

San Francisco Home Owners Council

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Infrastructure Fund

PROPOSITION E

Shall the City be required to set aside a certain percentage of its General Fund each year for 12 years (1993-2005) to be used solely to pay for certain types of capital projects, such as the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties?

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City spending for capital projects is set each year through the budget process. As used here, "capital projects" includes the construction, maintenance and purchase of City buildings and other public properties such as playgrounds and parks. The City is not required to set aside a particular amount of money for capital projects.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E is a charter amendment. For 12 years the City would be required to set aside a certain amount of its General Fund for capital projects. In the first year (1993-94), the amount would be 1.5% of the General Fund. The next year, the amount would be 2.0%. For the next nine years, the amount would be 2.5% of the General Fund. For the last year (2004-05), the amount would be 1.5%. The City could spend the money set aside under this measure only for capital projects.

In 1993-94, at least 62% of the capital projects money would have to be used for maintaining City facilities. In fiscal year 1994-95, this amount would be 41%, and in 1995-96, 31%. The Board of Supervisors could change these spending requirements by a 2/3 vote. In the following years, there would be no required minimum percentage for maintenance.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to require that a certain amount of the General Fund be set aside to pay for capital projects.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to set aside money for this purpose.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would reallocate funds from current city services to expand funding for facilities maintenance and capital improvement projects.

To the extent general fund regular revenues would be shifted to the infrastructure program, other current City spending would have to be curtailed or new revenues found to support these continuing expenditures.

For the period 1993-94 through 2004-05, I estimate funds in the following amounts would be allocated to the infrastructure program by this measure: approximately $17.2 million in 1993-94, $24.0 million in 1994-95, and $31.3 million in 1995-96, increasing thereafter at the rate general fund revenues increase until 2004-05.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 to place Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

YES: Supervisors Gonzalez, Hallinan, Hsieh, Kennedy, Maher and Shelley.

NO: Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.
PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Proposition E makes sense because it protects your investment in the parks, libraries, police stations, fire stations, health centers and other facilities which we, the citizens of San Francisco, own.

Proposition E makes sense because it sets aside up to 2.5 percent of the City's General Fund each year specifically to maintain and to make safe the buildings and facilities that serve San Francisco.

Proposition E makes sense because it is cheaper to properly maintain, repair and keep these buildings in good operating order rather than let them to deteriorate and have to replace them later at a much greater cost.

Proposition E makes sense because the services you pay for — when you use a branch library, a recreation facility, a health center — are not properly provided in a building that is falling apart.

Proposition E makes sense because those upon whom you may need to depend, the firefighters, the police officers, the health workers or librarians can only serve you properly if the buildings in which they work are maintained and in good repair.

Proposition E makes sense because it does not cost any more money. No new money is involved. Proposition E guarantees that enough of our current general fund revenue is set aside each year to keep the City's buildings and parks in good repair and to catch up with the deferred maintenance which we have allowed to occur in past years.

Proposition E makes sense, it is prudent, it is wise and, in the long run, will save the people of San Francisco big money.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.


Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

Some members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor state with ponderous certitude that our libraries, health centers and parks will fall apart if Proposition E fails. That's clearly an egregious exaggeration, if not outright hyperbole.

If voters wisely defeat Proposition E, funds for capital improvements will be allocated the same way that money for services to AIDS patients, breast cancer victims, senior services, police and fire and library hours are currently distributed: funds are appropriated every year through the budget process. As a matter of fact, our Charter, while forbidding the Board of Supervisors from increasing the Mayor's recommended budget for operational expenses, expressly allows the Board to increase the Mayor's recommended expenditures for capital improvements. Thus, funds for capital improvements already enjoy an advantage not allowed operating expenses. What's wrong with a level playing field for all of our city programs?

Proposition E requires a fixed percentage of general fund revenues for one purpose. Certainly, maintenance of public facilities is necessary, but E is yet another straightjacketing of our elected officials' power to respond annually to priorities in city services. Reserving one portion of revenues for just one purpose means that San Francisco's other critical projects must compete for an even smaller pot of money. That's not good government.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E!

Kopp's Good Government Committee

By Cheryl Arenson

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

To earmark or not to earmark was the critical question voters debated respecting Proposition J, the so-called Children’s Amendment. As many San Franciscans predicted, Proposition J continued an unfortunate trend in budgeting for San Franciscans’ needs.

This time we’re asked to approve a Charter Amendment reserving from 1.5% to 2.5% of General Fund revenues for capital projects. The amendment would become effective in FY 1993-1994 and conclude in 2004-2005.

How can we tell seniors, patients at San Francisco General and Laguna Honda Hospitals, and library users we can no longer fund these critical programs because we have chosen, instead, to purchase lawn mowers?

As you can see, Proposition E ensures a funding source for capital improvements but leaves the financing of health care, public libraries and senior services to the vagaries of the annual appropriations process of the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

How can the present Board of Supervisors predict 12 years into the future to determine what San Franciscans will need or desire? Their crystal ball must certainly be cloudless and, unbeknownst to most other San Franciscans, the supervisors must be all-knowing. Do you believe that? We don’t!

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION E — IT’S A BUDGETING SHAM AND BAD GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!

Kopp’s Good Government Committee
By Cheryl Arenson

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

Most of us properly maintain our cars and homes. We replace major components when they are worn out. We know that if we do not do so promptly, a much more expensive major repair or replacement will come along later. We call that being smart, being prudent.

Yet, San Francisco has long been deferring maintenance of public facilities and postponed dealing with failing components such as roofs, plumbing or electrical systems in need of replacement or repair.

Proposition “E” requires that for ten years, a small percentage, never exceeding 2.5%, of the general fund budget be provided to maintain and catch up on the deferred maintenance of our public buildings and parks. We believe that re-investing 2.5% of our taxes for the maintenance and repair of taxpayer’s assets is being smart and being prudent. It is no less than what each of you would do.

The opponents have not done their homework. Otherwise they would know that Proposition “E” deals not with “lawnmowers” as they claim but with infrastructure. They claim that Proposition “E” would compete with health care, libraries or senior services. We believe voters are smarter than to fall for that. San Franciscans know that they cannot be served in a health center which is closed because the roof leaks, in a library without working bathrooms or a senior center with a nonworking electrical system. Proposition “E” is designed to make sure that this will no longer be a real threat.

Vote Yes on Proposition E

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Noes: Supervisors Achtenberg, Britt, Migden and Ward.
PAID ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E

The nirvana of special interests is grabbing a chunk of our City’s General Fund. Inflexibility doesn’t matter; as long as your special interest seizes a percentage of our treasury, what the heck! All is fair in special interest politics. First (1974) we had the Open Space Fund ripping off millions annually from the treasury of San Francisco; last year the “Children’s Fund” which diverted more millions from the treasury. (And did you observe how the voracious beneficiaries of Proposition J fought over the division of these millions? It was human greed at its “best”.) Now enter Proposition E.

If passed by San Francisco voters, Proposition E amends the Charter to require the City to segregate its General Fund for capital projects. A bare majority of the Board of Supervisors has decided the City’s general fund for that purpose, at the expense of other programs, will best serve the City’s objectives, regardless of varying annual conditions or the vicissitudes of changing circumstances.

All of the City’s other programs such as libraries, health care and senior services will compete for the drastically reduced remainder of General Fund resources leaving less for these critical programs. In more easily understandable terms, Proposition E robs Peter to pay Paul.

In the 1991-1992 budget, $7,400,000 was allocated for capital improvements. If this charter amendment is approved, and 1.5% of the General Fund is set aside for capital improvement projects, the Controller estimates that this amount will be $17,900,000. That means funding for other critical city programs will be reduced by $10,500,000. And the deficit is only exacerbated for 1993-1994 and 11 subsequent years.

PROPOSITION E USES A RAPACIOUS MEAT AXE APPROACH. WE DESERVE BETTER FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. VOTE NO ON E.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
State Senator Quentin L. Kopp
Vice-President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Charter Amendment Adding Section 6.209

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 6.209 relating to annual mandated levels of funds for protection and maintenance of the City's infrastructure.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county of adding Section 6.209 to read as follows:

NOTE: This entire section is new.

6.209 Capital Fund Appropriation

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Charter to the contrary, the Mayor shall place and the Board of Supervisors shall approve in each budget and annual appropriation ordinance, through Fiscal Year 2004-2005 only, an amount (CAPITAL FUNDS) equal to the percentages specified below for the identified years of General Fund Regular Revenue sources.

A. The percentages allocated each year shall be:

- Fiscal Year 1993/1994: 1.5%
- Fiscal Year 1994/1995: 2.0%
- Fiscal Years 1995/1996 through 2003/2004: 2.5%
- Fiscal Year 2004/2005: 1.5%

For the purpose of this section the term "general fund revenue sources" shall be defined to include all revenues, however they may subsequently be identified or classified, of the type that are treated in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992 as Regular Revenue appropriations of the general fund. Not later than September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, the controller shall make available for public distribution a list of all general fund revenue sources and the amounts derived from those sources in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for fiscal year 1991/1992.

Capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be expended solely for the acquisition, maintenance, and construction of real property and improvements thereof belonging to the City and County of San Francisco (CAPITAL PROJECTS) in accordance with the following criteria:

(1) In Fiscal Year 1993/1994, 62% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Year 1994/1995, 41% of the capital funds must be used for maintenance. In Fiscal Years 1995/1996, 31% of capital funds must be used for maintenance. The allocation percentages specified in this paragraph (A) may be changed in any given year by the Board of Supervisors if such change is approved by resolution of the board approved by 2/3 vote addressing solely the question of the change in allocation percentage.

(2) In subsequent years, capital funds may be expended for any capital project selected by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors pursuant to the budgetary and fiscal provisions of this Charter.

The requirements of this section do not limit the authority of the City to appropriate additional funds for capital projects.

Any amounts appropriated pursuant to this section and not expended during the fiscal year shall be carried forward and expended in subsequent fiscal years in accordance with the allocation criteria specified in this section for the year in which the appropriation of the unexpended funds was mandated. Such carried forward funds will not meet any of the City's then current annual general fund capital funding obligation.

The voters intend that capital funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall not supplant or replace the maintenance components of existing departmental operating budgets.
Amending Charter Sections 3.510 and 4.103

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to transfer functions and personnel of County Clerk to the Department of Governmental Services, City and County of San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992 a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 3.510 and 4.103 to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

3.510 Governmental Services, Purchasing, Real Estate, Public Works, Electricity, County Agricultural Department; Coroner’s Office and Convention Facilities Management

The functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of Section 11.102 and Section 3.501 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Governmental Services, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of registrar of voters, recorder, public administrator and such other functions as may be assigned by the chief administrative officer, and shall be administered by the chief administrative officer. Effective July 1, 1992, the functions and personnel of the office of County Clerk shall be transferred to the Department of Governmental Services. The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Controller, and other City officers and agencies are authorized and directed to effectuate the transfer of the functions and personnel authorized by this Charter amendment.

The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange and which shall be in charge of and administered by the director of public works, who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

The director of public works shall appoint a deputy director of public works for operations, a deputy director of public works for engineering, and deputy director of public works for financial management and administration, and an assistant to the director of public works, each of whom shall hold office at the pleasure of said director. The director of public works shall designate a deputy of other employee to perform the duties of city engineer. Said deputy or employee shall possess the same power in the city and county in making surveys, plats and certificates as is or may from time to time be given by law to city engineers and to county surveyors, and his official acts and all plats, surveys and certificates made by him shall have the same validity and be of the same force and effect as are or may be given by law to those of city engineers and county surveyors.

All examinations, plans and estimates required by the supervisors in connection with any public improvements, exclusive of those to be made by the public utilities commission, shall be made by the director of public works, and he shall, when requested to do so, furnish information and data for the use of the supervisors.

The department of public works shall semi-annually notify the tax collector of the amount of each assessment that becomes delinquent and the lot and block number against which such assessment is levied, and it shall be the duty of the tax collector to note such delinquency on each annual tax bill.

Department of Electricity, which shall be administered by a chief of department. The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or telephone system of the city and county paying a fair compensation for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such connection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of electricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon the recommendations of the chief of the department.

Coroner’s office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

Convention Facilities Management Department, which shall include the city and county’s convention facilities, including but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center, and shall consist of a general manager and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The chief administrative officer shall have charge of the department of convention facilities management.

The chief administrative officer shall appoint a general manager of the convention facilities management department who shall hold office at his pleasure. The general manager shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of convention facilities management.

Subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer, the general manager shall have power to alter, repair, manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. All contracts or orders for work to be performed on convention facilities shall be awarded and executed by the general manager with the approval of the chief administrative officer and shall be administered by the general manager.

It shall be the function and duty of the department of convention facilities management to manage, operate and maintain all of the city and county convention facilities, including, but not limited to Brooks Hall, Civic Auditorium and Moscone Center. If in the election of November 6, 1984 two or more propositions amending Section 3.510 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

4.103 Superior Court Appointments

The powers and duties of the superior court are prescribed by state law. The board of supervisors shall provide for the maintenance of the superior court in accordance with the fiscal provisions of this charter.

Effective July 1, 1979, the functions and personnel of the office of county clerk shall be and are hereby placed under the direction of the superior court.

The county clerk shall be appointed by and shall hold office at the pleasure of the superior court, provided however that any person who holds civil service status in the position of county clerk on the date of adoption of this amendment ending this paragraph to the charter shall continue to have civil service status to said position under the civil service provisions of the charter.
PROPOSITION F
Shall the duties and personnel of the County Clerk be transferred from the Clerk of the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services, under the supervision of the Chief Administrative Officer?

YES  NO

**Analysis**
by Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court also performs the duties of the County Clerk in San Francisco. These duties include registering business names and issuing marriage licenses, among other responsibilities. Six employees within the Superior Court Clerk’s office now perform County Clerk duties.

The Department of Governmental Services includes the offices of the Recorder, the Public Administrator and the Registrar of Voters. The Chief Administrative Officer supervises this department.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition F is a charter amendment. It would transfer the duties and personnel of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

**A “YES” VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to transfer the duties of the County Clerk from the Superior Court to the Department of Governmental Services.

**A “NO” VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want the Clerk of the Superior Court to continue to perform these duties.

---

**Controller's Statement on “F”**
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that the organization and structure of the Chief Administrator’s Office is not modified.

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “F”**
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION F IS ON PAGE 66.
PROPOSITION'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION "F"
Proposition "F" makes sense because: A combined Clerk-Recorder's Office is consistent with the practices of the rest of the State when the Courts separate Clerk of the Court and County Clerk functions.

The Proposition will place both the Clerk's and Recorder's Offices with their related duties under a single authority, the Chief Administrative Officer. This change will transfer six employees from the County Clerk's Office to the County Recorder's Office.

The Proposition will consolidate the offices of County Clerk and County Recorder which will align related duties without an increase in cost to the City and County of San Francisco.

The Proposition is consistent with the Superior Court Resolution asking the City and County of San Francisco to take over the County Clerk functions from the Courts.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

No Opponent's Argument Was Submitted Against Proposition F
No Rebuttals Were Submitted On Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition F
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition F

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Chief Zoo Veterinarian be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department, subject to the approval of the Recreation and Park Commission, rather than under civil service rules?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Recreation and Park Commission appoints a General Manager to oversee and manage the Recreation and Park Department. With the approval of the Commission, the General Manager can hire and fire five upper management employees at his/her discretion. All other Recreation and Park employees, including the Chief Zoo Veterinarian, are hired and fired under the civil service system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G is a charter amendment. Under Proposition G, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would no longer be hired or fired under the civil service system. Instead, the Chief Zoo Veterinarian would serve at the discretion of the General Manager, with the approval of the Recreation and Parks Commission.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to serve at the discretion of the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Chief Zoo Veterinarian to continue to be hired and fired under the civil service system.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:
Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not increase the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
Chief Zoo Veterinarian

PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Proposition G would make the Chief Veterinary position at the zoo civil service exempt. This would allow the zoo staff to select the very best candidate nationally.

Presently this position requires a degree in veterinary medicine from an accredited veterinary school; a license to practice veterinary medicine in California and placement in the top 3 levels of the civil service examination.

This proposition would remove only the civil service requirements. This is a professional position requiring not just minimal schooling but the highest level and quality of education. This would allow the zoo to consider advanced degrees and specializations aimed towards an exotic animal population. Research of positions in the City requiring similar professional degrees indicates that appointments to these positions are traditionally exempt from the civil service provisions and are not subject to the civil service examination process.

Under the present procedure, all candidates are placed on a list. The candidate must be chosen from the top three eligibles on the list. In fact, the best person for the job, on the basis of quality of education, experience and know-how, could be number four and unreachable by the zoo. Proposition G would eliminate this danger and allow the zoo to select the best person to care for our animals.

Proposition G would allow the zoo to monitor, evaluate and, if necessary, remove the veterinarian more efficiently and rapidly.

The Recreation and Park Commission endorses Proposition G.

The Zoo Advisory Committee, a panel of citizens that investigated and recommended changes for the zoo, also recommended this position be exempted from Civil Service.

We want the very best person to care for our animals. We need the authority to choose that person through the passage of Proposition G.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.
Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The proponents of “G” miss the point: This measure isn’t about health care for zoo animals, IT’S ABOUT PATRONAGE HIRING!

In order to create “flexibility” in filling one City position, the Supervisors ask you to “exempt” that position from Civil Service so that a politically-appointed body which serves at pleasure of politicians can pick whoever it wants for the job!

That’s patronage hiring no matter how you sugar coat it!

Civil service was mandated for most City positions in our Charter to end the patronage hiring abuses that had characterized City employment during the days of Boss Reuf and Mayor Eugene Schmitz (who left office after conviction for bribery!).

But the Supervisors would have us turn the clock backwards. If the politicians really were just worried that they need flexibility to consider the fourth or fifth person on the Civil Service List for employment as a zoo veterinarian, they could draft a charter amendment which says that.

Instead, we are asked to exempt the position from Civil Service, so the politicians’ appointed commissioners can fill this slot on the basis of political criteria (such as who did you support for Mayor last time). Do you really think a person who had actively campaigned against the incumbent mayor or supervisors would have a chance to be hired, even if he or she were by far the most qualified? VOTE “NO” ON “G”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

"G" is "GREEDY"!
Here they go again! This year, like nearly every election, the grabby group down at City Hall has decided to clutter our ballot with yet another measure to give the politicians opportunities to get their friends patronage jobs by exempting City positions from civil service.
And that's what "G" is about: Political Patronage!
Every time a position is "exempted" from civil service the politicians get a chance to hire their friends.
Surprised?
You shouldn't be!
"G" was put on the ballot by the same Supervisors who have tried to con you into doubling their salaries and quadrupling the amount of campaign contributions they are legally able to collect from wealthy special interests. The same Supervisors who gave a $9 million City street away to the Rockefellers for free. The same Supervisors who have given us dirty streets, rising crime rates, and a $100 million City deficit, while philosophizing about foreign policy!
Say "NO" to patronage hiring!
Say "No" To "G"!

COMMITTEE AGAINST PATRONAGE HIRING
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT'S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Proposition G actually means GREAT animal health care!
Zoo animal medicine is a very small specialty of veterinary medicine practiced by veterinarians either working at or associated with zoos throughout the nation. Exempting this position from Civil Service will allow the Recreation and Park Department to conduct a national recruitment and hire the best available candidate in a timely manner. This ensures a strong well guided medical program at the Zoo. Our animals need a person that has this specialization, not just a degree from an accredited veterinary school and a license to practice veterinary medicine in California.

This is no giveaway of public funds and the "friends" that will benefit will be our animal friends who have waited long enough!

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition G
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition G

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, relating to the appointment and removal of civil service exempt executives of the Recreation and Park Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county an election to be held therein on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 3.551 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

3.551 General Manager; Other Executives

The recreation and park commission shall appoint a general manager, who shall hold office at the pleasure of the commission. The commission shall also appoint a secretary, subject to the civil service provisions of this charter.

The general manager shall be the chief executive officer of the department. Subject to the approval of the commission, he shall have power to appoint and to remove a superintendent of recreation, a superintendent of parks, a director of the zoo, an executive secretary to the general manager, a chief veterinarian of the zoo, and a director of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, all of whom shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of this charter, and shall hold office subject to such power of removal on approval of the commission. The position of director of Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens shall be filled only by a person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to direct and administer a complete program for the development, operation and maintenance of an arboretum and botanical garden.

Out of town on June 2, 1992? Apply for an Absentee Ballot. Just complete the form on the back cover, put a 29¢ stamp where indicated and mail it in. You will be sent absentee voting materials, including a ballot.
PROPOSITION H
Shall the Purchaser no longer be required to maintain an inventory of all materials, supplies and equipment for other City departments, leaving the responsibility for maintaining such inventories to individual City departments?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Purchasing Department, under the supervision of the Controller, is responsible for ordering and keeping track of the inventory of supplies and equipment for other City departments. As part of this duty, Purchasing Department employees operate the City's many supply storerooms.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H is a charter amendment. Under Proposition H, the Purchaser would no longer be responsible for keeping track of inventories of supplies and equipment for other City departments. Instead, those departments would keep track of their own inventories.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make City departments responsible for keeping track of their own inventories.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Purchasing Department to continue to perform this duty.

Controller’s Statement on “H”
City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition H:
Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it should not affect the cost of government, assuming that operating departments can oversee their storerooms with existing staff resources.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On February 10, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 to place Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

We are asking for your approval of a technical change to the Charter. With this change, City departments will account for their own storeroom inventories and report to the Controller, instead of having the Purchasing Department do so for them. The departments' operations should improve and accountability for City property will be improved.

The Public Utilities Commission, the Airport, the Department of Public Works, and the Recreation and Park Department have storerooms which historically have been operated by employees of the Purchasing Department. These employees will be transferred to the departments where they work and which "own" the storerooms and the inventories. The goal is to make the operation of the storerooms more responsive to the departments they serve, with no increase in staff.

The proposed Charter change deletes Purchasing's inventory and reporting requirements. This means that the separate departments assume these responsibilities as owners of the supplies and equipment involved. Under new internal procedures, the departments will make periodic reports on their property to the Controller, so accountability will be maintained.

We ask you to vote Yes on Prop. H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 16, 1992.

Absent: Supervisor Maher.

REBUTTAL TO PROPOSENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

The argument in favor of "H" is about what one would expect from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in philosophizing about foreign policy: It makes no sense.

Permitting each City Department to keep track of its inventory without any central controls will not effect "savings" like the Supervisors claim, but will open the door for rampant waste and corruption.

If you were a crooked contractor, "H" would give you carte blanche to arrange kick-backs and gratuities with unscrupulous employees in individual departments who will be freed from oversight by the Purchaser's office.

But do you expect the folks under the dome at City Hall to figure this out!

Of course not! They're too busy running U.S. foreign policy and running for higher office!

Tell our City officials you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing, rather than cluttering our ballot up with ill-conceived measures that will encourage corruption such as "H".

Send City Hall a message that you're tired of fiscal irresponsibility, patronage politics and corruption.

VOTE "NO" ON "A", "B", "C", "D", "G", "H", "T" and "J"!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

“H” is Hilarious!
Hilarious, that is, if you are an unscrupulous City vendor or public employee “on the take.”

“H” would eliminate central inventory controls over City supplies and equipment now maintained by the City Purchaser, and, instead, allow each City department to keep track of its own inventory!

Sound like the fox guarding the chicken coop?
That’s right!

But, after all, what kind of sound government policies do you expect to emanate from a Board of Supervisors that specializes in passing foreign policy resolutions and giving away public land to well-connected developers?

What do you expect from a City government that has managed to run up a $100 million budget deficit?
The same people who brought us Metergate now want you to pass a ballot measure that will create an opportunity for new Metergates in every City department!

Tell the Supervisors that you want them working for cleaner streets, less crime, and affordable housing rather than cluttering our ballot up with ridiculous measures such as Proposition “H”.

VOTE “NO” ON “H”!

CITIZENS AGAINST CORRUPTION

Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPOSITION’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H

Proposition H will streamline government by eliminating duplication of effort. Proposition H’s opponents want City government to be cumbersome.

In City storerooms, storekeepers are being transferred from Purchasing to the individual departments. They will cease to be Purchasing employees and become employees of PUC, the Airport, Public Works, the Port, and Rec and Park. This reorganization is being done to improve operations. Proposition H does not affect this transfer — Proposition H makes a technical change to the Charter necessitated by the transfer.

If Proposition H is passed, departments will report inventory information directly to the Controller. If Proposition H is not passed, then departments could have to report the data to Purchasing, which in turn would report it to the Controller. This extra step is a waste of time and money, and adds nothing but delays to the process.

The Controller’s Office will continue to monitor inventory information. It makes no sense, but costs money, for data to bounce off Purchasing on its way to the Controller.

The amendment removes wasted effort, not control, from government.

Please save money by voting Yes on Proposition H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

This argument was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 23, 1992.
Absent: Supervisors Alioto and Maher.

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition H
No Paid Arguments Were Submitted Against Proposition H

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, relating to maintenance of inventories of materials, supplies, and equipment.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held thereon on June 2, 1992, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 7.100 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by strike-out type.

7.100. Material, Supplies, Equipment and Services

The purchaser of supplies shall purchase all materials, supplies and equipment of every kind and nature, and enter into agreement for all contractual services required by the several departments and offices of the city and county, except as in this section otherwise provided. Purchases of books, magazines and periodicals for the library departments, works of art for museums and other articles or things of unusual character as to the purchasing thereof, may, on the recommendation of a department head and the approval of the purchaser, be purchased directly by said department head.

Purchases for construction operations, or for any operations conducted outside the boundaries of the city and county may, on the recommendation of the department head in charge thereof, and the approval of the purchaser of supplies, be made by the department head. All such purchases made by officials of departments other than the purchasing department shall be made in accordance with regulations established by the purchaser of supplies. The purchaser of supplies shall have authority to exchange used materials, supplies, and equipment to the advantage of the city and county, advertise for bids, and to sell personal property belonging to the city and county on the recommendation of a department head that such articles are unfit for use.

All purchases shall be by written purchase order or written contract except in case of emergency. All purchases in excess of $1,000 shall be by written contract; provided, however, that on the recommendation of the department head, in case of an emergency actually existing, the purchaser of supplies, with the approval of the chief administrative officer, may make such purchases in the open market on the basis of informal bids. At least three bids or quotations shall be secured on open market purchases. All contracts and purchase orders in excess of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) of materials, supplies or equipment and all agreements for contractual services in excess of fifty thousand dollars shall require the signature of the chief administrative officer in addition to the signature of the purchaser of supplies. Beginning with fiscal year 1987-88, the board of supervisors shall be authorized to increase or decrease by ordinance the dollar amount of contracts requiring approval of the chief administrative officer under this section. The purchaser of supplies shall not enter into any contract or issue any purchase order unless the controller shall certify thereon that sufficient unencumbered balances are available in the proper fund to meet the payments under such purchase order or contract as these become due.

The purchaser of supplies shall establish specifications and tests to cover all recurring purchases of material supplies and equipment. He shall, as far as is practicable, standardize materials, supplies and equipment according to the use to which they are to be put, when two more types, brands or kinds are specified or requested by individual departments.

Purchases of equipment shall be made in accordance with specifications furnished by the department requiring such equipment in case the use of such equipment is peculiar to such department. For patented or proprietary articles sold by brand name, the purchaser may require each department requisitioning same by such brand name, to furnish specifications of the article requisitioned, and may advertise for bids on the basis of such specifications, under conditions permitting manufacturers of, or dealers in other articles made and sold for the same purpose, to bid on such specifications or on the specifications of their own product. If the purchaser of supplies recommends the acceptance of the lowest or best bid, stating his reasons in writing therefor, and if the department head concerned recommends the acceptance of any other bid on such proprietary articles, stating his reasons in writing therefor, the award shall be determined by the controller.

The purchaser of supplies shall require departments to make adequate inspection of all purchases, and shall make such other inspections as he deems necessary. He shall develop standards for determining when articles or services may be below standards, specifications of samples furnished should be rejected.

He shall have charge of central storerooms and warehouses of the city and county. He shall have charge of a central garage and shop for the repair of city and county equipment. All garages and shops heretofore maintained by departments for the construction, maintenance, and repair of departmental supplies and equipment, and the personnel assigned thereto, excepting the shop and personnel for fire alarm, police telegraph and traffic signal manufacture and repair operated by the department of electricity, are hereby transferred to said central garage and shop.

He shall, under the supervision of the controller, maintain an inventory for all materials, supplies and equipment purchased and in use in all departments and offices of the city and county. He shall be responsible for the periodic check of such property, and in case of loss or damage deemed by him to be due to negligence, he shall report the same to the mayor, the chief administrative officer and the controller. He shall have authority to require the transfer of surplus property in any department to stores or to other departments.
Dividing California into Two States

PROPOSITION I

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state?

Analysis
by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I would make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

A "YES" VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy to support the idea of dividing California into a northern California state and a southern California state.

A "NO" VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition I on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND ITS FULL TEXT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
PropONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

California’s government is in a coma. Can it be revived? That’s the only question you really need to answer before voting to create a new state out of Northern California.

An unusual proposal, but that doesn’t make it either new or bad. The Dakotas, Carolinas and Virginias have all split and so should the Californias.

Our state is over 30 million people. In twenty years, we will be bigger than Italy or France. The question is not how big can we get, but rather how big should we get?

State government should be localized, closer to the people. It provides local roads, schools, parks etc. It should interact personally with its citizenry, yet our state senator now has more constituents than our congressman, and soon our assemblyman will also. That’s not local government!

A smaller state would be more representative. Congress is already remote and Sacramento is getting there.

In reality, there are already two Californias. Historically, climatically, environmentally, economically and culturally, there are two separate and distinct Californias.

Culturally, San Franciscans and other Northern Californians are closer to Oregon and Washington than to Los Angeles and Orange County.

It is time to admit that bureaucracies will never shrink themselves. Our only hope is to start over: A brand new government designed by Northern Californians to serve Northern Californians.

Splitting our state will allow San Francisco and Los Angeles to pursue our separate destinies as neighbors and friends.

Residents of the 51st State will have similar values, better representation and greater control over their own destiny. Your “YES” vote will not make all of our problems disappear. We’ll just finally get to deal with them our own way.

Voting YES on I commits us to nothing. It simply allows us to explore the possibilities.

Vote YES on I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Split California? GET REAL! There are no compelling arguments for dividing the state.

The Dakotas and Carolinas were never split as states. They were admitted as separate states, North and South. It took the Civil War to divide Virginia.

Sacramento won’t move any closer if the state is split. Local roads, parks, and schools have always been the primary responsibility of local government. If California is divided, the new state would still have a very large population — maybe 15 million. We still couldn’t get to know our representatives personally.

Splitting the state would not reduce the bureaucracy or cut costs. The bureaucracy would double. We would have to build a new state capitol and hundreds of other new facilities.

The proponents argue that a smaller state would be more representative — but of what? A smaller state would be dominated by rural areas where interests such as lumber and mining hold inordinate power. It could be disastrous for our urban communities and our environment. If Southern California is allowed to develop the coastline unchecked, our beautiful coast could be destroyed.

California is already Number One. We already have the biggest voice in Washington. Our state’s economy is one of the largest, most diversified, and most technologically advanced in the world. We share 200 years of history and culture. Why change a good thing?

Vote NO on I (splitting the state) and I (policy favoring state splitting).

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

The Golden State is often depicted as a state full of freeways, fast cars, valley girls, yuppies, guppies and spaced-out hippies. However, these stereotypes belittle an aspect of California we should be proud of. California is enriched by its great diversity — culturally, economically, and politically.

The Golden State has shared a common history and culture since the early Spanish missionaries settled in the 1700s. California was admitted to the Union in 1850. There are numerous state symbols — the poppy, the redwood, the grizzly bear, the real California cheese . . .

A state assemblyman from a rural district proposes in Proposition I to divide California into two states (Northern and Southern California). Get a life! There are much more pressing issues — the recession, education, and the environment, for example — that we should be concerned with. Proposals like Proposition I make outsiders think Californians are wacky.

California, besides sharing a common history and culture, is one of the leading industrial, agricultural, and technological powers of the world. With over 50 electoral votes, we are politically the most powerful state in the nation.

Dividing the state would hamper our ability to protect the environment. California’s ecological concerns are better addressed by one unified state policy. Northern California’s voice in legislation is vital in preserving our whole state’s beautiful coastline. Pollution and other environmental problems directly affect California as a whole.

Putting Proposition I on the ballot has cost the city over $25,000 of our tax money. Voting a unified NO on Proposition I will send a strong message: DON’T WASTE OUR TAX DOLLARS ON FRIVOLOUS BALLOT MEASURES!

Committee Against Splitting the State
Alexa Smith
Arlo H. Smith
Andrew de la Rosa

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

ALL THAT THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION I WOULD DO IS TO ALLOW SAN FRANCISCANS THE RIGHT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPT OF A SEPARATE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STATE.

The opponents of Proposition I have totally closed minds. They aren’t interested in discussing creative ways of making our legislative system work better for us. Don’t they trust the voters?

The opponents of Proposition I would have you believe that any discussion of splitting the state is wacky. With that kind of reasoning, do they think that North and South Dakota, North and South Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia are wacky too?

Over 30 of California’s counties have placed this measure on their June ballots. Are San Franciscans going to sit on the sidelines and let other counties set the agenda on this discussion? Shouldn’t San Franciscans have the same right to express themselves as the rest of the counties?

Opponents of Proposition I argue that we should be proud of our diversity. We are and we will continue to be diverse. Have the opponents looked around and seen who lives in the Bay Area these days? The issue of diversity has nothing to do with exploring the alternatives to a 50,000,000 person mega-state that is unresponsive to its citizens needs.

Lastly, the only costs involved in presenting this measure to the voters is the cost of printing the page in a voter handbook that would be mailed out anyway.

Isn’t our right to express our opinion worth that much?

Vote YES on PROPOSITION I.

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher
Dividing California into Two States

No Paid Arguments Were Submitted In Favor Of Proposition I

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

There's no legitimate reason why this measure is on the ballot. A fatuous Board of Supervisors, the sponsor of Proposition I, is so embarrassed by its fiscal foolhardiness, that it wouldn't even submit a ballot argument in support of Proposition I. This is irresponsibility at its zenith. Severing California in two pieces won't solve any problem facing California. Even if San Franciscans voted unanimously, the effect on the State Legislature, which holds the power to determine such a measure, would be negligible at best.

Think of all the extra expenses of hundreds of politicians on the payroll and perquisites of a Northern California. It's enough to make Jimmy Gonzales' mouth water.

Yet once again, San Francisco officials have taken it upon themselves to offer voters a meaningless ballot measure on a frivolous issue, which, according to the City Controller, will cost San Francisco taxpayers a "substantial, but presently indeterminable amount".

The proponent of the measure argues that State government should be more personalized, that State government should "interact" in a more personal way with citizens, and that state senators represent more constituents than representatives in the US Congress. He fails to point out, however, that members of the Board of Supervisors have as many constituents as state representatives and about 100,000 more than congressional representatives. If supervisors are serious about personal interaction, perhaps they mean implementation of district elections for the Board of Supervisors.

There's no reason to believe that two governors and two more Assemblies and Senators will be any better than one. It's sad that some people feel the answer to California's problems lie in the creation of more government. Perhaps proponents of Proposition I see it as a way to get a job in State government.

VOTE NO ON I!

Save the spotted owl!
Don't let timber interests chop off Northern California.

Dave Wall
John Riordan
Candidates for Democratic Central Committee

City and County of San Francisco heroes Fremont, Stanford, and General Sherman wouldn't support California's breakup.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeeman

Vote No on Proposition I. California's problems will not be solved by dividing the state. Dividing California will not create more jobs, end the drought or reduce taxes.

Don't double the size of state government. Vote No on Proposition I.

Donald D. Doyle
President
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
VICE PRESIDENT QUENTIN L. KOPP

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Kopp's Good Government Committee opposes the Board of Supervisors' proposal to divide California and is indignant that irresponsible supervisors would encumber the Municipal ballot with a meaningless "advisory" trick. So pathetic is the Board of Supervisors that it didn't even have the nerve to submit a ballot argument in support of Propositions I or J. Anyone who abhors the foolishness of Board of Supervisors resolutions on foreign affairs should likewise oppose this wasteful proposition. The Registrar of Voters estimates Propositions I and J will cost San Francisco taxpayers $50,000 in ballot expenses. What sloth — at our expense.

The argument espousing the division of California is as old as the state itself, and the idea has been good for nothing more than "hype" or publicity for the instigator of the proposal. So is the case with Proposition I, which proposes to divide California into Northern California and Southern California. Similar measures have been rejected in 1859, 1909, 1941, 1964, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1974 and 1978.

This measure supposedly creates "city policy". Even however, if a majority of San Francisco voters supported the measure, only the Legislature is empowered to enact the proposition. Therefore, it's an egregious, baleful waste of taxpayers' time and money. There are an endless number of serious issues facing San Francisco, but dividing the State of California is not among them. When will our supervisors get serious. Send them a message — we are fed up and insulted by their vaudevillian antics.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION I!

KOPP’S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan
TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION I

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF DIVIDING THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTO TWO STATES, NORTH CALIFORNIA AND SOUTH CALIFORNIA

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to support dividing the State of California into two states, consisting of a northern California state and a southern California state?

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION J

DESCRIPTING AND SETTING FORTH A DECLARATION OF POLICY TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD THEREIN ON JUNE 2, 1992, RELATING TO THE QUESTION OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO BEING A PART OF THE STATE OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, IN THE EVENT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IS DIVIDED INTO TWO STATES.

BE IT MOVED, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Charter Section 9.108, sets forth the following declaration of policy to be submitted to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held on June 2, 1992:

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in the event the State of California were divided into a northern California state and a southern California state, for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state?
San Francisco in Northern California

PROPOSITION J

Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California is divided into a northern California state and a southern California state?

YES  ➔  NO  ➔

Analysis

by Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The United States is made up of 50 states. California is one of those states. It has been proposed that California be divided into two states, a northern California state and a southern California state.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J would make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A “YES” VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to make it City policy for San Francisco to be part of the northern California state if California were divided into two states.

A “NO” VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want to adopt this policy.

Controller's Statement on “J”

City Controller Edward Harrington has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed declaration of policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would affect the cost of government in possibly substantial but presently indeterminable amounts.

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 18, 1992 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 to place Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


ABSENT: Supervisor Alioto.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST THIS MEASURE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW THIS PAGE.
TEXT FOR PROPOSITION J IS ON PAGE 82.
San Francisco in Northern California

PROONENT'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

If you agree that California should be split into two states, then San Francisco should be located in Northern California.

The boundaries of the 51st State must be approved by a majority of the voters before the split can occur.

Historically, culturally, environmentally, and economically, San Francisco belongs in Northern California.

Look no further than to the debates over creeping Los Angelization. Or freeway spirals. Or Honda ads spoofing northern versus southern California car attitudes. Even Madison Avenue recognizes our inherent differences.

How much will a new state cost? Thankfully, no more than we can afford. The legislation to divide California carries a "state-back" guarantee. It does not allow taxes to be raised, education funding to be cut, the CSU or UC system to deny access or charge out of state tuition, or permit any retirement or pension plan to be changed.

Let's keep San Francisco is northern California and allow the two new states to pursue our own destinies as neighbors and as friends.

Vote "YES" on Proposition J.

Submitted by Supervisors Bill Maher and Harry Britt

REBUTTAL TO PROONENT’S ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Proposition J would express approval for splitting the state. Vote NO on J. San Francisco should remain within California.

The proponents suggest that media stereotypes are a valid reason for splitting the state. But don't let car commercials fool you. Songwriters recognize the broad similarities between Northern and Southern California. They don't speak of "Northern California Girl" or "Hotel Southern California."

Actually Northern and Southern California have many things in common. Both regions share concerns over urban development, the environment, hi-tech industry, and earthquakes. Common concerns are best addressed by a unified state policy.

If California splits, San Francisco would be one of the few major cities in Northern California. Urban areas would have less of a voice in legislation affecting issues such as the environment. The new state would be dominated by rural areas and the timber and mining industries. These industries have manifested little concern for the environment.

If we are going to split the state wherever there are cultural differences, when would it stop? When San Francisco is a state all by itself?

Splitting the state would be costly. We would have to duplicate the existing state government. WE CAN'T AFFORD IT!

Besides the great cost, how would we decide who gets what? Who would get the GRIZZLY BEAR and the REAL CALIFORNIA CHEESE, for example? If that seems difficult, what about the really serious issues?

Vote NO on I and J!

Committee Against The "State-Split" Joke
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember
OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

"J" IS A JOKE!
A joke on us, the taxpayers, who will have to foot a $25,000 or so bill because the Supervisors did not have the good sense to keep this frivolous measure off the ballot.
Proposition “J” asks us to declare a policy that San Francisco should be part of the new state of Northern California if the Golden State is divided.
Who wants to divide California? Lumber and agricultural interests represented by Assemblyman Stan Stanham who want weaker environmental, labor and consumer protection laws! People who want an all-white rural state of “Northern California” Those who want a “Northern California” state government and congressional delegation with few women and minorities!
To vote “YES” on Proposition “J” is to say you think this backwoods “state-splitting” scheme is o.k.
Tell City Hall you’re tired of the jokes like Proposition “J” the Supervisors keep cluttering on our ballots.
Tell the Supervisors you want them to spend their time getting us clean streets, less crime and affordable housing, rather than grandstanding with foreign policy issues, and crackpot ballot measures like the present one.
Tell the Supervisors to stop clowning around!
VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION J!

COMMITTEE AGAINST THE “STATE-SPLIT” JOKE
Arlo H. Smith, Democratic County Committeemember
Alexa Smith, Democratic State Committeemember

REBUTTAL TO OPPONENT’S ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

FREEDOM OF CHOICE and FREE SPEECH IS NO JOKE!!!
What Proposition “J” really asks is, “If you would like to discuss the idea of a Northern and Southern California, which state would you prefer to be in?”
In other words, why should San Franciscans allow the other thirty counties which will vote on this measure decide on which state we belong in?
California will only continue to grow! It’s a fact. If you had 30 million relatives come live with you, would you keep them all in one house? It makes sense to at least think about and discuss buying another house just as it makes sense to at least think about and discuss creating another state.
San Franciscans are, and will continue to be, ethnically and culturally diverse. In a smaller state, all of our different communities will have more representation, not less! Don’t let the right to shape your own destiny be taken from you!
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Submitted by Supervisor Bill Maher

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Don't be misled. The Board of Supervisors doesn't even have the courage of its convictions to submit an argument in support of Proposition J, because it's spurious and embarrassing. Send the supervisors another message — you're elected to conduct municipal affairs, not for cheap publicity stunts. Stop costing us money with crazed ballot measures. Why does it always seem as if running the city well is the last thing on Board members' minds? VOTE NO ON J.

KOPP'S GOOD GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
Cheryl Arenson
Dan Dunnigan

Keep the City and County of San Francisco in historical California.

John Riordan
Democratic Committee Candidate
Past College Board President
Terence Faulkner
Republican Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinion of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
DON'T LET THE WIND BLOW YOUR RECYCLABLE PAPER AWAY!

Put paper in paper bags or tie it with string.
Help keep our streets clean while you recycle!
Important Facts About Absentee Voting  
Also Known as Vote-By-Mail

APPLICATION FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT

Any voter may get an absentee ballot. You no longer need a reason (e.g. illness, travel) to get an absentee ballot. Any registered voter may request one.

Permanent Absentee Voters: The disabled may apply to become permanent absentee voters. A permanent absentee voter will automatically receive a ballot each election without having to apply each time. Whenever a permanent absentee voter moves or re-registers however, s/he must re-apply for permanent status. Frequent travellers are not eligible for permanent absentee voter status. They must apply for an absentee ballot each time. An application to be a permanent absentee voter is on the back cover of this pamphlet.

Third Party Delivery of Absentee Ballot Applications: Unless you know and trust the person delivering your application for an absentee ballot, you should deliver or mail it directly to the office of the Registrar of Voters. Political campaigns often ask voters to mail their applications to their campaign headquarters, and the campaigns then add the information you provide to their files and mailing lists. This may delay your application for as much as three weeks or even past the deadline for the application to arrive in our office. If you receive an absentee ballot application from a campaign, we recommend that you mail it directly to the San Francisco Registrar of Voters.

Applications: We strongly recommend that voters use the application provided on the back cover of the voter information pamphlet and include the mailing label with the bar code. This form with the bar code on the label allows us to process your request more rapidly.

If you do not have that application form, you may send us another application form or you may send a post card with your request for an absentee ballot. Please print your name, birthdate and residence address, the address where you want the ballot sent if it is different, your day and night telephone numbers, your signature and the date you are making your request. You may “fax” your request to this office at (415) 554-4047.

RETURNING YOUR ABSENTEE BALLOT

To be counted, your ballot must arrive in the Office of the Registrar of Voters or any polling place by 8 p.m. on Election Day. If your ballot arrives after that time, it will not be counted. A postmark on your absentee ballot return envelope before or on Election Day is not acceptable if the ballot arrives after 8 p.m. on Election Day.

Never make any identifying marks on your ballot card. Some absentee voters sign or initial their ballot card. NEVER make any identifying marks on your ballot. Your ballot is no longer considered secret, if there is such a mark, initial or signature, and thus cannot be counted. This is also true for the write-in stub if you vote for a write-in candidate.

“Cleaning” your ballot card: After punching out the holes corresponding to your choices, you will notice that there are many little paper chips hanging from the back of the card. These hanging paper chips must be removed from the back of the card, or they will fall back into their holes as if you never punched it, and thus those votes will not be counted.

You must sign your name on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. You must personally sign the envelope in the space provided. No one else, including anyone with a power of attorney, is permitted to sign for you. If your signature is not on the envelope, it will not be opened, and the ballot will not be counted. Also, be sure not to damage the Bar Code that is printed on your Absentee Return Envelope. It helps us to process your ballot faster.

Third party delivery of ballots: If you do not mail your absentee ballot and are unable to deliver your ballot to the Registrar of Voters or a polling place, only your spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, sister or brother can return your absentee ballot for you. However, when you have your ballot returned by a third party, you and that person must complete the appropriate sections on the Absentee Ballot Return Envelope. Your ballot will not be counted unless those sections have been completed properly.

EMERGENCY VOTING

Within seven days of an election, if you become ill or disabled, and are unable to go to your polling place, you may request in a written statement, signed under penalty of perjury, a ballot to be delivered by your authorized representative who presents the written statement at the Office of the Registrar of Voters.

You or your authorized representative may return the ballot to the Registrar of Voters or to a polling place. If your authorized representative returns the ballot, the appropriate sections of the absentee ballot return envelope must be completed. THESE BALLOTS MAY NOT BE MAILED.
Telephoning the Registrar of Voters

The Registrar now has special lines for specific purposes:
To register to vote, call 554-4398.
To request an absentee ballot application, call 554-4399.
For information about becoming a Poll Worker, call 554-4385.
For all other information, call 554-4375.

For your convenience and because of the huge number of calls during the weeks leading up to the election, the Registrar uses automated information lines in addition to regular operators. If all operators are busy, callers may hear recorded messages which will direct them to leave their name, address and telephone number. Callers with touch tone phones may be asked to press numbers to direct their calls. Callers with rotary phones may wait on the line for an operator, or to leave a message.

AVOID LONG LINES — VOTE BY MAIL

It's as easy as 1-2-3.
1. Complete the application on the back cover.
2. Put a 29¢ stamp where indicated.
3. Drop your completed application into a mail box.
Within two weeks, you will receive your Absentee Ballot.

YOUR POLLING PLACE

The location of your polling place is shown on the label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you.

Of the 7,000+ telephone calls received by the Registrar of Voters on Election Day, almost all of them are from voters asking where they should go to vote.

Remember on Election Day, take the back cover of your Voter Information Pamphlet with you. The address of your polling place is on the top part of the mailing label on the back cover of the Voter Information Pamphlet which was sent to you. You may also wish to write down the address of your polling place in the space provided on the Polling Place Card.
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**POLLING PLACE CARD:** To save time and reduce waiting lines, take this page with you to the Polls. Show your mailing label to the poll worker. The location of your polling place is on the mailing label on the other side of this page.

After reading this pamphlet, write down the names and numbers of the candidates of your choice. Write the number corresponding to your choice of "YES" or "NO" for each of the State and Local Propositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - SHORT TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US SENATOR - LONG TERM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SENATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PROPS</th>
<th>PROP</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES - Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE, MUNI COURT # 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you remember to **SIGN** your application on the other side?

Your Return Address

___________________________________________

___________________________________________

Germaine Q Wong
San Francisco Registrar of Voters
Room 158 -- City Hall
400 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4691

[Place Stamp Here]
The Post Office
Will Not Deliver
Mail Without
Postage
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
City and County of San Francisco
Room 158 - City Hall
400 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
(415) 554 - 4375

Ballot Type
Green
13th Assembly District
3rd Senate District
8th Congressional
Precincts Applicable
3000's

Voter, please bring this entire back page with you to the polling place.
The location of your polling place is shown on the label below.

Please **DO NOT** remove the label from the application below.

Vote-By-Mail Voters --- Cut or Tear Along Perforated Line

**Do Not Remove Label**

LOCATION OF YOUR POLLING PLACE ➔

MAILING ADDRESS ➔

**ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED**
**YES OR NO**

**ABSENTEE BALLOT (Vote-By-Mail) APPLICATION - June 2, 1992 Primary Election**

**Sign** this application and return it. Registrar must receive application by May 26, 1992.

**Check One:**
☐ Send my ballot to the address on the label above.
☐ I want my ballot sent to the address printed below.

☐ I apply to be a PERMANENT ABSENTEE VOTER; I meet the qualifications explained on page 5.
☐ All voters receive the English version; I also want my Voter Information Pamphlet in: Spanish _____, Chinese _____

**Check Here If Appropriate:**
☐ I have moved since I last registered to vote.
☐ My new address is printed below.
(Residence Address ONLY.)

☐ [Address Details]

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 9411 [Apt. No.]

**Check below all that apply, then sign your name:**

☐ You MUST SIGN here, to receive a ballot.

☐ [Signature]

☐ [Date Signed]
☐ [Day Time Phone]
☐ [Evening Phone]

Your signature - **DO NOT PRINT**